

The Logic Of Sense In The Jubilate Agno By Christopher Smart

A Test Case for the theory of Sense of Deleuze

Kent D. Palmer, Ph.D.

P.O. Box 1632
Orange CA 92856 USA
714-633-9508
kent@palmer.name

Copyright 2004 K.D. Palmer.
All Rights Reserved. Not for distribution.
Started 04.10.21; Version 0.4; 04.10.27; csj01a04.doc

Keywords: Deleuze, Smart, Madness, Series,
Sense, Logic

Jubilate Agno

Christopher Smart (Smart) (1722- 1771) was a poet who went mad and wrote the Jubilate Agno (JA) between 1758 and 1763. JA was discovered in manuscript and published after the poet's death as an example of the writings of a poet as madman. It seems an excellent test case for the theory of Deleuze in Logic of Sense. Deleuze singles out the child, the madman and the poet for special treatment in his book. Smart also wrote children's poetry during his career as a poet. Also in a famous slanderous attack on Smart just before he is put away in the madhouse he is compared to a child. So Smart comes the closest of anyone I know of in English who brings together the features that Deleuze would like to emphasize in the relations between poet, child and madman.

Johnson had this to say about Smart:

"Madness frequently discovers itself merely by unnecessary deviation from the usual modes of the world. My poor friend Smart showed the disturbance of his mind, by falling upon his knees, and saying his prayers in the street, or in any other unusual place. Now although, rationally speaking, it is greater madness not to pray at all, than to pray as Smart did, I am afraid there are so many who do not pray, that their understanding is not called in question."¹

The degree of the madness of Smart is not known but it is known that he was confined at least twice during the years of his breakdown and that it was during this time that he wrote JA. There is some evidence that he was not mad and was in fact a political prisoner. But the case is very unclear.

Here the plan is not to offer any proof of his madness. Nor are we attempting to offer any literary criticism of this work in relation to the other sane works of Smart. Rather what we would like to do is to use JA as a test case for the theory that G. Deleuze offers in Logic of Sense. The *theory of sense* in the Logic of Sense (LoS) makes use of madness and paradox as a ground for understanding the nature of sense. However, the theory is lacking good examples that might give us confidence in it. Therefore, the exploration of other examples in order to increase our confidence in the theory of Deleuze is in order. The poem of Smart then appears on the horizon once we start to look for other promising examples. This is because of the structure of the JA. The JA was originally written in a call and response form with a series of **Let** phrases aligned at least partially with **For** phrases in imitation of certain conjunctions of Let and For phrases in the Bible. It is said that it is clear from the numbering of the manuscript that he would write the Let phrase on one page and the For phrase that coincided with it on the adjacent page². Thus, it appears Smart has constructed in his JA poem two series of phrases that begin with Let and For which are parallel to some extent with each other.

¹ Life of Johnson

² However other scholars dispute this.

Unfortunately we have lost some of the poem so we cannot see the full extent of the coincidence of these two series. But Deleuze is clear in his presentation of the idea of **series** in LoS that series that arise out of paradox should always be doubled. Thus the JA gives us a good starting point for understanding how these two series might arise out of madness, i.e. lived paradox as expressed by the poet whose mind has returned some might say to a state similar to the child or a primitive. Deleuze believes that Children, Poets and Madmen have a privileged position when it comes to being able to understand paradoxicality and thus the sense that arises out of this groundless ground. But once we recognize that Smart has constructed a good example of partially aligned dual series in his poetry of madness then we see that this is a good test case for the Deleuzian theory because we can ask whether the other elements that Deleuze mentions are there in the JA. These other elements include the floating signifier which is paradoxically part of both series, also the esoteric and portmanteau words, and the other elements that Deleuze mentions in LoS. Deleuze constructs an elaborate theory of how these various concepts relate to each other without giving us many good examples of these relations which makes us wonder whether he just made up the structure of his theory or whether they have any reference to things in the world, such as the poems of mad poets. Deleuze himself uses the work of Artaud as an example of madness in depth counter to the superficiality of Carroll's madcap antics in his children's books. But in Smart we appear to have a madness of superficiality rather than depth (or a combination of both) which is exemplifying the double series on the surface that Deleuze is speaking about in relation to the work of Carroll. So the question we can ask is whether this example of the generation of the double series in poetry assailed by madness has the other aspects that Deleuze attributes to the Theory of Sense in LoS. Also this poem gives us a concrete example of two series such as those that Deleuze speaks of and it is helpful to have such an example because in his use of the

