

PENTANGLE

Established 1992

Editors

Josephine Bliss

Charlotte Kalfas

Zorada Porter

Rachel Sizemore

Sydney Baker

Julia Manning

Faculty Advisor

Dr. Andrea Gazzaniga

Cover Art

Photography by Zorada Porter

Sigma Tau Delta

Pi Omega Chapter

Department of Literature and Language

Northern Kentucky University

Highland Heights, KY 41099

Pentangle's History

Pentangle, a journal of student writing, debuted in 1992 at Northern Kentucky University and is sponsored by the Pi Omega chapter of Sigma Tau Delta, the International English Honor Society. Pi Omega is committed to the principles of Sigma Tau Delta, as stated in the international pledge: "To advance the study of chief literary masterpieces, to encourage worthwhile reading, to promote the mastery of written expression, and to foster a spirit of fellowship among those who specialize in the study of the English language and of literature."

The name of the journal, *Pentangle*, alludes to the famous image of the pentangle in the Middle English poem, *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, where it is a symbol of truth and of the perfection to which Sir Gawain aspires. This association is consistent with the editorial staff's goal of honoring writing of merit in *Pentangle*. The *Pentangle* title also echoes the title of Sigma Tau Delta's official journal of student writing, *The Rectangle*.



Submission Guidelines

Pentangle solicits submissions of research papers, critical essays, and book reviews pertaining to all areas of literary studies in upper division and graduate courses. Book reviews should be for books written in the last two years. All submissions must be in MLA format (Gibaldi, et al., 7th ed.) and typed using Microsoft Word. Please email all submissions to pentangle@nku.edu. When submitting manuscripts, please include a bioline and contact information.

Editorial Policy

The editors reserve the right to edit submissions for grammar and punctuation. Editing may also include revisions to thesis statements and transitional sentences as well as other changes that clarify the work. The editors will work diligently to ensure that the integrity and intent of the author's work is maintained.

© Northern Kentucky University 2018

No part of this publication may be produced without the permission of the individual authors or artists.

Northern Kentucky University is an equal opportunity/affirmative action institution. The content, views, and unique perspectives reflected in the literary pieces and artwork contained herein are to be attributed to the writers, not the university, editors, or related sponsors.

This publication was prepared by Northern Kentucky University and printed with state funds (KRS 57.375). It is Northern Kentucky University's policy to ensure equal employment opportunity for all persons and to take the necessary actions needed to recruit, employ, train, promote and retain qualified faculty and staff, including members of protected groups. Discrimination against any individual based upon protected status, which is defined as age, color, disability, gender, national origin, race, religion, sexual orientation, genetic or veteran status, is prohibited. MC180583

Contents

Close Reading:

The Labyrinth

Andrew Molloy 1

He's more myself than I am:" Moving Past Narrative

Limitations of Brontë's *Wuthering Heights*

Kathryn Hunzicker 7

Men Eat Chicken and Lucy Gets It: Sadism in Victorian Literature

Calla Thomas..... 14

Deviant Desire and Guilt in Oscar Wilde's

The Picture of Dorian Gray

Angela Crout-Mitchell 23

Close Reading:

Hedda Gabler

Kyle Burnett..... 31

C.S. Lewis' Celtic Influence:

The Voyage of the Dawn Treader as a Modern Immram

Morgan Caudill..... 34

Close Reading:

Splintering of Identity in Viet Thanh Nguyen's

The Sympathizer

Rachel Sizemore 43

Classicism Issues in *Jonathan Strange and Mr. Norrell*

Fai Alsayegh 47

Close Reading: The Labyrinth

Andrew Molloy

In today's society, passion is an emotion that has a positive, benevolent connotation. Indeed, individuals tend to believe that following a passion for a career is the right decision because it ultimately provides happiness and, in some cases, security. Although in today's society the word passion has been romanticized so that negative connotations are avoided, in the past, the word "passion" was not only capable of revealing positive connotations, but it was capable of revealing negative connotations as well, evincing that it was not always intelligent to follow a passion because it could result in a negative consequence. In fact, in *Phédre*, Jean Racine reveals how passion is an inexorable characteristic that, when unaddressed or expressed, provokes psychological and physical agony.

Before discussing how passion, whether unaddressed or expressed, creates agony though, it is first important to understand how the three main characters—Hippolytus, Phédre, and Theseus—have a passion that is inexorable. In *Phédre*, the first character that discloses the characteristic of inexorable passion is Hippolytus, King Theseus's son, who states that he wants to leave Athens because of a woman named Aricia, a girl that his father has prohibited anyone from courting or marrying. In the beginning, Hippolytus's passion is revealed when Theseus is missing from Athens and when Hippolytus says, "If hate [for Aricia] were what I felt, would I run from her," implying that he actually loves and does not hate her, thus exposing his passion for Aricia (Phé.1.207). Also, because Hippolytus divulges his passion when his father is missing, he illustrates

two things; firstly, that he has carried this passion for a long time because he has held onto it even when his father was in Athens; and secondly, that Hippolytus will only reveal this passion if his father is missing. Therefore, Racine reveals that passion is inexorable because Hippolytus is unable to continue hiding his unaddressed passion that he has been holding onto for a prolonged period of time, only revealing it when he cannot bear to carry it any longer.

Another character that has an inexorable passion is Phédre, Theseus's wife, who has concealed her love for Hippolytus. Similarly to Hippolytus, Phédre is only able to reveal her passion because Theseus is missing. In fact, Phédre first announces to her servant, Oenone, that she has "lived guilty for too long" while living in Athens (Phé.2.277). In confusion, Oenone replies and asks, "Guilty of what?" (Phé.2.278). Phédre first attempts to ignore Oenone's question, but she eventually claims that she is in love, stating, "I am in love, yes, I am in love," thus showing that her love for someone consequently causes herself guilt. In addition, Phédre claims that the person who causes her guilt and that the person whom she loves is "that noble prince/[she] prosecuted," which is "Hippolytus" (Phé. 2.330 & 338-340). Indeed, Phédre ultimately conceals her love for Hippolytus until she cannot bear it any longer (just like Hippolytus conceals his passion for Aricia), and because King Theseus is away from Athens, Phédre feels as though this is the—maybe her only—opportunity to express her unaddressed, inexorable passion for Hippolytus. In fact, if Phédre is able to control her passion for Hippolytus, why does she express it when she feels as though the king is never going to return to Athens? Aricia is not trying to surreptitiously express this desire so that she can save Theseus's feelings; she is trying to avoid being condemned by her husband. Thus, because Phédre reveals her passion for Hippolytus while Theseus is away from Athens, she enables Racine to confirm that passion is an inexorable characteristic.

