

Calvinistic Implications in Byron's *Giaour*

Hoyoung Kim *

Contents

- I. Introduction: Byron and Calvinism
- II. The Mechanism of the Fall
- III. The *Giaour*'s "Predestined" Fate

I. Introduction: Byron and Calvinism

The relationship between Christianity, especially Protestantism, and English Romanticism is a rich mine for scholarly exploration. Being well aware that many English radicals and Romantic poets who first enthusiastically embraced the French Revolution were from radical Protestant sects, M.H. Abrams insists that many Romantic poets were strongly influenced by the Biblical view of man and his destiny (32)—especially, its apocalyptic yearning for “the new heaven and the new earth” (57), which was strongly reflected, for example, in Blake’s poems.¹⁾ Another of the most cherished themes of Romanticism, the theme of exile, has a strong Christian implication: a Romantic hero cannot find his spiritual home in this world; he knows only too well that

* Assistant Prof., Dept. of English Literature

1) Abrams, however, does not give his critical attention to Byron’s narrative poems, which show Byron’s subtle transformation of

the world in which he roams is a fallen one.

As Bernard Blackstone points out, Byron's Eastern tales "revolve round Biblical axes: Eden, sin, expulsion, murder, exile" (32). More specifically, it is now a Scholarly consensus that Byron was strongly influenced by Calvinism (Trueblood 19). Discussing the Christian implication inherent in the theme of the inevitability of man's fall, Robert F. Gleckner cautiously suggests:

It is at least possible that the Calvinistically trained Byron was more fully aware of the analogies he created in his poems than we are willing to give him credit for. (389)

Calvinism offered Byron a very important set of ideas to understand human existence; this point is amply shown in his handling of the setting, point of view, characterization, and structure of *The Giaour*

However, it does not necessarily mean that Byron was a Calvinistic Christian. As the narrative poem intricately unfolds itself, the reader's Calvinistic expectation of the Giaour's fate—partly encouraged by the several narrators' judgments of him—clashes with the Giaour's own understanding of his fate, which completely diverges from orthodox Calvinism and seems to head for Stoicism and Platonic idealism.

John Calvin (1509-1564), in spite of his tarnished reputation as the theocratic tyrant at Geneva, was the first reformer who wrote a systematic theology entirely based on the Bible. To him the salvation history from *Genesis* to *Apocalypse* was the foremost material for his

many central ideas of the Christian view of man and his destiny. He insists: "Byron I omit altogether; not because I think him a lesser poet than the others but because in his greatest work he speaks with an ironic counter-voice and deliberately opens a satirical perspective on the vatic stance of his Romantic contemporaries" (13).

theological thinking—not any hairsplitting discussion concerning the existence and nature of god as hotly debated by medieval scholastics. He gave very clear-cut—sometimes too narrow—expressions to such doctrines as original sin, free-will, and predestination. Byron scholars usually use the epithet “Calvinistic” without defining the term as if there were a consensus on what Calvinism means. However, we should carefully distinguish the thought expressed in Calvin's writings and the later developments by his followers (George 234). Theodore Beza, Calvin's immediate successor, for example, is responsible for giving the controversial doctrine of predestination the central place in Calvinism: he made Calvinism sound strongly deterministic. But the question is how much Calvinism Byron knew: his actual knowledge of Calvinism is hard to ascertain.

There is a good possibility that, as Byron's biographers suggest, Byron was merely exposed to his nurse's much hardened Calvinistic creeds (Marchand 1: 33). But, unfortunately, there is no way to identify the content of her creeds exactly. Andre Maurois, Byron's famous biographer, offers a very popular and vulgarized—only half-serious—version of Calvinism.