term 'series' Deleuze is also vague using the term in a wide meaning related to his term *repetition* in Difference and Repetition. We might think of a series as the result of a Repetition compulsion. The point that Deleuze makes in his earlier book is that no matter how many times we repeat something we can never recapture the source of the repetition which is a unique singularity that can never be repeated. The dual series that Smart creates while he is confined for his madness is an excellent example of the kind of series we might expect from the madman. In *Anti-Oedipus* Deleuze and Guattari talk of how the schizophrenic deals with the movements of whole peoples in their expression of their madness. In JA Smart deals with the myriad names in the bible and associates each one with an animal, herb or stone. Each Name uses each animal to express either praise or blessing within the Let phrase. The corresponding For phrase contains the response of Smart, i.e. what that kind of praise or blessing from the unique perspective of that conjunction of man and animal calls up in him. Thus, the Let phrase is inherently doubled already by its conjunction of the Biblical Name and the Animal/Herb/Stone in question. Some of the Name and Animal combinations are obvious from the bible stories themselves. But after exhausting these natural associations then Smart allows his imagination run wild in associating Biblical Names and Animal Species as if he were trying to exhaust both resources in his repetitions of the Let phrases. It is interesting in the context of Deleuze that he wrote each one on a separate piece of paper, obviously standing side by side one numbered even and the other numbered odd for each corresponding Let and For phrases. This is because Deleuze says that there is a line of sense between the two parallel series. In other words sense comes out of the frontier between the two series which in this case is a discontinuity of the space between the two pages on which the phrases are written. So from a Deleuzian point of view the set up of the two series on two adjacent pages in JA is almost a perfect representation of the theoretical double series. Also because each Let statement specifies a different Name in the

Bible and a different species of animal we are dealing here with heterogeneity and difference. This is amplified by the fact that classification schemes for animals in the Eighteenth century were in chaos. This chaos of classification of animals in the biology at of the time is balanced by the fact that we know nothing or almost nothing of many names in the bible. Many times these names in the bible appear as mentions, as in genealogies, and we know nothing of the people to whom the names refer. So that the names in many cases have come unglued from the biography of the person named and thus the names become like floating signifiers. However for the most part the names of the animals are actual common animals (rather than genus and species in some classificatory system) given in the books that Smart had access to in his captivity or sometimes times these are the poetic names for the animals that are given. However, the names of the animals are not specified in any ordered way by a specific tree of genera or species, rather they are mentioned randomly as Smart saw fit. Likewise there is no seeming order to the mention of the names from the bible. Rather there is a heterogeneity of names and of animals that emphasizes difference. And this difference is emphasized by the quixotic combinations of animals and names in many cases which bubble up out of the imagination of Smart. So, here is another reason that Deleuze would like the series that Smart has created, because they emphasize difference and heterogeneity, and each combination has the feel of a fated throw, i.e. an arbitrary combination that when considered by itself can be considered determinate. Each combination is a determination of a relation between man and beast. Continually the esoteric biblical name is combined with an arbitrary beast and the combination itself has the feel of what Deleuze calls the portmanteau name, i.e. a chiasmic combination where beast and man combine in order to offer blessing or praise, one by the means of the other, or vice versa. So there is a lot going for our using Smart's JA as prime example on which to test the Deleuzian theory. If madness does produce paradox and out of that paradox two series do

form then we would also expect to see other aspects of the theory of Deleuze in Logic of Sense appear such as the paradoxical floating elements, the esoteric words, and the portmanteau words, and other aspects of the theory that are so difficult to imagine without good examples to lead our intuitions along the way that Deleuze is indicating.

This paper will be constructed as a working paper or an experiment in which we will take a part of the theory of Deleuze one at a time and try to find the corresponding element in Smart's JA. We will treat the JA of Smart as Deleuze treats the work of Carroll such as Alice in Wonderland. JA is clearly nonsense and one feels as one reads it that it is the work of a madman. But there are moments of beauty and strangeness in it that are awe inspiring. Within the endless repetition of Let and For phrases there are moments of inspiration that rises above the monotony of the endless difference between man's name and beast or stone or herb. It is those moments in which a preternatural sense rises out of the non-sense. And it is because of those moments that JA holds the interest of critics. We do not have many works of an actual poet in the midst of his madness. And what is so interesting is the contrast between JA and the *Song to David* that he wrote after his madness which has a crystal clear quality that is quite astounding, and which is much better than the poet's previous works in the eyes of the critics. However, *Song to David* also has some very esoteric parts where he talks about the pillars of the temple which were considered by many contemporary readers to reflect Smart's continued madness. So we could go another step and consider the relation of the poet's work before and after madness with the production of madness itself, which we can rarely do in the case of poets. But in this essay we will not take that further step of considering the JA in context with his other works except as is necessary for our to exploration of Sense in JA. Smart was noted for winning prizes for religious poetry. He won one prize five times for his religious poetry and that was the basis of his fame. But he

wrote all sorts of poetry some of it very bawdy. He also edited and wrote absurd political satire in Magazines called *the Student* and *the Mindwife*. So we can see that he led a life that was torn between religion and the life of the world. In his breakdown there is some sort of religious crisis that is working itself out which afterwards allows him to write the *Song to David* which is an astonishing work of Praise about the Poet of the Bible who wrote the Psalms, but who himself had many stories told about his worldly involvement. It is clear from the poem that Smart identified himself with David and that the poem which is considered his best work was in some sense a result of individuation that came out of his madness. But here we are concerned not with the diachronic view of Smart's development through madness to individuation. Rather we are concerned with the nature of the madness itself and its effects on his production, which was to destroy his capacity for production of poetry which sank into a kind of obsessive repetition of difference. No better example could Deleuze hope for of the repetition of difference. Smart translated the Psalms of David from the Bible. Yet, the work of David the poet of the bible who wrote the psalms is the event that cannot be repeated by any other poet. Thus in writing his own poetry Smart is stuck in a repetition compulsion complex related to his desire to achieve what David had achieved in the Bible. Eventually Smart solves the problem of the repetition complex by writing a poem about David himself. Smart cannot be a David again. There was only one David and there are only one group of poems that are the psalms. Imitations such as those that Smart tried to write will not do. Ultimately all of Smart's repetitions of attempts to write genuine religious poetry must fail despite winning prizes. In the prize poetry that Smart wrote he attempts to solve the problem of the authority of the poet when writing in a religion of revelation with a monotheistic God. Poets do not have access to revelation and thus must solve the paradox of their not knowing enough to speak about revealed subjects. Although he solves this problem of authority of voice in his prize winning poems he does not manage to