King Theseus is another character that has an inexorable passion, especially for his wife, Phédre. Theseus's inexorable passion for Phédre, however, is revealed once he arrives and discovers, incorrectly, that Hippolytus is in love with Phédre. To manipulate the king, Oenone accuses Hippolytus of loving the queen, an accusation which antagonizes Theseus. Subsequently, when Theseus comes face-to-face with Hippolytus, he says, "the thunderbolt [Zeus, God of Thunder] has spared you too long," which shows that Theseus is immensely upset about the deceptive news that he has received from Phédre's servant (Phé.5.62). Theseus also banishes Hippolytus from Athens as he states, "Get out[,] unless you want to die among the trash I have swept into ditches," thereby showing how he even wants his son to be out of his presence—possibly even existence (Phé.5.84-85). More importantly, however, once Hippolytus leaves, Theseus prays to

Neptune, the God of the Ocean, and demands a wish. Theseus says:

That moment has come. Grant me my wish.

Now! Avenge a heart-broken father.

Break your wrath on the herd of this traitor [Hippolytus]

Smash the bones of his effrontery (Phé.5.100-104).

In other words, Theseus calls upon Neptune to murder Hippolytus because of his son's supposed passion, and therefore, because Theseus reveals his indignant attitude and prays for his son to die, it is clear that Theseus has an inexorable passion for his wife that will not tolerate anyone taking her away from him. Thus, if the character Theseus is willing to murder his own kin—his own blood—so that he keeps his wife, Racine illustrates clearly that Theseus carries an inexorable passion.

Now that the passions of the characters have been exposed, it is possible to begin analyzing how passion, whether unaddressed or expressed, provokes agony psychologically and physically. As mentioned earlier, Hippolytus is first to express his inexorable passion; however, his passion for Aricia ultimately causes himself physical agony and causes Aricia psychological agony. After Hippolytus and Aricia have both confessed their love for one another, they plan to "consecrate together/ an everlasting love," showing that they wish to be married and have a life together. (Phé.5.97-98). However, when Aricia runs away from Athens to meet Hippolytus so that the two of them can get married at a shrine, she runs into a group of other men who are standing over Hippolytus's body, which is described as being "hardly recognizable as man," meaning that his entire physique and appearance has been destroyed by an extremely painful death (Phé.5.284 & 381). As a result of seeing Hippolytus's deformed body, Aricia cries "out just once, then drop[s], silent/ like somebody jabbed through the heart," which reveals the intense psychological and emotional agony that she is suffering (Phé.5.405-406). Thus, as a result of Hippolytus and Aricia's expressed love for one another, both of them end up in agony. Hippolytus's life ends through intense physical trauma, whereas Aricia's life continues but will cause her psychological agony for the rest of her life because she will never marry the one she truly loves. Therefore, Racine verifies that expressed passion provokes agony because Hippolytus and Aricia, both of whom expressed love for one another, are left in agony whether it be physically or psychologically.

King Theseus is also a character in the play that suffers psychological agony. After he discovers that his son was not in love with Phédre and that Phédre was in love with his son, Theseus is filled with an agonizing guilt because he prayed for Hippolytus to die. Theseus says:

“Now my error of judgement
 Is so monumental and plain
 Let us go weep at my son’s body.
 Let us embrace the little of him that’s left
 And expiate the madness of my prayer” (Phé.5.487-491).

In short, Theseus admits that he made an “error,” that is, praying for his son to die, an error that is “so monumental and plain” that he must “weep” at his son’s body because he is filled with sadness and guilt, a perpetual guilt that will never be extinguished (Phé.5.487-489). Not to mention, when Theseus uses the word “expiate,” he further implies how guilty he feels, thus enhancing and reinforcing an understanding of his guilt. In fact, why would Theseus not be suffering from a psychological agony? Only a father incapable of love would not suffer from a psychological agony after causing his son’s death. Because Theseus has killed his son, he will have to remember his actions and feel guilty about them for as long as he lives, a true psychological pain, a perpetual psychological agony. Thus, through Theseus’s actions, Racine reveals how an expressed passion, specifically Theseus’s passion for Phédre, is capable of provoking psychological agony.

Similar to all the other characters, Phédre does not avoid the agony that is dealt in the play; indeed, she endures psychological agony because her passion is unaddressed. In the beginning of the play, Phédre contemplates the idea of death and how she believes she deserves to die or, at least, to have never been born. In fact, when talking to Oenone, Phédre says, “I detest my life,” and “I would have preferred to die,” because she loves Hippolytus and is unable to express her love for him considering her marriage with Theseus (Phé. 1.415-416). Also, almost immediately after the preceding quotations, Phédre continues to talk to her servant and says, “If only you will let me die quietly/ and stop lashing me with these pointless reproaches/ and stop making such efforts to keep me alive,” further illustrating her desire to die (Phé.1.421-423). If Phédre is so consumed with the idea of death, how is she not enduring psychological agony? Think about it: Because of her perpetual desire for death, Phédre tacitly admits that she is thinking improperly and would rather die than live because she has not been able to express her love for Hippolytus, and therefore, through Phédre’s obsession with death, Racine makes evident that unaddressed passion, as well as expressed passion, provokes psychological agony.

Unlike other characters, however, Phédre not only suffers from psychological agony because of her unaddressed passion; she suffers from physical agony as well. Indeed, near the end of the play, Phédre announces that she “was insane with an incestuous passion,” thus revealing that

she was in love with Hippolytus (Phé.5.456). However, this guilty and “incestuous passion” has caused her to choose a “slower conveyance to the land of the dead,” or in other words, a slower and more painful way to death (Phé. 5.471-472). In fact, Phédre claims that she is “drunk on an infallible poison” that her sister brought to Athens, a poison that is causing her to die slowly (Phé. 5.475-476). In addition, Phédre claims that she can “feel [her] pulses pushing [the poison] icily/ into [her] feet, hands, and roots of [her] hair,” which only begins to describe the chilling, agonizing death that Phédre is suffering (Phé.5.477-478). Therefore, because Phédre conceals her passion for Hippolytus, she dies a slow death—a physical agony—thus evincing how Racine illustrates that physical agony is provoked not only by an unaddressed passion but by an expressed passion as well.

It is important to realize, however, that the main characters—Hippolytus, Phédre, and Theseus—suffer an intense amount of agony mutually. Although it is not directly stated, Racine creates this agony for two reasons: firstly, to prove that no character was solely responsible for everyone’s agony; and secondly, to prove that passion, whether unaddressed or expressed, provokes agony. If Phédre told Theseus about her passion before he went missing from Athens, all the characters would have suffered agony; Phédre, because she would have been exiled from Athens or killed in a very similar way that Hippolytus died; Theseus, because he would have exiled the women he loves and would have caused himself to live alone; and Hippolytus, because he would still be unable to express his passion to the women he loves. Furthermore, if Hippolytus told Theseus about his passion for Aricia, all the characters would have endured agony as well; Hippolytus, because his father would have condemned his decision to marry Aricia; Theseus, because his critical judgements of Hippolytus’s passion would cause his son to leave Athens anyway; and Phédre, because she would not have been able to express her love for Hippolytus and would remain living with Theseus unhappily for the rest of her life. And finally, if Theseus would have concealed his passion for Phédre, all three characters would have still suffered agony; Hippolytus, because he would have ran away with Aricia, thereby expressing his love for her; Theseus, because he would have discovered that Hippolytus ran away with Aricia; and Phédre, because her true love would have ran away with another women, never to be seen again. Thus, because all characters would have suffered agony one way or another, just like what happened in the play originally, all the characters generate and induce agony amongst each other equally and thereby make all the characters culpably responsible for the events of the play. In short, Racine reveals that the characters are jointly responsible for the outcome of the play and that passion, whether unaddressed or expressed, provokes

agony because the characters' passions are inextricably woven so that, if one character expresses or conceals his or her passion, the other characters are harmed physically or psychologically.