We are corrupt from our birth up, in that we have participated in Original Sin. Certain men, united to Jesus Christ by the Holy Ghost, can be raised to a life of holiness; those who are not thus saved are condemned to everlasting punishment. As for the operation of the Holy Ghost, that depends on the choice of God, who has predestined some to life everlasting, and others to damnation. (27)

Byron's acute self-awareness due to his lame foot and the horrible stories concerning his violent and wicked forefathers might have strongly

conditioned him to be influenced by Calvinism, which tends to uphold a pessimistic and deterministic view of man, at least, in its later rigid form. A plausible explanation may be that even though Byron eventually abandoned the Calvinistic idea of God, he retained the pessimistic and fatalistic view of man. Indeed a careful reading of Byron's *Giaour* reveals that his understanding of Calvinism is far from being superficial: Calvinism very closely touches the very core of Byron's understanding of man.

II. The Mechanism of the Fall

After briefly questioning whether true heroism is possible in the present age, Byron, at the beginning of the poem, immediately gives an idyllic description of unspoiled Greek isles; but the reader soon realizes that they look idyllic only in appearance because there lurk "the night-prowlers" (30) ready to strike innocent victims. No place in nature is safe from the Fall. Calvin, in his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, insists:

Whithersoever you turn your eyes, there is not an atom
of the world in which you cannot behold some brilliant
sparks at least of God's glory. (1: 10)

Of course, Calvin was not a visionary mystic. He says this only to emphasize the stark fact of man's fall: his blindness to the glory of God shining through nature and his tendency to corrupt and destroy it. Calvin further insists: "(Adam) ruined his posterity by his defection, which has perverted the whole order of nature in heaven and earth" (1: 42). Nature shares the fall with man. Thus, what Byron presents at the very beginning of his poem is a small scale *Genesis*. He explicitly calls the Greek isles "These Edens of the eastern wave" (15).

There follows the charming images of the Rose and the Nightingale strongly suggestive of Adam and Eve before their fall. Indirectly, they foreshadow the main characters of the *Giaour* and Leila.

The maid for whom his melody,
His thousand songs are heard on high,
Blooms blushing to her lover's tale:
His queen, the garden queen, his Rose,
Unbent by winds, unchilled by snows,
Far from the winters of the west,
By every breeze and season blest,
Returns the sweets by Nature given
In softest incense back to Heaven: (23-31)

These lines offer a pre-lapsarian vision of the perfect harmony between nature and Grace: there is neither gulf nor antagonism between the creator and his creation. But there "lurks" (39)—like the serpent in *Genesis*—the pirate intent on destroying his victim who innocently approaches, playing his guitar merrily on his pleasure boat. This sudden rude awakening to the fallen nature of the world fraught with malignity and violent death is a constantly recurring pattern in Byron's *Giaour*.

Byron makes this pattern more impressive by reversing the Biblical order: a grim vision of reality precedes poignant images of innocence and beauty, deepening the reader's sense of their vulnerability. The nameless Turkish narrator first describes Hassan's deserted and desolate palace after his death (288-298). Spiders, bats, and owls only occupy this once splendid mansion, witnessing the futility of man's achievements in this world. This grim scene, however, is suddenly followed by and juxtaposed with a series of Hassan's childhood images full of delicacy and sweetness. Now the palace is sultry and dry; but it once enjoyed cool springs, rest, and soothing music, young Hassan

playing around his mother so carelessly (299-315). But this momentary glimpse into an Edenic past is brutally cut by the following chilling lines: "The last sad note that swelled the gale / Was woman's wildest funeral wail" (322-3). Byron's narrative strategy enforces the idea that man has no way to escape from the consequences of the Fall.

The similar pattern is employed in the description of beautiful Leila. First, the narrator gives a confusing story of how treacherous Leila fled away with the Giaour, her being disguised as a Georgian page (439-472). But the reader knows better than he does, having already witnessed the Giaour fleeing away alone. The reader soon realizes that she was killed by Hassan and was thrown into the sea. This fact has been obscure until now because of Byron's deliberately fragmentary and highly suggestive narrative technique: but now it becomes quite evident. This sudden and shocking realization of her brutal death is immediately followed by an exquisite description of her beauty (473-518). Her extremely charming eyes, fair cheeks tinged with blushing, and graceful demeanor are all described in especially sensuous and vivid imagery. This shocking contrast intensifies the reader's sense of the transiency and vulnerability of innocent beauty. Byron, following Calvin's pessimistic view of human existence, sees it radically subject to impermanence and death.