live the religious life that would support his words in those poems. He is not a man like Blake who lived out his convictions. So eventually Smart sinks into the sullied world as he writes for various literary magazines as a hack writer of anonymous satirical and perhaps political pieces. Eventually this worldliness mostly in the form of drinking and indulgence in prostitution of his day takes a toll on Smart and he disintegrates into a religious madman in an age of enlightenment where there is not much tolerance for that sort of madness. He takes the Mrs. Mary Midnight character from *The Midwife* on stage where he dresses in drag and presents her orations. It is said that eventually he has his identity revealed and that he was put in private prison of a mental institution by the government as a punishment for his scathing satire. But whether sane or mad Smart is put into prison after a scandalous attack on him printed by his publisher Newbery who wanted to distance himself from Smart. In that attack Smart is called a Six Foot Tall Child and accused of being a Homosexual because of his cross dressing. Once he is in the insane asylum, whether as political prisoner or as mad man, Smart resorts to a repetition compulsion which some believed that he used to mark his days of confinement. It is the product of this repetition compulsion that we will study through a Deleuzian lens to see whether it supports the theory of Logic of Sense or not.

Preamble

First we will consider the preamble to the JA text in which Smart sets up the basis for the repetition of Let and For phrases.

Rejoice in God, O ye Tongues; give the glory to the Lord, and the Lamb.

Notice here the reference to the *tongues* that are to rejoice and give glory to God as Father and Son.

Nations, and languages, and every Creature, in which is the breath of Life.

Smart is referring to the tongues of all creatures with the breath of life, including all the nations with their various languages. This

reminds us of the places in *Anti-Oedipus* where Deleuze and Guattari talk about how the schizophrenic will talk about the movements of whole peoples and not about themselves. Thus there is a reference here to a fundamental phenomena of madness from the point of view of Deleuze and Guattari of the mass nomadism of Schizophrenia. So this suggests a depth madness like that of Artaud as opposed to the surface silliness of Carroll. What is interesting about this work of Smart is that it combines both the dual series of Carroll that suggests surface with the depths suggested by Atraud. For Deleuze and Guattari the mention of the multitudes of living creatures, and especially their tongues, is an important sign of schizophrenia. The tongue is at a key point in the body that it expresses speech, but it also is involved in all sorts of bodily functions and even sexual functions in the role of a desiring machine. But *tongues* is only mentioned once in the JA text so there is no other context in which to see the plural word used to attempt to determine its other functions besides rejoicing. However, the singular word *tongue* is mentioned several times. One mention is as follows:

For the ENGLISH TONGUE shall be the language of the WEST.

So the tongue means the language, of which he thinks the English language is unique and has a unique destiny in the West which is a prophecy that seems to be beginning to be fulfilled.

For every word has its marrow in the English tongue for order and for delight.

Smart thinks that the English Tongue is the core of language in general.

For his (Jeoffry's) tongue is exceeding pure so that it has in purity what it wants in musick.

Smart attributes purity to the tongue of his cat.

Let Ziba rejoice with Glottis whose tongue is wreathed in his throat.

Here is a standard example of a Let phrase that

mentions the tongue. Ziba means statue³ and he was a servant of Saul given lands of Mephibosheth by David which he was allowed to keep despite varying stories of the behavior of Mephibosheth's (exterminating the idol) behavior during the rebellion of Absalom. Glottis means the space between the vocal chords⁴.

So the words of Ziba were words of discord, as a result of which he gained half the lands of the son of Saul that he was suppose to look after Mephibosheth⁵ who corrected the story

³ a servant of Saul whom David made steward of Saul's son Mephibosheth. 2Sa 9:2-18; 16:1-4; 19:17,29; http://www.reference-guides.com/smiths_bible_dictionary/Ziba/

⁴ The space between the vocal cords is called the glottis. As the vocal cords vibrate, the resulting vibration produces a "buzzing" quality to the speech, called voice or voicing. See <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Glottis>

⁵ Mephibosheth: (exterminating the idol), the name borne by two members of the family of Saul --his son and his grandson.

1. Saul's son by Rizpah the daughter of Aiah, his concubine. 2Sa 21:8 He and his brother Armoni were among the seven victims who were surrendered by David to the Gibeonites, and by them crucified to avert a famine from which the country was suffering.

Ziba told. David said, "Shall there any man be put to death this day?" and was in a generous frame of mind and therefore did not rescind his gift.

The tongue can therefore be the language of a people or of an animal like Smart's cat. But it can also bear besides praise and blessing false speech which is made for gain of property, such as the speech of the accusers of Smart. The Glottis produces the consonants.