Because passion is an inexorable characteristic, it is thus an emotion that is nearly impossible to appease. In fact, passion is not an emotion that anyone can control; rather, it is an inexorable emotion that one must seek to restrict by adapting a method of coping, even though it may lead to inescapable harm in the end. In fact, this inescapable harm may be the reason why Racine titled the play *Phédre*, because Phédre is the only character that, in some way, copes with or gets away from a passion that causes her harm—by simply killing herself. Even more odd is that the purest individuals also have difficulty concealing this emotion, as seen with Hippolytus in the play. Nevertheless, what's important to remember is that this play carries a valuable lesson for today's society. As of late, time is spent discussing how individuals follow their prolonged passion that cause them agony. Will it ever be possible to fully resist or cope with the passions that one cannot truly control? Will we always be trapped in a labyrinth of inextricable and inexorable passions that dismiss our desires only to cause us pain? If so, perhaps the wrong question is being asked. Instead of discussing whether or not it is possible to resist or cope with a passion, which will ultimately result in agony, perhaps it is time to begin asking this: "Shall [we] never get out of the labyrinth?" (Phé.4.7).

Works Cited

Racine, Jean. "Phèdre." *The Norton Anthology of Western Literature*, edited by Martin Puchner, vol. 2, W. W. Norton, 2014, pp. 1639-1699.

"He's more myself than I am:" Moving Past Narrative Limitations of Brontë's *Wuthering Heights*

Kathryn Hunzicker

In Emily Brontë's novel *Wuthering Heights*, readers are introduced to the tumultuous lives of Catherine Earnshaw and Heathcliff through the retelling of *Wuthering Heights*' housekeeper Nelly. Over the course of the novel, one learns of the anguish, isolation, and pain felt by each of the protagonists. It is perhaps these complex and volatile emotions that draw Filmmakers to the story of *Wuthering Heights*. The relationship shared between Catherine and Heathcliff has been adapted time and time again with varying portrayals and narratives on the screen. For a novel like *Wuthering Heights*, the argument of accuracy of adaptation seems remiss as it is within these film adaptations that Brontë's characters take on new life past the confines of the recounted story given of them in her novel. Through examining these adaptations, viewers are better able to understand the diverse and complex emotions of Catherine and Heathcliff's romantic relationship.

Brontë's novel shares its own pitfalls in terms of telling the complete story of her characters. The most prominent of which is the novel's events being the retellings of the housekeeper Nelly and the visiting tenant of *Wuthering Heights*, Lockwood. The primary gateways to the retelling of the past events of the novel are third party spectators to those events as opposed to the protagonists who are directly affected by them. Thus, the story of Catherine and Heathcliff is somewhat open ended as the narrative

that the reader explores in Brontë's novel could be considered to be merely a projection of the thoughts and ideas of Nelly in regard to the events. This opens the door for filmmakers to take particular liberties with the contents of the text in further exploring elements of Catherine and Heathcliff's relationship. As Bernard Paris writes of the novel's narrative perspective, "Since no perspective is privileged, its limitations belong to the character rather than to the implied author, and we do not reconcile it with the others" (240). Due to the novel's narrators and their limitations by their own opinions, readers draw closer to the protagonists of the retelling as opposed to the reteller. This idea directly encourages filmmakers to explore the idea of what was taking place beyond the realm of Nelly's conservative and biased narrative. In this particular case, any deviation from the original novel could be directly seen as an instance of moving past the limited narrative perspective of Nelly and trying to further understand the true nature of the novel.

To further this idea, Nelly and Lockwood's narration directly manipulates how the reader identifies with Heathcliff and Catherine. The two serve as spectators to the very painful and tragic events of Catherine and Heathcliff while trying to articulate the pain of those characters. Neither Nelly or Lockwood share events of their own lives that hold any sort of comparisons in their own lives to the troubles of the protagonist lovers. "The contrast between the humdrum narrators in *Wuthering Heights* and the extraordinary main protagonists of the story has been commented on for more than a hundred years. The failures and foibles of the former ensure that a reader's sympathy is not naturally driven to fuse with any viewpoint of theirs" (Thormählen 185). The reader is ultimately drawn to Catherine and Heathcliff for their passion, anguish, and their isolation. Perhaps, this is why adaptations find validity in the removal of any characters outside of the protagonist lovers. At the heart of the story, *Wuthering Heights* is the tale of the troubled love shared between Catherine and Heathcliff. All of the other characters merely serve as obstacles or spectators to that love story.

In the 1939 film adaptation of the novel, director William Wyler utilizes this idea in the removal of the characters of Linton, Young Catherine, and Hareton. He also enables the character of Isabella to remain in Heathcliff's life as his wife despite Heathcliff's love for Catherine. In this decision, Wyler decides to remove and change secondary characters in order to amplify and explore the anguish of Laurence Olivier's Heathcliff. He is so desperate not to be alone after Catherine's death that his cruelty towards marrying Isabella out of spite adapts to something of a semblance of comfort as well. This implores viewers of Wyler's adaptation to recognize how broken and spiteful Heathcliff has truly become after the past discrepancies of his life. Wyler also removes Young Catherine and Hareton to rob Heathcliff of a good deed

and a sense of peace that Brontë's Heathcliff finds within the novel. Olivier's Heathcliff is never able to provide his blessing to the marriage of the second generation of characters and therefore is not able to heal his past wounds through the pair of double characters. The happy ending that Heathcliff is able to give to these two characters is replaced with his continued pining of Catherine. Heathcliff is sympathetic and pitiful by the end of Wyler's adaptation. It makes his release into death and the arms of the ghostly Cathy all the more resonant.

In a similar vein, Coky Giedroyc's 2009 mini series sought the complete removal of the character of Lockwood. The series opted instead to open on the arrival of Heathcliff's son Linton to the estate of *Wuthering Heights* in order to illustrate Heathcliff's initial cruelty. Giedroyc's decision removes the viewpoint of Lockwood from the narrative instead encouraging his viewer to meet Heathcliff alongside the terrified, sickly child of Linton who emerges from the horse carriage. As opposed to Wyler, Giedroyc executes a sharp focus on the narrative of the second generation of characters and this introduction proves more useful. He establishes Heathcliff's relationship with his son right away and by removing the arrival of Lockwood, invites his viewer to scoff as Heathcliff mocks his own son. Heathcliff's cruelty is amplified by being shown as opposed to recounted by Lockwood.