From the Calvinistic point of view, the present servile state of Greece conquered by the Turks has more than political implications. Byron's view of contemporary Greece is subtly ironic and ambiguous. Is the misery and bondage of Greece due to the Turks or to Adam's Fall—that is, man's radical flaw—or to both? Byron laments:

'Tis Greece, but living Greece no more!
So coldly sweet, so deadly fair,
We start, for Soul is wanting there.

Hers is the loveliness in death,
That parts not quite with parting breath:
But beauty with that fearful bloom,
That hue which haunts it to the tomb,
Expression's last receding ray,
A gilded Halo hovering round decay,
the farewell beam of Feeling past away!
Spark of that flame, perchance of heavenly birth,
Which gleams, but warms no more its cherished earth!

(91-102)

This passage is very important in understanding Byron's view of human existence in this world. The language is so general that a strictly political interpretation never serves the richly paradoxical images in the passage. The phrases—"coldly sweet," "deadly fair," "the loveliness in death," "the fearful bloom," "A gilded Halo hovering round decay"—all imply the essential impermanence and finitude of human existence. Blaise Pascal's famous Christian insight—man's potential grandeur and his actual wretchedness—permeates this passage, especially, the last two lines.

However, there is also an obviously political message in the poem. Byron strongly urges the Greeks to fight for freedom against the tyranny of the Turks: "Oh, servile offspring of the free / Pronounce what sea, what shore is this?" (111-12). This advocacy of political action, however, has some ironic undertones:

The Heroes, though the general doom
Hath swept the column from the tomb,
A mighty monument command,
The mountains of their native land! (130-33)

The subordinate conjunction—"though"—gives an ironic twist to this

apparent advocacy of ancient heroic spirit: "the general doom " is not merely an obstacle to the heroes; it is fatal to them. Moreover, there is a tinge of skepticism on the part of Byron himself. The Greeks, Byron says, have become so servile and guileful that "In vain might Liberty invoke / the spirit to its bondage broke / Or raise the neck that courts the yoke " (161-63). Significantly, in *The Giaour*, it is the Turks not the Greeks that show any sign of valor and heroism. The Greeks prefer to hide cowardly and guilefully inside the sea caves or in the groves, waiting for their Turkish victims. Byron's apparent enthusiasm for the independence of Greece is deeply colored by his fundamentally pessimistic view of human nature.

The idea of man's Fall, of course, is closely related to the famous doctrine of original sin. This idea is implicit in the Old Testament. But it was St. Paul who first clearly claimed that when Adam disobeyed the God, the whole human race fell together and inherited his sin and guilt, losing supernatural Grace and communion with God (Rom. 3:9-20). Calvin gives an unmistakably sharper and more pessimistic expression to the already gloomy idea. He insists:

Original sin . . . appears to be a hereditary
depravity and corruption of our nature, diffused
through all the parts of the soul, rending us
obnoxious to the Divine wrath, and producing in us
those works which the Scripture calls "works of the
flesh." (1: 43)

This directly opposes the classical humanistic belief in man's perfectibility through virtue, which was enthusiastically embraced by Renaissance humanists. One of the most important implications of the Calvinistic idea of original sin is that man himself is completely incapable of doing any good apart from the God's Grace. Even the most seemingly

noble and praiseworthy human action is colored by self-awareness or self-conceit, another name for sin. We are aware that we did good. This doctrine may partly explain the Byronic hero's curious indifference to all worldly ambitions and glories. A good Calvinist knows so well that no human action is free from sin and eventually from remorse and death, the consequences of Adam's Fall. St. Paul claims: "the wages of sin is death" (Rom. 6:23). Byron's characters in *The Giaour* grimly follow this inevitable chain. This is an iron law of no exception which works behind the seemingly confusing and fragmentary narrative of *The Giaour*.