In a way you can see the tongue as a singularity from which all the praise and rejoicing comes but which also ties man to the world through eating and other vulgar or lying speech as well as acts that might be considered sinful. The tongue in this sense is a floating signifier. And it is the tongue that is uttering each of the For and Let phrases in the text. So it is the origin point of the praise and rejoicing,

2. The son of Jonathan, grandson of Saul and nephew of the preceding; called also Merib-baal. 1Ch 8:34 His life seems to have been, from beginning to end, one of trial and discomfort. When his father and grandfather were slain on Gilboa he was an infant but five years old. At this age he met with an accident which deprived him for life of the use of both feet. 2Sa 4:4 After this he is found a home with Machir ben-Ammiel a powerful Gadite, who brought him up, and while here was married. Later on David invited him to Jerusalem, and there treated him and his son Micha with the greatest kindness. From this time forward he resided at Jerusalem, of Mephibosheth's behavior during the rebellion of Absalom we possess two accounts--his own, 2Sa 13:24-30 and that of Ziba, 2Sa 16:1-4 They are naturally at variance with each other. In consequence of the story of Ziba, he was rewarded by the possessions of his master. Mephibosheth's story --which however, he had not the opportunity of telling until several days later, when he met David returning to his kingdom at the western bank of Jordan --was very different from Ziba's. That David did not disbelieve it is shown by his revoking the judgment he had previously given. That he did not entirely reverse his decision, but allowed Ziba to retain possession of half the lands of Mephibosheth, is probably due partly to weariness at the whole transaction, but mainly to the conciliatory frame of mind in which he was at that moment. "Shall there any man be put to death this day?" is the keynote of the whole proceeding. See http://www.reference-guides.com/smiths_bible_dictionary/Mephibosheth/

but it also has paradoxically other aspects that are mundane and even could be sinful. So we can see right away that a paradoxical object that unites the two series exists right at the beginning of the poem in the form of the tongue. The same tongue will say both the call and the response of the Let and For phrases of the text.

Let man and beast appear before him, and magnify his name together.

This next line is very important. Man and Beast appear before God together and magnify Gods Name. But what we get in the rest of the poem is the Let propitiations that contain the names of the men of the bible, many lost to history except their names, and the names of the difficult to classify species of beasts as well as herbs and gems. Names of individual men are different from names of species. This is a key point because all the names of men belong to the same species and they are paired with names of animals from many different species. The individual animals themselves are not named except for Smart's cat Jeffrey. Thus the difference of the names of men is being put together with the difference of the species of animals. But man and animal appear together to praise God. God is what is above man and animal is what is below man in the great chain of Being. Thus God as the supreme being is unified⁶ and men and animals are fragmented into different men with different names and into different species. Man and Beast appear before the unity of God and magnify the name of God together. After this statement then we have the litany of men and animals conjuncted and some small comment on them in the Let phrase. Then on a separate piece of paper Smart himself responds as it suits him at the moment. Many of these responses, about a two thirds of them seem to be nonsequiturs between the call and the response. But the point is that it is Smart who is responding. It is as if there is an external proclamation of the fact that man and beast must rejoice and there is a disorganized internal response to this proclamation from Smart.

⁶ Smart's prize winning poems were on the unity of the Supreme Being.

Let Noah and his company approach the throne of Grace, and do homage to the Ark of their Salvation.

First Noah comes with all the animals and pay homage. So the first sentence contains one man, the one named man that survived the flood, and all the animals together. This is like saying that originally there was a relation between a single name of a man and all the animals. All the animals were together in the Ark with one man as a whole representing everything living against the background of universal destruction.

Let Abraham present a Ram, and worship the God of his Redemption.

Next Smart present us with Abraham and the Ram that was sacrificed instead of his son, which was the redemption of Abraham by God.

Let Isaac, the Bridegroom, kneel with his Camels, and bless the hope of his pilgrimage.

Let Jacob, and his speckled Drove adore the good Shepherd of Israel.

And so we continue starting with the key figures in the religion and animals commonly associated with them in biblical stories toward names without stories and animal associations made up by Smart. And this is where the Smart crosses the line. He generates endless conjunctions out of his imagination seemingly without end. Sometimes it has been noted he coded into the conjunction of names and species his inner thoughts that could not be expressed openly in his madhouse prison, for instance just before he was broken out of the prison. However, the whole of the population of names in the Bible and the Whole of Nature are coming to him in pairs and proclaiming the necessity to rejoice or praise the name of the Lord and the Lamb. Notice that the name of the Lord is paired with the animal of the lamb who represents Christ. In other words the heavenly pairing is now endlessly repeated by pairings of men's names and the species of animals. This is a classic example of repetition where what is repeated is what can never be recaptured by repetition because it is a singularity. No amount of the repetition of the

names of men and the species of animals will allow us to traverse to the event of the conjunction of the name of the Lord and the lamb. Thus there is a logical trap here which is of the kind that Deleuze is talking about in Difference and Repetition and Logic of Sense. This is the sort of logical paradoxical trap that is seen many times worked out in mythology.