As impactful as the absence of character helps to shift the focus solely on the novel's protagonist, the portrayal of the characters themselves is what ultimately drives each of these adaptations. In her novel, Emily Brontë focuses equally on Catherine and Heathcliff in terms of narrative time on the page. The Catherine of the novel sees a rather privileged upbringing and by extension exhibits an unnatural sense of entitlement and selfishness. Though most of this selfishness is underscored by a sense of naivety from her upbringing, it is cruel either way. "Her inability to conceive of any other viewpoints except her own is crucial to her relationship with Heathcliff" (186). Her inability to see how her actions will affect others are perhaps what drives her into the arms of Edgar for money and security. It is why she cannot see why Heathcliff cannot be happy with her or remain with her. She becomes a stubborn character over the course of the page with the pain she inflicts on Heathcliff completely prevalent. As the story is told through Nelly, this selfish and cruelty could be mere extensions of Nelly's own distaste for Heathcliff or projections of what Catherine was like in youth. As Nelly says to Lockwood, "She was much too fond of Heathcliff. The greatest punishment we could invent for her was to keep her separate from him" (Brontë 33). Nelly may very well be projecting these images of Cruelty onto Catherine to give her power in the tumultuous relationship or to hurt Heathcliff herself through the use of Catherine.

These images of cruelty translate very vaguely onto the screen through adaptation. In the 1992 adaptation of the novel, Juliette Binoche's Catherine Earnshaw comes closest in this representation. Often times over the course of the film, Catherine responds to many a situation with a childlike giggle which personifies the naivety that Brontë alludes to in the novel. The most impactful use of this comes when Binoche's Catherine declares to Nelly that Edgar Linton has asked to marry her. As Nelly asks her if she loves him, Catherine responds with halfhearted sentiments punctuated by an amused giggle. She does not recognize the cruel thing she is about to impose on Heathcliff and thinks only of the money. Another exhibition of Catherine's character comes in the form of a scene crafted entirely for the film in which Heathcliff predicts Catherine's future. He states that if she should open her eyes to the sun, so shall be her life but if she should open her eyes to storm, that shall also be her life. When Catherine opens her eyes, a storm begins to roll in and she utters the words "What have you done?" in the direction of Heathcliff. This subtle moment not only gives the viewer insight into her dependency on Heathcliff, but also alludes to the Catherine of the novel who fails to understand the course of her own actions. Why should Heathcliff be the cause of her "impending doom" when she herself will make the decisions that will affect the state of her life? The scene goes on to show Catherine proclaiming to the storm "I don't care. Do you hear me? I don't care." Once again Binoche's Catherine refuses to accept things that will not accommodate her and shows her emotional indifference. While Binoche's Catherine does not chuck hot applesauce across a table, she illustrates the cruelty and selfishness of the novel perhaps better than any other on screen portrayal.

In comparison, Charlotte Riley's 2009 depiction of Catherine directly contrasts that of Binoche's and the novel. Largely in part to the over the top portrayal of Tom Hardy's Heathcliff, Catherine Earnshaw is both dwarfed in vivacity and importance. Riley's Catherine adheres more to the idea of a ghostly woman who simply goes through the motions of life. Her marriage to Edgar is illustrated in such a way that it seems as if she has married him to appease him. She is quiet and docile in speech throughout most of the series' narrative. The only time she deviates from this behavior is to scorn Heathcliff for courting Isabella out of jealousy. It places great importance on the event as the viewer sees the only thing that will truly shake Catherine is her intent for Heathcliff's isolation and her jealousy. Through this approach, we are able to see a cruelty in Catherine, though perhaps it is subtler than the novel or Binoche's performance. Riley's Catherine wants to be happy but does not want Heathcliff to have his own happiness without her. She continues to follow convenience and allows Hardy's Heathcliff to bear most of the burden of their relationship. A similar dynamic is shared between

Lawrence Olivier's Heathcliff and Merle Oberon's Catherine. This is perhaps why Hardy and Olivier's characters dwarf the Catherine figure. The viewer explores the damage Catherine has inflicted as opposed to what's been inflicted onto her.

As Lin Haire-Sargent writes of the intent of the novel, it is "The story of a brutal, calculating sadist, the bane of two families over two generations in such a way that by the end the readers horror is overwhelmed by sympathy" (410). In terms of adaptations, Heathcliff is the character who sees the greatest amount of screen time in an attempt to recreate the novel's initial goal of obtaining sympathy for such a sadistic character. The novel's Heathcliff finds much of his redemption against the background of Catherine's cruelty, the blessing of Young Catherine and Hareton's marriage, and his reunion with the ghost of Catherine in death. The latter perhaps being the most impactful as it ends his journey to becoming a sympathetic character and finally unites him with the character of his affections who he has chased throughout the entire novel. In the novel, the actual scene of Heathcliff's death is recollected as "Mr. Heathcliff was laid on his back. His eyes met mine so keen and fierce, I started: and then he seemed to smile." (256). The smile in this scene displays that Heathcliff welcomed death as an opportunity to be reunited with the love that has evaded him in his mortal life. The vagueness has inspired different approaches. The three adaptations that have been examined thus far take different approaches to this scene in an effort to evoke different endings to the viewer's emotional journey with Heathcliff.



In the 1939 adaptation, Olivier's Heathcliff stumbles out into a blizzard in pursuit of the ghost of Catherine which Lockwood has described to him. Heathcliff remains on this hopeless pursuit as Nelly recites the events of the past. The viewer reconvenes with the present day Heathcliff as he is discovered lying dead in the snow after Dr. Kenneth insists that he saw him with a woman outside. This portrayal of Heathcliff's death speaks to the pitiful nature of Olivier's Heathcliff that we discussed earlier but also adds an element of a bookend to Heathcliff's narrative in the film. Just as Lockwood arrives in the blizzard to the icy nature of *Wuthering Heights*' master, Heathcliff dies in the blizzard as a symbol of the emotional void and coldness he experiences as he pines after Catherine. By having Dr. Kenneth announce that he's seen Heathcliff with a woman we presume to be Catherine, Nelly proclaims. "No, not dead, Dr. Kenneth. And not alone. He's with her. They've only just begun to live." Finally, the pining Heathcliff finds his closure. The viewer finds their sympathy in the suffering that Heathcliff endured in the elements in pursuit of the ghost of the woman he loved. It speaks to the suffering that Heathcliff endured over the entire course of the narrative and that suffering is what ultimately kills him.