This chain of sin-remorse-death is already present at the beginning section of the poem, which contains many themes and motifs adumbrating later events.²⁾ The following passage is strongly suggestive of the Cain story in *Genesis*.

He who hath bent him o'er the dead
Ere the first day of Death is fled,
The first dark day of Nothingness,
The last of Danger and Distress, (68-70)

This murder in turn inevitably dooms the murderer to remorse and death (81-90). This chain of sin-remorse-death relentlessly governs the fates of the three major characters: Leila, Hassan, and the *Giaour*.

Significantly enough, Byron suggests that even innocent Leila is not free from sin. By presenting a seemingly fragmentary passage depicting the image of a beautiful insect-queen, which is a continuation of the image of the Rose, the garden-queen, at the beginning of the poem, Byron implies that Leila herself is responsible for attracting the *Giaour*

2) Frederick Garber offers a helpful suggestion: "*The Giaour* contains a world of echoes and reflections in which place is both location and paradigm, and events have multiple references and reverberations" (155).

into an illicit love affair. The insect-queen is pursued by a boy; but the narrator uses the active voice in describing the actions of the insect-queen, who actually "invites" (391) and "lures" (396) the boy. Moreover, the narrator also suggests the possibility that the Giaour might have abandoned Leila before her death as the boy leads the insect-queen to suffering (404-9). This possibility can never be verified in the text, but it is evident that the Giaour feels himself responsible for her death, having been unable to prevent her from being killed by Hassan. Both lovers are bound for remorse. "A life of pain, the loss of peace" (402) waits the insect-queen. As for the Giaour, he, "like the scorpion girt by fire," (423) is tormented by remorse. The nameless Turkish narrator, reporting the rumor of her elopement, characterizes her behavior as "treachery deserving a grave" (462). Hassan functions as the nemesis of her sin.

Hassan, once involved in the drama as the nemesis of Leila's sin, turns out to be a Cain, whose angry and cruel revenge forms his very mortal sin and seals his fate. Hassan also falls into gnawing remorse. The Turkish narrator describes the cheerless life of Hassan after his murder of Leila:

Black Hassan from the Harem flies,
 Nor bends on woman's form his eyes;
 The unwonted chase each hour employs,
 Yet shares he not the hunter's joys.
 Not thus was Hassan wont to fly
 When Leila dwelt in his Serai. (439-44)

Now the Giaour becomes the nemesis of Hassan's sin, thus completing this tragic drama.

The curse for Hassan's sin was sent
 To turn a palace to a tomb: .

He [the Giaour] came, he went, like the Simoom,
That harbinger of Fate and gloom, (280-83)

What Byron presents through this complex, and seemingly confusing and fragmentary narrative is a compelling picture of the relentless chain of sin-remorse-death: everybody involved in this chain, regardless of one's original intention, is bound to hurt and destroy each other, becoming each other's nemesis.

III. The Giaour's "Predestined" Fate

As far as the Giaour is concerned, his sin and remorse are threefold. He leads Leila into an illicit love affair, is indirectly responsible for her death, and kills Hassan for revenge. From the moment he appears on the page, he is described as a deeply isolated figure belonging neither to Christians nor to Moslems. Becoming Hassan's nemesis and murderer, his fate seems to be doomed for eternal damnation as Calvin says:

Those. . .whom [the God] has created to a life of
shame and a death of destruction, that they might be
instruments of his wrath, and examples of his
severity, he causes to reach their appointed end. . .
increasing their blindness and stupidity. (1: 137-8)

This relentless progress toward sin and death is exactly what the Giaour undergoes whether he likes it or not. Calvin's doctrine of predestination briefly quoted above gives God the absolute power to render eternal life to some and eternal damnation to others: this doctrine has offered a fierce battleground for theologians since St. Augustine first gave a clear form to it, fighting a fierce theological battle against Pelagius who championed an individual's free-will. What Calvin did was simply to offer a rigid interpretation to St. Augustine's, making it

absolutely clear that all human efforts to save oneself apart from God's Grace is futile. Unfortunately, this doctrine later degenerated into a source of both grim fatalism and egoistic pride in one's personal salvation (Dowey 272), two extreme emotional states a Calvinist could be easily induced to.