An example is the fact that in Indo-European mythology there is a universal Giant that is slaughtered at the beginning of time. The entrails of that Giant become the different features of the earth. Bones become stones, flesh the soil, hair the grass etc. Then in Indo-European culture there is the sacrifice of animals. Here there is a destruction of the animal that is meant to recapture ordinary wholeness of the Giant. No matter how many animals you tear apart you will not recapture the wholeness of the primordial Giant. Thus sacrifice is a repetition compulsion of separation which cannot recapture the unity of the original Giant. Notice that this mythological story also talks about the relation of men and animals. Men as individuals have names but animals normally do not, unless they are pets. Instead animals are known by their species. One might say that the repetition compulsion of JA is the inverse of this Indo-European myth because it is the men who are fragmented with many names, and it is the animals, except his pet cat, that are mentioned as a whole species instead of as individuals. Men are separated and Animals are gathered together as a whole species. It is interesting that these two examples are inverses of each other and that the relation between men and animals is so important in these cases or repetition compulsion. This is because when Men become Mad they fear being reduced to animals. But mad men are not ever just animals. Once they have had language, they can never be animals again, they can never become like wolf-children who never had language. But we sacrifice animals in order to get back the primordial human unity prior to the unfolding of the world in all its variety. The killing of animals is the destruction of this unfolded variety. Today by the destruction of

the myriad species that vanish every year from the planet we have taken this idea of sacrifice and made the equivalent of genocide for animal species out of it. As population of humans increase there is an exponential production of humans with different names as the named species vanish from the face of the earth. But at the same time in the form of safaris or ecotourism humans with names travel in order to have encounters with various unnamed individuals from unique species of animals. We consider our conjunction with animals very important while at the same time we are destroying the animals so as to make that conjunction more and more rare. With only twenty some rhinos left the possibility of a named person encountering a rhino is becoming statistically slimmer and slimmer all the time until soon it will be impossible.

Let and For

Let and For statements come from the bible. They do not always come in pairs and in fact tend to come in sequences of Let phrases and sequences of For phrases. But we have said that the let statements propitiate the God, i.e. they ask the God to Let something occur. The For statement on the other hand gives the motive or the response to the Let statement. Many times in JA the relation between the Let and For statements are inscrutable. Sometimes it is an insight that Smart had into the relation between a kind of animal and a story in the bible. But many times we wonder if there is any sense at all to the conjunction of the animals and names. And beyond that we wonder whether the comments in the Let and For phrases beyond the conjunctions make any sense. If it makes sense then in many cases it is a private language. Yet how ever esoteric there is a sense to what Smart is saying and it rarely becomes complete nonsense. However, one gets the impression that one is reading the work of someone who is mad regardless, perhaps driven mad by the rigor of the asylum itself, or mad to begin with but never the less the author is recognized as unhinged. So there is in the JA a question of the relation of sense and nonsense. In the midst of this are some

very amazing statements that are worth noting which appear as anomalies out of the monotony of the JA as it vacillates between fractured sense and nonsense. But for the most part the Let phrases must be decoded by looking up the appropriate Bible reference and the named animal. On the other hand the For statements are of a personal nature in many cases and thus may or may not be clear to the reader. But amongst both kinds of statements there are phrases that are very interesting that stand out from the monotony of heterogeneity of names and species. For instance there is . . .

Let Knightly, house of Knightly rejoice with Zoronysios a gem supposed by the ancients to have magical effects.
Star -- word -- herb -- gem.

The final statement Star -- word -- herb -- gem is very interesting. Particularly since both herbs and gems can take the place of animals in the Let phrase. Smart says also . . .

For all the stars have satellites, which are terms under their respective words.

For tiger is a word and his satellites are Griffin, Storgis, Cat and others.

In other words, Stars/words have satellites which are the related words with similar meaning. The phrase Star -- word -- herb -- gem suggests an equivalence between stars, words, herbs and gems. Stars are in the firmament, words are spoken by the tongues of men, herbs grow on the earth, and gems come from under the earth. All have variety but Smart is suggesting it seems that a star, and a word, and a herb and a gem might have a common source. A word may be a name, say a name from the bible. So we might see that there is a common source for the name and the herb or gem in the Let phrase. We might also see that the animal is treated merely as a word and thus we might have picked one of the satellites of these sources when we pick a particular name for the animal, say a biological classification name or a common name or a poetic name. The phrase Star -- word -- herb -- gem suggests that within the variety of different sorts of things there is an affinity and it is the job of the poet to see that affinity and that when we see that affinity that is what causes us to rejoice. It

suggests that the Let phrases have the job of brining that affinity between the words of man and the animals, gems, herbs, and by implication stars of the firmament, i.e. pure sources that appear in the words and their satellites. We might think of these sources as singularities in the Deleuzian sense. They are found nestled in the differences among the stars, the herbs, the words, the gems. And some of these gems have magical properties like the gem Zoronysios. Here the gem has a name and is not just an individual of a species.

This is just one example of the kinds of singular statements that one finds hidden in the JA which has a strange kind of sense that raises above the seeming nonsense of the text which elaborates difference unending. Each conjunction of the Let phrases are trying to see into the hidden harmony within the nature of things by seeing these secret sources that capture Smart's fancy. There is no way in an essay of this type we could go through these word-gems and attempt to interpret them. So we will move on to our experiment which is to take the parts of the theory of Sense in LoS and apply it to JA.