The 1992 adaptation opts to follow much of the details of Heathcliff's death from the novel. Ralph Fiennes's Heathcliff dies from exposure to the rain after starving himself. It works towards the true nature of Heathcliff's sadism as he punishes himself near the end of his life so he can find pleasure in the arms of his lost love. This death works towards Fiennes's portrayal of Heathcliff with "his sadism, his emotional aloofness, even his depressive personality" (Haire-Sargent 426) as Heathcliff dies in solitude and by a slow suffering inflicted by his own hands. There is a scene of Catherine in front of a portal of light that accompanies this to show that Heathcliff is in fact reunited with her in a holy spectacle. It's almost religious in tone as Heathcliff fasts himself to be reunited with his angelic Catherine in the heavenly paradise of death. This depiction certainly speaks to Heathcliff's sadistic nature and his skewed views of Catherine.

Tom Hardy's Heathcliff does not experience such slow and painful deaths in the 2009 adaptation. While the other portrayals of Heathcliff revel in their own torture before ultimately dying, Hardy's Heathcliff shoots himself after encountering a vision of Catherine. It is a fitting end to Hardy's demonic, sadistic Heathcliff who terrorizes others throughout the course of the narrative. He shows no emotional remorse for Isabella or his son and the scene where he passes his blessing on to Hareton and Young Catherine is implied as opposed to stated. He suffers and he projects that suffering onto almost every other character throughout his life. The manic nature of Hardy's Heathcliff almost makes the death scene appear as the killing of a wild, manic animal. It suggests that Heathcliff not only pines after Catherine but also detests himself for the cruel person he has become without her. In this, we see Heathcliff's self-deprecation and violent nature. It is volatile by comparison to the other two and amplifies the true cruelty of Heathcliff's character.

Though film adaptations of *Wuthering Heights* have deviated from the novel, one can never truly argue that they deviate from the primary narrative as even the primary narrative does not evoke a full, objective story. As Ian Balfour writes, "In adaptation, the trick is often to do by any visual means necessary- or by primarily visual means- something of what was done verbally, in the more or less nebulous spirit of the text" (971). Every element of these adaptations sought to incorporate the spirit of Brontë's novel, to explore beyond the literary bounds put in place by the novel's narrator, and to bring viewers closer to the true nature of the relationship shared between Catherine and Heathcliff. These adaptations explore multiple facets of this relationship and continue to further the horizons of the literary landscape of *Wuthering Heights*.

Works Cited

- Balfour, Ian. "Adapting to the Image and Resisting It: On Filming Literature and a Possible World for Literary Studies." *PMLA*, vol. 125, no. 4, 2010, pp. 968–976. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/41058297 
- Brontë, Emily. *Wuthering Heights*. Edited by Richard J. Dunn, Norton, 2003
- Emily Brontë's Wuthering Heights*. Directed by Peter Kosminsky, performances by Juliette Binoche and Ralph Fiennes, Paramount Pictures, 1992.
- Haire-Sargent, Lin. "Sympathy for the Devil: The problem with Heathcliff in film versions of *Wuthering Heights*" *Wuthering Heights*, edited by Richard J. Dunn, Norton, 2003, pp. 410-427
- Paris, Bernard J. "Wuthering Heights." *Imagined Human Beings: A Psychological Approach to Character and Conflict in Literature*, NYU Press, 1997, pp. 240–261. 
- Thormählen, Marianne. "The Lunatic and the Devil's Disciple: The 'Lovers' in *Wuthering Heights*." *The Review of English Studies*, vol. 48, no. 190, 1997, pp. 183–197. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/518669.
- Wuthering Heights*. Directed by William Wyler, performances by Laurence Olivier and Merle Oberon, Samuel Goldwyn Productions, 1939.
- Wuthering Heights*. Directed by Coky Giedroyc, performances by Tom Hardy and Charlotte Riley, PBS, 2009.

Men Eat Chicken and Lucy Gets It: Sadism in Victorian Literature

Calla Thomas

This will not have a happy-ending. This essay will not end with a perfect conclusion, in a box, with a bow on top; this presentation is not complete, nor does it seek to be complete. This is a work in motion, a body in transition, a text The University shuns, but is necessary. It's 2017 and we still believe that if we work hard, love, and have some luck everything will work-out for us in the end; virtue is rewarded, and vice is punished. The modern-world has accepted this as a truth; we see it as the way things are, but it's a steaming pile of stool fed to us by Victorian authors. Killers get away, rapists still rape, and Donald Trump is the President. Success and the fruits of life are not rewarded to the virtuous. My work seeks to demystify the ideals of sophisticated refinement, having "high" morals, and staying in your place, as ideals that "paying-off". The ideals the Victorians embedded into our society were ones centered on building a strong national identity, expanding the Royal British Empire, and protecting the queen. I am not arguing that our time is connected to the Victorians; what I am arguing is, because of the sadistic ideals of the Victorian society we have connected ourselves consciously and unconsciously to the Victorians. When we view the Victorians we see a society in control, booming with people and technology, expansive, and governed in an order that appears immobile and timeless. The Victorians have ideals that are attractive; we are drawn to them as readers, creators, philosophers, and as scholars. But something

happens when we open a book: an action occurs. When we read, it is the opening of a door. What emerges once we open a book and begin to read is the formation of a metaphysical hall, where ideals engage. This "hall" is a middle ground where exchanges of power between the reader and the author are made. What is fascinating about this occurrence is not all parties have to be aware for this interplay to occur. This interplay is a power-struggle that can currently be described as sadistic. However, the exchange does not have to be sadistic; the reader-author exchange has the potential to be empowering and liberating.

Sadism is a psychoanalytic term used to diagnose disorders of the mind and body. However, I am not using the term as such. I am applying the term sadistic as an adverb: a word that is used to describe an act. The use of the term sadistic in this work is utilized to outline the behaviors between a body of text and a congregation of readers. I am providing a lens we can use to observe and anteriorly understand ways readers and authors interact with text. I want to reiterate this is a method of gazing; one can consider this text operating as a window or a picture. For this essay, I will be analyzing two Victorian texts, *The Moonstone* by Wilkie Collins and *Dracula* by Bram Stoker, and two contemporary texts: Robert Tierney's and Jill LaZansky's *Author's Intentions and Readers' Interpretations*, and *Sexual Sadism: A Portrait of Evil* by Michael H. Stone. I seek to clarify some of the ambiguities between the relationship of readers and authors. By clarifying the interchanges that occur between the reader and the author, we can restore the balance of power that the Victorians off-set. We have options when deciding what we read and write. Currently, we are under the illusion that our only options are binaries; "kill or be killed" or to "eat or get ate." I want to rupture the fantasy of the reader-author relationship as being bound to a binary. The roles change. To create this framework, I utilized the following theories: Queer Theory, Deconstruction, and Feminism. Other tools that are helpful, but not necessary to understanding the framework I am presenting are the tradition of Hermetics and Ontology.