Byron's poem is saturated with predestination language. The three narrators—the fisherman, the nameless Turk, and the monk—all judge the fate of the Giaour by the doctrine of predestination, forgetting that it is God not man who gives final judgment. Describing the Giaour's flight from Hassan's palace, the fisherman guesses what is happening in the Giaour's tormented soul.

What felt he then, at once opprest
By all that most distracts the breast?
That pause, which pondered o'er his fate,
Oh, who its dreary length shall date! (265-70)

Moreover, the Giaour's "woe without name, or hope, or end" (276), as the fisherman calls it, is a grim omen for the Giaour's eternal damnation. The nameless Turk goes further, placing dead Hassan in the bliss of Paradise and cursing the Giaour to hell.

. . .thou, false Infidel! shall writhe
Beneath avenging Monkir's sythe:
And from its torments' scape alone
To wander round lost Eblis' throne: (747-50)

This crude dualistic view of man's destiny is matched only with the monk's equally conventional interpretation of the doctrine. The monk bitterly complains about the Giaour's unmonkish way of living in the monastery—for example, refusing to shave his head—and regards him as a hopeless creature suitable only for eternal damnation (910-15).

It is only when the reader listens to the Giaour's confession before the

prior at the end of the poem that he begins to know Giaour's own thoughts about his past and destiny. At first he seems to agree with the several narrators' judgment of him as a sinful and doomed man. He confesses that his past life was nothing but an attempt to escape from a life of ennui.

My days, though few, have passed below
 In much of Joy, but more of Woe;
 Yet still in hours of love or strife,
 I've 'scaped the weariness of life:
 Now leagued with friends, now girt by foes,
 I loathed the languor of repose. (982-7)

This is an unusual confession by a confirmed sinner because he is at least free from sins produced by attachment to worldly objects and ambitions. He knew from the start that there is no meaning whatsoever in any human activity *per se*, perhaps having been a good Calvinist. If every human activity is subject to futility, there are three alternatives to take: to surrender oneself completely to the Grace of God as Calvin recommends, to commit suicide, or finally to live moment by moment with no thought of worldly achievement: of course, the Giaour took the third alternative. But the Giaour, even though he thought himself free from worldly ambitions, could not escape from the iron chain of sin, remorse, and condemnation. He confesses that he is a Cain condemned for his sin.

She died—I dare not tell thee how;
 But look—'tis written on my brow!
 There read of Cain the curse and crime
 In character unworn by Time: (1056-9)

The Giaour fully understands the Christian interpretation of human existence as subject to futility, a gnawing sense of imperfection and guilt,

and death. But both the narrators and the Giaour himself testify that he is not a Christian, at least, in any conventional sense. Hassan calls the Giaour "Apostate from his own vile faith" (616); the monk also thinks that the Giaour simply uses the monastery for his own purpose (899-900). The Giaour himself denies not only any Christian consolation and forgiveness from the prior--perhaps a remnant of hard-headed Protestantism which refuses any mediator except Jesus Christ--but also a Christian burial. Then, is he a thorough-going nihilist negating all religious and secular values? Gleckner thinks so:

The total picture cheers no heroes, advances no cause
(private or public), asserts no values. It is a
completely depressing, pessimistic, even nihilistic
view of man and the world. (396)

Nevertheless, the Giaour tries to offer two solutions to the totally bleak picture of man and his destiny he himself has reached after his tragic affair with Leila and Hassan: one is Stoic; the other is Platonic in nature. Ultimately he is not a total nihilist; he desperately seeks for some values. Whether he succeeds or not is another question.