Looking for the Logic of Sense in the Jubilate Agno

- **Double Series**

We have already said that the Series are the Let and For phrases of the JA. These series are statements that appear on different sheets of paper and which are partially aligned and partially misaligned perhaps because of the ravages of time or perhaps by intention. This is the clearest example of two partially aligned series that we know and it is interesting that it appears in the unpublished work of a mad poet. If we take madness as the ground of paradox then we see arising here a pair of series that

perhaps encode his inner thoughts during his imprisonment. He is decoding his thoughts during his confinement and recoding them into the statements of JA which in some sense are meant perhaps to mark time.

- **Floating paradoxical signifier**

We have seen that Deleuze says that there are not just two displaced series but that there has to be a paradoxical element which connects them and we have found right away that this is probably the tongue that appears in the first line of the poem. We have discussed why the tongue is paradoxical earlier and we can see that it does connect the two series by being the element of the body that utters the two series. But its paradoxicality comes from the fact that it functions in all kinds of speech and in other acts of the body as well that are perhaps sinful. Smart is calling attention to all the tongues of all living things and asking that they rejoice and give praise to god.

- **Esoteric words**

We have mentioned that the equivalent of the esoteric words are the names from the Bible. Smart believed that the bible was the word of god and equivalent to Christ. The names of the bible thus have a holy status for Smart. They become esoteric because you must know the bible very well to know what the words mean, but also many of the words

may be only mentioned in the Bible and may not have a known meaning. So they are esoteric in the sense of being from holy writ, but also because it takes knowledge to know who these personages are, and they become fully esoteric when they can no longer be attached to any bibliographical information. Some of the animals, gems, herbs etc. can also be seen to have an esoteric meaning like Zoronysios.

▪ **Portmanteau⁷ Words**

We don't really have any combined words that are Portmanteau words per se in JA. But the combination and conjunction of Names of Biblical characters or other names and Species of animals, herbs, gems, etc has the same effect of creating a chiasm in which by the conjunction there is produced a unique relation which has a specific sense of its own. We can say that we really have Portmanteau phrases where the hinge between the two halves of the traveling case is the rejoicing or praising that is being called for by Smart.

The interesting thing about the double series of Let and For Phrases is that it has a peculiar structure of double doubling, an effect that Deleuze does not mention. In other words, there is the doubling of the Human Names and Animal Species within the Let Phrase, with a supplemented comment. We have likened this first doubling to the portmanteau words of Carroll. We have likened the human names and also the odd animal names to esoteric words of Carroll. Then there is the Doubling of the Let

and For phrases themselves on different pages, with the break separating pages between them as the line of sense that separates the two surfaces of the series. Let phrases are external and impersonal calls while For phrases are internal and personal responses to that call. The Tongue as the floating signifier says both the call and the response and is related to every living tongue and is thus the floating signifier that paradoxically unites the two partially mapped series. In other words, the elements that seem separate and disparate in Deleuze's account are in JA connected and form a compact interdependent structure. JA is an enunciation of the main elements of Deleuze's theory of Sense. Each Phase can be seen as a sort of proposition which has Manifestation, Signification and Denotation. Manifestation is the relation to the imprisoned possibly mad poet who writes the verses as a manifestation of his disintegrated and disturbed subjective experience. Signification is the relation between the all the Let phrases, all the For phrases, and the partial mapping between them which is achieved by alignment of the pages on which they were written, but also the relation between the phrases and the Bible, and also the Anglican Theology of his time, but also in relation to Smart's understanding of the Science of his time, especially Biological Science which was in such disarray with respect to the classification of animals. Denotation has to do with the actual references that Smart is making with each word, whether esoteric or common which Smart uses to pick out something of interest to him within the realm of his various concerns. But what is interesting is that as Deleuze says that these various modalities of propositions, of which Let and For phrases are modulations, do not give the JA its sense. Its sense is definitely related to nonsense, which is created by the backdrop of imprisonment, possible madness, and boredom which has disorganized and collapsed his world. Smart had to face the nonsense of his situation and in that absurd situation of imprisonment for political reasons, or madness or both he turned to God for help, and his response at least in print is his rejoicing within the poem which is the counterpoint to

⁷ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Portmanteau>

his despair of ever being released. In this situation that Smart calls his “Jeopardy” he produced his *Magnificent*. Out of extremes of despair came a meditation on rejoicing and praise of Smart’s Creator in a very unique way. It shows the signs of having the schizophrenic nomadism mentioned in *Anti-Oedipus* which treats myriad of men of the Bible and others and throngs of animals brought into idiosyncratic conjunction by Smart. In principle the number of statements of Let and For are infinite. But we have only a finite number from which to judge the entire work. But each one is a unique conjunction crafted by Smart to produce a singular concept which points to the Star -- word -- herb -- gem structure and indicate some of its satellites. We can associate this idea of the correspondence of Star -- word -- herb -- gem with the definition that Deleuze gives *Concepts* in his *What is Philosophy* book. Star - word -- herb -- gem is a sort of alignment of elements that appear in Smart’s insight. Each of these elements have their own satellites similar to the components of Deleuze’s *concept*. Essentially the Star is the source which is celestial which is expressed as a word with meaning, preferably in English according to Smart, but the word also has its expression as a herb. The herb is used for medicinal purposes and thus establishes the relation between the human body and living nature of plants. Each herb has its botanical qualities and effects which can be studied. The gem on the other hand is most likely to be noticed for its value, beauty or magical effects. But gems are structures like the essences of things, so much so that in Arabic the term *Jawhar* for essence means gem. The gem also represents non-living nature and order because of the faceting of the gem which can be brought out of the raw gem by the gemologist. If we see an alignment between celestial and living and non-living terrestrial with the words of language in the middle which have sense then we begin to get an idea of the way that Smart views *concepts* in JA. Concepts come about by conjunctions of names of Biblical characters and species of Animals, Herbs, or Gems. This is what Deleuze calls the Concept to concept relations. But each thing which is mentioned