The reader-author relationship is an agreement that a speaker makes to an audience. It is also an agreement the reader makes to the author and the text. These roles are defined in Robert Tierney's and Jill LaZansky's *Author's Intentions and Readers' Interpretations*. The reader-author relationship defines the author as having a ground or platform; the text and they communicate that ground to the reader. Aristotle considers "the word" to be God-given, the author is the scribe of God, and the readers the congregation. The readers have the role of communicating with the text. The reader is obligated to challenge the author or speaker. The Victorians shifted the roles by producing mass text without creating responsible readers (LaZansky 6-8). They delve into Aristotle's model of speech outlined in his work, *Rhetoric*.

They state, the reader is compelled to interpret the meaning of the text the author presents; furthermore, the reader is viewed as having the responsibility to successfully interpret what the author is saying to understand the deeper meaning of the text by asking questions and challenging authors (LaZansky 7). This deeper meaning is embedded in the society the reader is reading from and the society the author is speaking out of (LaZansky 8). This does not mean the two societies are connected, it means that the deeper meaning is hidden between the exchanges between two (LaZansky 5-6). Furthermore, Tierney and LaZansky state that Aristotle believes there to be an ethos the author must abide by; a speaker is obligated to be honest because the reader assumes them to be speaking truth (LaZansky 5).

The Victorians moved this balance and gave all the power of the text to the story-teller – the author. Developing the meaning of the text is a shared responsibility (LaZansky 8-9). The Greeks loved public theater and the Victorians deemed the theater to be immoral and low (Dickens 1). With this morality imposed on the theatre the lower-classes of people lost power with the text, because the Victorians changed the method of communication (Dickens 1). With theater under the Greeks and the Romantics the masses physically engaged with a text. The invention of mass publication and the shift of values from spoken to written text, coupled with the development of a class-based economy, de-based the power-dynamic between the reader and the author. Not every Victorian citizen could read written text nor was every Victorian citizen “trained” on how to properly engage with written text. Victorian society was one where cities and industrialization were devouring the sanctity of the farms (Dickens 4). Industry was disrupting the order of the Romantics and imposing a new order. Under the Victorians we have the formation books being used as a form of profit and we also have the need to maintain a nation with a strong sense of self (Dickens 6). This ideology diminished the readers role and responsibility to understand the deeper meaning of the text, because it was not profitable and nor did questioning the nation lead to a strong sense of national identity.

The author has consumed the authority of the reader by providing all the meaning to the text. This is a sadistic tendency of reader-author relationships formed by the Victorians. The readers feel satisfaction because meaning is still given, and the author is satisfied because they have power, no matter how distorted the balance is. For the Victorians to maintain enough power for global expansion they needed their people to know order (which provides security) and to have pride in their nation. This can only be done if people put their identity into their nation. By diminishing the role of the reader and shifting the values of the word from spoken to written, the Victorians created a relationship where the reader has almost no choice, but to identify with its nation.

When we interpret the word sadistic there is a notion of evil attached to it (Stone 136-138). However, I am not using sadistic with the connotation of evil, but as a term to help us visualize the interplay that occurs with the author-reader relationship. The reader-author relationship is currently viewed as a stable construction, but it is not. There are situations that occur where the author becomes the reader and the reader becomes the author, in other words the roles are interchangeable. We see the roles of readers and authors inter-change in many Victorian novels. For example, in *Dracula* by Bram Stoker, we can see this occur with the characters of Johnathan Harker and Wilhmina Harker. The story begins with Johnathan Harker being the narrator and has multiple narrators taking over throughout the text. All the characters have a place in the story; however, the order of narration is controlled. *Dracula* begins with an ambiguous edict, “How these papers have been placed in sequence will be made manifest in the reading of them. All needless matters have been eliminated, so that a history almost at variance with the possibilities of later-day belief may stand forth as simple fact (Stoker 1).” This ordering of the text is not unintentional. The Victorians were people acting with purpose. What Stoker is doing here is ordering or commanding how the text *should* be read. The reader does not have to comply with the ordering, because books and written words are valuable by society the reader unconsciously consents. The reader gives up their power to critically engage with the text, because the author commands, all this is done for a place within the larger national identity.

This exchange of power can be described as sadistic. Sadism defined by Michael Stone in his work, *Sexual Sadism: A Portrait of Evil*, is considered to have eight varieties; lust-murder, mutilation of a corpse, injury to a woman via stabbing, flagellation, or comparable means, defilement of a woman, symbolic sadism (cutting a woman’s hair rather than her skin or cutting her story), sadism via use of an object, and ideational sadism (Stone 134). Stone also states sadism is to be defined by orgasm (getting off) with the actions of a lust-murder, harm to a woman, etc. *Dracula* clearly fits into the description; it is a story centered around a lust-murder where Lucy (a woman) gets stabbed by Arthur (a man), Arthur is a husband of Lucy and the Victorians gave men specific duties as husbands and men; protect the chastity of the woman and the integrity of the family. If Arthur is a good husband, he will protect Lucy, even if it’s from herself and, “Arthur never faltered. He looked like a figure of Thor as his untrembling arm rose and fell, driving deeper and deeper the mercy bearing stake (Stoker 230).” Arthur murders Lucy because she has become a threat and ne Ar-thur stabs Lucy, because her voluptuous mouth made one tremble to see (Stoker 228). Lucy’s mouth can be interpreted as her vagina or her sexual-desire (power). Her power is so “ugly” that it fuels Arthur’s rage when killing

her. Lucy's murder ends with her being buried, sent to God, in her proper place, and Arthur "gets-offs" with the murder (Stoker 234). This is an example of sadism; furthermore, the characters actions show us the attitudes the Victorians had towards women. The Victorians feared the power of women. Women were not allowed the same freedoms as men, because the security of national identity depended on women being inserted into roles. Lucy's murder is an exchange of power. Lucy is murdered because she is "othered" and her power is viewed as a perversion. Lucy receives multiple blood-transfusions. Blood is what binds the man and the woman together. In a society where the custom is one man for one woman and divorce is considered unclean, Lucy's reception of multiple blood donors makes her polyamorous (Stoker 136). Polyamory is an ideal that contradicts with the high morals of the Victorians. The Victorians see it as their duty to set the moral standard, as an imperialistic society anything threatening national security was to be destroyed. Lucy's lust-murder is a sadistic mannerism that is not only carried out through *Dracula* but is imposed on the reader.

Stoker blatantly states that there are pieces of the story missing, because the text is meant to *almost* be at variance with the changing times (Stoker 1). The Victorians were aware times change, ideals too (Dickens 4), but the Victorians also knew if you could control how society changes, you can alter the ways, "the times", or cultural consciousness changes. If the reader has *other* ideals than those of the author, those ideals are attacked and murdered, because they are a threat to the nation. Lucy is not just a woman but a symbol. Lucy represents foreign land. Being a nation seeking world-wide domination, control, and maintenance of your power means you need a story that speaks of and inspires those ideals. You need to give the conquered people something to believe in while simultaneously killing off oppositional "detrimental" ideas. Everything depended on order with the Victorians. Men and women need to be in their "proper" places. Men must control the power (sexual desire) of women. Men must control how "the story is told" because this is how legacy is passed down. The total consumption of power by manipulation of sexual desire is sadistic.