First of all, he seems to have turned a stoic. He claims that there is "Now nothing left to love or hate, / No more with hope or pride elate," (988-9). This admirable spirit of calm detachment is allied with his brave bearing of misfortune, rejecting the easy solution of committing suicide:

My spirit shrunk not to sustain
The searching throes of ceaseless pain;
Nor sought the self-accorded grave
Of ancient fool and modern knave. (1004-7)

He has no fear of death (1008). He is above the whimsical power of fortune: "Alas! the breast that inly bleeds / Hath nought to dread from

outward blow" (1155-6). One of the most remarkable statements by the Giaour is his assertion that he is indifferent to the dualistic view of man's destiny upheld by Calvinism, which assigns man either eternal salvation or eternal damnation. The Giaour is at least free from egoistic concern for personal salvation: "I would not, if I might, be blest; / I want no Paradise, but rest" (1269-70). Byron offers Stoic detachment as an answer to the rigidly dualistic doctrine of predestination.

This noble Stoic spirit of calm detachment and inner freedom, however, is marred by the Giaour's outburst of passion and self-pity. His past experience with Leila and Hassan was so intense that he is still deeply troubled with the conflicting emotions of love and hatred in spite of his profession of Stoic detachment:

The maid I love, the man I hate—
And I will hunt the steps of fate,
To save or slay, as these require,
Through rending steel, and rolling fire: (1018-21)

This hot outburst of passion is followed by quite an un-Stoical self-pity.

And tell him—what thou dost behold!
The withered frame, the ruined mind,
The wrack by passion left behind,
A shrivelled scroll, a scattered leaf,
Seared by the autumn blast of Grief! (1253-56)

Ultimately, the Giaour's Stoicism fails. Perhaps Byron was too good a Calvinist to believe that human efforts to impose order and tranquility to essentially mutable and fallen human nature can be successful.

Another alternative for Christian consolation promised by the prior is a Platonic idealization of love. This seems to be what the Giaour truly cherishes as the final goal of his life (1281-2). To the Giaour, his love for

Leila was and is the only genuine experience in his entire life despite its sinful nature. This is another divergence from orthodox Calvinism because the Giaour tries to build meaning on his and Leila's sinful love. However, amid all the falsities of life, it was Leila's love that was true: "Her treachery was truth to me: / To me she gave her heart " (1067-8). He professes his absolute faithfulness to her: "But this was taught me by the dove, / To die—and know no second love " (1165-6). His Romantic idealism makes Leila more than a beautiful woman: "She was a form of Life and Light " (1127). His eulogy on love has an unmistakably Platonic ring:

Yes, Love indeed is light from heaven:
 A spark of that immortal fire
 With angels shared, by Alla given,
 To lift from earth our low desire.
 Devotion wafts the mind above,
 But Heaven itself descends in Love:
 A feeling from the Godhead caught,
 To wean from self each sordid thought:
 A ray of Him who formed the whole:
 A Glory circling round the soul! (1131-40)

This heavily Christianized—though he employs the term "Alla " instead of "God "—Platonism calls into question the Giaour's apparent apostasy. Is the Giaour attempting to create a mystical version of Christianity, rejecting Calvinism of hard dogmatic creeds? There can be no sure answer. One thing is certain: the Giaour desperately tries to create a deeply personal myth of love out of his tragic experience with Leila. Like Milton's *Lycidas*, Leila undergoes a strange sea-change from death to resurrection. Like the shepherd persona of *Lycidas*, the Giaour laments Leila's miserable fate.