participates in the Star -- word -- herb -- gem relation of analogy and insight into the play of surfaces of the world of sense. Unique stars are named like men. While on the other hand living herbs and non-living gems are seen in terms of their species. So the word is seen as the interface between the celestial and terrestrial realms which stand for the Biblical names in relation to the animal species and other kinds of things named in the Let phrases. So “**Star** (celestial) → **word** (interface of sense at the point of conjunction) ← (terrestrial living) **herb** – (terrestrial nonliving) **gem**” has the same structure as the conjunctions of names of men and kinds of beasts that intersect in the conjunction of praise or rejoicing. In this specification of the conceptual matrix we see the consistency of Smart’s thought which mirrors the idea of the concept with the structure of the Let phrases in his *Magnificent*. Here we want to say that Smart has his own way of looking at concepts which echoes that of Deleuze without being exactly the same. Like Deleuze Smart is interesting in producing Sense by his conjunctions of Names of individuals and Names of Species or kinds. Sense appears at the interface in this conjunction as a specified *concept*. But sense also appears in the interspace between the externality of the Let phrases and the internality of the For phrases. But the Sense of conjunction is different from the sense related to the interface between inside and outside, or call and response. Nonsense appears in the profusion of the similar statements all independent of each other and the esoteric words or portmanteau relations between individual names and species names which suggest strangeness and endless heterogeneity like a rhizome. Sense appears when we zoom in to the specific conjunctions and see what are the specific references in the bible to that person or the specific attributes of the particular animal, herb, or gem. To these attributes of man and animal there are supplements in the Let statement where Smart comments on the conjunction. Then there is the response of Smart in the For phrase. Sometimes the responses in the for phrases form a meaningful series in themselves. So not only is there the conjunction of call and response that is also a source of sense, but

there is the interrelation between For phrases as a series of related statements that also gives sense to parts of JA. In this way we can see that the Let Statements are all independent of each other by definition, although they can sometimes have similar forms. The For and Let phrases are not always conjuncted spatially. For some of the For and Let phrases we do not have the corresponding phrases and do not know if they existed at one time or not. But conjuncted sense within the let phrase, and conjuncted sense in the Let=For relation which forms the warp is different from the woof where successive For phrases maintain the same theme over some set of phrases within JA. The famous example is the section about Smart's cat Jeffrey. The section on the cat forms a coherent set of For phrases that belong together and have sense together. We notice that Smart himself has a relation with a Cat with his own name. So both Smart and the Cat have names as individuals, and here we are not just considering the species of Cat in general. Thus Smart as an individual is conjuncted with a specific individual cat and both have names as individuals. This relation with a specific named animal is a key element in the text which gives concrete existential meaning to the series of named men and unnamed identified species of animals that proliferate throughout JA. The sense of Smart's relation to his cat is different from the sense built up previously. Thus we have a hierarchy of sense represented in JA. We have the warp senses of name-species conjunction and Let-For conjunction. Sometimes instead of a single man the man represents a house, i.e. a genealogically related set of individuals in a patriarchal line of descent. We have the sense of the supplements in the Let external call lines. We have the sense of the internal response in the For lines. We have the woof combination of For lines that are about the same subject. Finally we have an instance of a particular named man and a particular named cat as individuals within the For line sets.

Senses:

A. Let *praise or rejoicing* conjunction:
 Man/House Series^A=I=Animal/Herb/Gem Series^B. Warp

B. Let supplement (call/external). Warp Series¹
 C. For phrase (response/internal). Warp Series²
 D. Let=2=For phrase conjunction
 E. Set of related for phrases. Woof
 F. Specific set of phrases: Smart/man=3=Jeffrey/cat. Woof
 G. Warp and Woof Together as specifically ordered TEXT
 H. Preamble
 H. Preamble=4=LET/FOR TEXT
 I. Whole of JA