The Victorians asserted their power as an empire by dominating the his-stories of the past, by consuming *other* religions and moralities. The Victorians considered Christianity the one true religion not because this was true, but because they needed to assert a belief system that could move with the Victorians and mobilize as the Victorians did. The Victorians were conquering other nations, to take over a nation means you must control how and what "the other" conquered countries believe. Victorians needed newly acquired territories to believe that they had a role in maintaining their new empire. So, for "the other" to have an identity meant the other had to ascribe to the Victorian concept of self, but the Victorians concept of self

is rooted in the identity of England. This means the Victorians asserted themselves as a world-wide power by consuming the identity of the other through their literature (Dickens 6).

We see this force of nature mobilized in books like *The Moonstone* by Wilkie Collins. *The Moonstone* is a Victorian-era sensational novel. In his essay "What is Sensational about the "Sensation Novel?," Patrick Brantlinger defines the Sensation novel as, "a mass-produced text that deals with crime, often murder as an outcome of adultery sometimes bigamy, in apparently proper bourgeois, domestic settings, dealing with secrets developed to tantalize the reader by withholding information rather than divulging it (Brantlinger 1-2)." The Victorians have created a form – the Sensation novel, that outright denies and ignores the ethos established by Aristotle in *Rhetoric* (LaZansky 5). Aristotle says the speaker is obligated to tell the truth, not part of the truth, but the whole truth, and the Sensation novel is a form that takes power from the reader by hiding information and presenting it as a mystery. This sadistic abuse of power of the author is displayed by the key narrator in *The Moonstone*. Gabriel Betteredge's role as a narrator is to represent the author by the telling the story. Collins delegated his power as the speaker to his narrators. Aristotle says the speaker must tell the truth, but what if a character makes an omission? Collins uses the unreliable narrators as a loop-hole to the ethos established by Aristotle. The author tells the truth or the story through a series of interrupted narrations leaving the reader to fill in the gaps; but remember, the Victorians have stolen the power of the reader by funneling the readers identity into the identity of the nation. Interpretation cannot happen the way Aristotle states it should, because the Victorians have sadistically created an "out" without informing the reader (they get-off). The unreliable narrator serves as an escape for the Victorian author. The author uses the inconsistency provided by the narrators as a method mystification and tantalization. The omission of information arouses the senses in the reader so much that they no longer seek the truth, they only seek the pleasure provided by the author.

When the reader arrives at a shift of narration an integral truth is left-out. Collins betrays the relationship with the reader by abruptly ending Betteredge's narration. Gabriel Betteredge finds out the secret, however because of Betteredge's love for Franklin Blake he leaves out the truth, and says it's because he does not trust the Indians: "...when I know a family plate-basket to be out on a pantry table, is to be instantly reminded of that superior to my own. I accordingly informed the Indian that the lady of the house was out; and I warned him and his party off the premises (Collins 17)." What Betteredge is saying is, hey I'm not racist, but I don't trust those Indians, because I think they want my food. In present times we would consider this statement the typical "white-man" racist-statement, "I'm

not racist, but here I go saying something racist.” I want to pause here for clarification; Betteredge’s statement is not limited to opinions about race. In *American Anatomies* by Robyn Weigman, she states that ideals about race and sexuality are connected (Weigman 3). I want to push this further by arguing, Betteredge’s statement is a reflection not only of ideals of race and sexuality, but of class and reader status. Betteredge is saying he does not trust anyone other than his own kind. Betteredge expresses an elitist ideal that resonates on a multitude of levels. His lack of trust is the reason for his betrayal to the reader. Betteredge views the reader as an *other*; his perception taints the power balance of the reader-author relationship. Betteredge feels that since he cannot trust the reader he has the duty to omit information that may change what the reader thinks is true. Nothing more exemplifies this betrayal than when Gabriel Betteredge’s narration ends, “In the dark, I have brought you thus far. In the dark I am compelled to leave you, with my best respects (Collins 192).” Betteredge’s distrust may appear as insignificant but the nature of Betteredge’s distrust is an integral part of understanding the sadistic mystery. The Victorians were tricky people. (Here’s where the understanding of Hermetics come in handy) If a person was truly enlightened they’d see a light in the darkness or be a light in the darkness. A reader was expected to know the truth in a place where there was no “truth”, this was not the ethos Aristotle established in *Poetry and Rhetoric*. The Enlightenment ideas were ones that did not include the welfare of “lower” masses of people. The Victorians valued the Enlightenment, Idealism, and Realism; they had theoretical solutions to everyday “practical” life (Dickens 6). The “solution” to the everyday problems of poor sanitation, lack of representation, labor abuse, gender-inequality, and oppression was highly idealistic – it was meant to soothe the mind not the body. The Victorians wanted to put a band-aid on the wound caused by imperialistic industrialization, by telling the reader to be happy, because with enough hard work, with enough faith, everything will be ok, if not in this life surely the next (Stoker 69).

We are in the next-life, and the ideals of social refinement, high-morals, and virtue have not paid off. Readers don’t know their power and authors abuse their power. Since the Victorians imposed a standard that values the written word over the spoken word, what occurs when reader opens a book is to automatically give the author all their power. The Victorians imposed a standard that established the author as the creator; the reader as the created. This is an ideology we still believe and carry out in modern reading practices. We have been programmed, conditioned, and we need to remedy this. This can only be done by a restoration of power to the reader and an engagement in freedom-oriented reading practices. Rarely, are readers expected to challenge the ideals of the authors because the hierarchies in

place elevate the author over the reader. This is an illusion promoted and pushed out by contemporary times, because it is profitable. Our standard that says readers are only correct when they analyze the authors in a neat box; the context of their time, is an oppressive standard. If the text is still living in our time, why can’t we analyze it in the context of present time? We need to remove this barrier between the reader and the author, so we can restore the balance of power. This cannot be done without first accepting the power dynamic as being “off” or sadistic. As Stone suggest by removing the connotation of evil from sadism we can see it as imbalance of power, without the morality attached to the definition of sadism we do not demonize the author nor the reader. I agree with Stone the connotation of evil needs to be removed; however, it is not enough.