She sleeps beneath the wandering wave—
Ah! had she but an earthly grave,
This breaking heart and throbbing head
Should seek and share her narrow bed. (1123-6)

This deep guilt-stricken feeling, however, is suddenly changed by his firm conviction of her resurrection: "I saw her: yes, she lived again " (1272). There follows the gothic ghost story of revived Leila appearing in his hallucination. Whether this emotionally charged and weird fragment goes well artistically with his previous profession of noble Platonic idealism is a difficult question to answer. However, one thing is certain: the *Giaour's* repeated use of the affirmative word "yes " strongly suggests that he has overcome his previous total nihilism.

Byron's *Giaour* is a poem deeply affected by Christianity and, more specifically, by the Calvinistic view of man and his destiny. Calvinism, as a radical expression of Christian truths, offers Byron a useful intellectual frame of reference for understanding human existence completely subject to futility, guilt, and death. The Calvinistic concepts of the Fall, original sin, the chain of sin-remorse-death, and predestination, therefore, are very useful hermeneutical tools for the reader to understand his poem. But the *Giaour's* attitude toward Christianity is anything but plain. It is true that the *Giaour* is not a Christian in any conventional sense. But he seems to move toward a Romantic version of Christian Platonism. His tragic affair with Leila leads him to a genuine appreciation of the importance of love to his life: out of this realization, he becomes a mythmaker creating a highly idealized and personal myth of his beloved Leila dead and resurrected. It is wholly up to the reader whether he finds in the *Giaour's* confession a Romantic metamorphosis of the Christian myth.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *Natural Supernaturalism: Tradition and Revolution in Romantic Literature*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1971.
- The Bible. The Authorized Version*. Philadelphia: A.J. Holman Company, 1937.
- Blackstone, Bernard. "Guilt and Retribution in Byron's Sea Poems." In *Byron: A collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Paul West. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., , 1963. 31-41.
- Byron, George Gordon. *Byron's Poetry*. Ed. Frank D. McConnell. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1978.
- Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. 2 vols. Trans. Ford Lewis Battles. Philadelphia: the Westminster Press, 1960.
- Dowey, Edward. "Calvinism." *A Handbook of Christian Theology*. Ed. Marvin Halverson. New York: Meridian Books, 1958. 40-3.
- Garber, Frederick. "Byron's Giaour and the Mark of Cain." *Etudes Anglaises* 1973: 26 (2): 150-9.
- George, Timothy. *Theology of the Reformers*. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press, 1988.
- Gleckner, Robert F. "The Giaour as Experimental Narrative." In *Byron's Poetry*. Ed. Frank D. McConnell. New York: W.W.Norton & Company, 1978. 389-403.
- Marchand, Leslie A. *Byron: A Biography*. 2 vols. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1957.
- Maurois, Andre. *Byron*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1930.
- Trueblood, Paul G. *Lord Byron*. Twayne's English Authors Series. New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1969.

Abstract

Calvinistic Implications in Byron's *Giaour*

Kim, Hoyoung

Byron's *Giaour* is a poem deeply influenced by Christianity, and more specifically, by the Calvinistic view of man and his destiny. Though Byron abandoned the Calvinistic idea of God, he retained the pessimistic and fatalistic view of man characteristic of Calvinism. A careful reading of Byron's *Giaour* reveals that his understanding of Calvinism is far from being superficial: Calvinism, as a radical expression of Christian truths, offers Byron a useful intellectual frame of reference for understanding human existence completely subject to futility, guilt, and death. The Calvinistic concepts of the Fall, original sin, the chain of sin-remorse-death, and predestination, therefore, are very useful hermeneutical tools for the reader to understand his poem, giving many insights into Byron's handling of the characterization and seemingly incoherent and fragmentary narrative structure of the poem. But the *Giaour*'s attitude toward Christianity is anything but clear. It is true that the *Giaour* is not a Christian in any conventional sense. But he seems to move toward a Romantic version of Christian Platonism. The *Giaour*'s tragic affair with Leila leads him to a genuine appreciation of the importance of love to his life: out of this realization, he becomes a mythmaker creating a highly idealized and personal myth of his beloved Leila dead and resurrected.