Now the point that we would like to make is that the differences between these various sorts of poetic structures is where the sense arises. And that there is a difference between these various kinds of sense. The Warp Senses and the Woof Senses are different. Warp and Woof combine to produce the text which has a specific order. And the Sense of the Text when combined with the preamble that mentions the paradoxical floating signifier of the *Tongues* and the God=5=Lamb conjunction gives further context and meaning to the Text itself. Smart has concocted his own logic of sense in which he produces a set of different kinds of sense that we must reckon with if we are to come to terms with his text. This logic of sense says that sense unfolds from conjunctions, i.e. juxtapositions of different elements at different levels of the hierarchy of the text. But the text itself points to a heterogeneity of *concepts* that come out of those conjunctions following the intuitions analogies based on thinking in terms of Star -- word -- herb -- gem, i.e. the conjunction between Celestial and Terrestrial with language or tongues or words being at the surface or interface between these two realms. In some ways the Logic of Sense of Smart is more precise than that of Deleuze while it generally fits within the schema of the Logic of Sense constructed by Deleuze. This is because Smart constructs an object, i.e. JA that exemplifies concretely these different kinds of Sense rather than merely referring to the works of others. His JA performs and expresses these kinds of Sense in a way that LoS merely dreams of doing. When we read JA we confront all these various kinds of Sense rather than merely having a general idea about them built up from looking at many different texts but primarily commenting on the texts of Carroll that exemplify paradox. In JA the paradox is the life of Smart that led to his madness or his imprisonment for political

reasons or both. In Smart there is an existential lived experience of imprisonment that gives rise to the JA poem rather than merely the silliness of Carroll's poems. Yet Smart in JA seems to embrace this silliness.

Let Bukki rejoice with the Buzzard, who is clever, with the reputation of a silly fellow.
For I bless God in the behalf of TRINITY COLLEGE in CAMBRIDGE and the society of PURPLES in LONDON. –

Let Sered rejoice with the Wittal -- a silly bird is wise unto his own preservation.
For I bless the thirteenth of August, in which I was willing to be called a fool for the sake of Christ.

Smart for his Mrs. Mary Midnight absurd oratory if nothing else had the reputation of a Silly fellow among his peers especially when his serious religious poems were connected to his Politically incorrect and absurd oratories which were delivered in drag. Paradoxes abounded in the life of Smart and his incarceration brought these out in a way that was very similar to the Logic of Sense that is discussed by Deleuze. Smart tried to resolve these paradoxes and JA was the result. But it was also the attempt to resolve the fundamental problem of the Authority of the Poet of religious verse that was an intellectual crisis among poets of the time of Smart. JA was an experiment in attempting to resolve this problem of authority using the Call and Response format found in portions of the Bible such as Job. The poet now locates himself in his response to the call in the For phrases of the poem. But the poet is also the source of the Call phrases in the Let portion of the poem as he magnifies God through specific conjunctions of man and nature. The authority of the poet is split in JA and this allows the split between the religious persona of the poet and the secular persona of the poet to coexist. The religious persona is the source of the call and the secular persona is the one who responds. Thus Smart is exemplifying his schizoid nature as being split between religious and secular persona, even if his diagnosis was perhaps not schizophrenia. In his asylum prison Smart had the paradoxicality of his life bottled up for seven years. JA was the distillation of that paradoxicality, and what is amazing is that the structure of JA separates

out the strata of conjunctive sense very precisely in what Deleuze talks about as the Silly surface. But since the paradoxical floating signifier that unites the series as a singularity is the tongue we can see that there is a hint of the deeper connection to the body that Deleuze talks about in his relation to Artaud. Perhaps the fact that Smart did not sink into a full Schizophrenia such as Deleuze describes in the case of Artaud that he really was a political prisoner after all. What is ironic is that he was thought mad in his age and became the icon of the mad poet for the romantics. He has interesting similarities to the first romantic poet Blake. Both were thought mad because of their religious mania. Both had hidden texts revealed after their deaths. Both had strange interpretations of religion that they encoded in their works. Both were ambivalent about Science, although Smart tried to marry religion and science while Blake rejected it. But in JA Smart is seen rejecting portions of the science of his day. Both were concerned with the relation between imagination and reason. Smart can be seen as proto-Blake and as pre-romantic. The romantics seized on the rumors of madness of Smart to produce out of him an icon of the mad, child like, poet.

Ultimately we must contrast the embodied *Logic of Sense* of Smart and theoretical Logic of Sense of Deleuze. But we can see that the paradoxical life of Smart when imprisoned gave rise to a theoretically elaboratable structure very much like the one described by Deleuze but much more specific and precise due to its elegant embodiment and more compact than the other examples used by Deleuze such as the work of Carroll. But Smart does not just embody the double series and the other aspects of the theory of sense but he thinks with it. And the JA is an meditation on this *conceptual* thought form as well as a thinking about his own situation through it. Some of the results of this thinking process that is apparent in the JA are similar to things expressed by Deleuze as well. For instance, Smart's meditation on the meaning of the letters out of which names are built echoes some of the things that Deleuze says about

letters and names, that again echoes what Socrates says about letters and names in the Cratylus. So Smart not only produces an infrastructure of thought similar to that theoretically elaborated in LoS, but also thinks thorough it to reach conclusions that are similar to some of the conclusions that Deleuze reaches, which are like earlier conclusions reached within the philosophical tradition. There is a play of distortions between these similar conclusions of the thought process based on conjunction and the embodiment of the Logic of Sense. But the family resemblance can be seen through the distortions. Deleuze makes the case that there is a logic of sense itself which manifests out of paradox and which though singular in each instance is universal in the sense that singularities arise everywhere at particular places and at all times eventually. In Smart's work JA we see a particularly good example of this process of the Logic of Sense arising out of paradoxicality and we can see this as a retrospectively grasped origin of Romanticism as a backlash against the Enlightenment.