I am urging us as scholars, intellectuals, a society, culture, to engage in freedom-oriented reader-author practices. I urge the promotion of what Michel Foucault calls, governmentality; the practice of self-governance (Foucault 285). Foucault’s theory of self-governance is a practice that focuses on the care and governance of self. This ideal expands the concept of “self” or the id. What this also means for the literary world is, when we create a text, we give up ownership of interpretation, we allow all people to establish meaning to the text, and lastly, we give up some power as authors; by not establishing ownership of the text. We see the text as a creation that is not attached to our identity as “the author” by allowing the reader room to identify and create with the author by re-opening the interplay established by Aristotle. Furthermore, this ideal can also create a dialogue that seeks freedom by not playing “the game” of truth. At the beginning of pathos, logos, and, ethos was nothing, darkness, man molded them into what they are today. Plot changes and new plots are introduced while old plots are in motion. Simply put, order is an illusion. As a society we need to give up control and accept, there is no order, there is nothing but what we make. What world do you want to live in?

Works Cited

- Brantlinger, Patrick. "What is Sensational about the Sensation Novel?" *19 Century Fiction* JSTOR. Accessed 14 November 2017.
- Dickens, Timothy. "The Victorian Age." <https://www.ucm.es/data/cont/docs/119-2014-02-19-3.%20The%20Victorian%20Age.pdf> Accessed 11 November 2017.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Government of Self and Others: Lectures at the College de France*. St Martin's Press, 2010.
- LaZansky, Jill and RJ Tierney. *Author's Intentions and Readers' Interpretations*. University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, IL, May 1983.
- Stoker, Bram. *Dracula*. Norton, 1987.
- Stone, Michael H. "Sexual Sadism: A Portrait of Evil." *Journal of American Academy of Psychoanalysis and Dynamic Psychiatry*, vol. 38, no. 1, 2010, pp. 133-157.
- Wiegman, Robyn. *American Anatomies: Theorizing Race and Gender*. Duke University Press, 1995.
- Wilke, Collins. *The Moonstone*. Arcturus Publishing, 2010.

Deviant Desire and Guilt in Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray*

Angela Crout-Mitchell

Historically, Britain's Victorian Age is considered to be one of the most austere and morally pure eras. Ironically, its literature displays deviation from that view. While social constructs, such as class position, morality, and acceptable social behaviors were observed, the writers of the Victorian Age took it upon themselves to expose the hypocrisy and hidden vices of the era. None is as successful in this endeavor than Oscar Wilde. While a great deal of his work reflected the nonsensical and arbitrary approach to all facets of society, *The Picture of Dorian Gray* starkly explores the ideas of desire, beauty, evil, and art, often through a social lens. Wilde champions and condemns the Aestheticism movement and questions the value of how desire and sex, in its various orientations, reflect the era's growing fascination with ideas outside of the conventional Victorian set of beliefs.

Shortly after the success of *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, Wilde faced trial for breaking the decency laws of the time that related to homosexuality and faced his ruin. It is only fitting that the novel addresses sexual attraction of men to men, and depicts the manner in how homosexuality impacted Victorian life. Though never blatantly described in specific terms, Wilde alludes to the issue early in the novel. In Chapter 1, Basil Hallward describes his immediate, and consuming attraction to Dorian Gray saying,

When our eyes met, I felt that I was growing pale. A curious sensation of terror came over me. I knew that I had come face to face with some one whose mere personality was so fascinating that, if I allowed it to do so, it would absorb my whole nature, my whole soul, my very art itself (Wilde 10).

Basil Hallward's description of his first impressions of Dorian Gray instantly encompasses the sexual and artistic tone for the rest of the novel. He admits to his budding feelings of ardent and forbidden desire and love, while drawing attention to the relevance of art as a thing of value. It is clear that Wilde, through Hallward, makes the connection between the soul, nature, and art. The physicality of the passage also enhances the connection to desire. The images of the eyes, faces, and the physical sensation of terror are all contrived to clearly display the impression of Dorian Gray as a work of art and something to be desired.

Nunokawa, in his essay detailing the homosexual aspect of Basil Hallward's love and desire for Dorian Gray also discusses the moment Basil first sees Dorian. The article describes the relationship between desire and guilt.

And in spite of considerable textual testimony that to the contrary: the "curious sensation of terror" that arrests the artist when he meets the show stopping face of a beautiful boy prophesies a destiny quite opposed to the conclusion that defines the coming out story. Hallward's sexual attraction threatens to engulf his identity, rather than rendering it distinct; it threatens to force him not from the closet, but rather to the vanishing point (Nunokawa 312).

Hallward struggles with this element of identity crisis throughout the novel. His struggle is first seen in his reluctance to allow Sir Henry interaction with the object of his desire, Dorian. It is later exhibited in his desire to control Dorian, while wallowing in his confusion about his own motives and desire for the boy.

With perhaps the exception of Sybil Vane, Basil Hallward is the only character in *The Picture of Dorian Gray* who appears to have any reverence for the Victorian code of morality. It is not a question of knowing that decadence exists. He does. His appreciation and adherence to social order can be said to contribute to his downfall, and death at Dorian's hands, at the end of the novel. His desire for Dorian, which required him to step outside of normalcy, became a tortuous practice in denial. It can be argued that it was his resistance to the sublime, evil, and aesthetically pleasing was the catalyst of his decline, rather than the desire itself.

The Victorian age, ironically enough, ushered in the era of the study of sex. According to Denton's article on the subject, Basil would have been perceived as homosexual (Denton 466). The article states,

That is to say, the 19th-century 'homosexual' was an individual who engaged in sexual acts with same-sex partners, though from a naturally sedimented heterosexuality. Consequently, any person who had an opposite-sex partner, though practiced same-sex relations as well, would not have identified or been referred to as (interpellated as) 'bisexual,' but rather as homosexual (Denton 466).

The novel does not explicitly mention Basil's romantic or sexual interests outside of Dorian. Therefore, it is unclear whether he would have fallen into the bisexual or homosexual category. In either case, it is clear that from first meeting Dorian that Basil felt conflicting emotions that threatened his sense of propriety and decency. Basil is unable to embrace the aesthetic values, as Dorian and Lord Henry do, and as a result is overwhelmed by his so-called deviant desires. Ultimately, while it is Dorian who kills him, his deterioration and guilt throughout the novel is the greater culprit. He was simply unable to set aside his principles and values to live for pleasure and desire alone.

Basil is not the only character in *The Picture of Dorian Gray* that experiences love, desire, and guilt. Dorian's love affair with Sibyl Vane is a catalytic occurrence within the novel. While the two begin wildly in love, Dorian becomes less favorable when Sibyl discovers that her love for him steals her art, her acting. After attending a play in which he planned to show off her artistry to Lord Henry and Basil, Dorian behaves as if her poor acting is an insult to him, and that the girl in some manner lied about who and what she is. He tells his friends, "But she seems to me to be simply callous and cold. She has entirely altered. Last night she was a great artist. This evening she is merely a commonplace, mediocre actress" (72). Dorian's criticism of Sibyl highlights his true feelings for the actress. It is not the person herself who he loved. It is, rather, the perceived art. He did not want a woman. He wanted a work of art to be just that, with no meaning, no importance, and no value outside of itself. Hallward takes a different approach to the situation. He gently reprimands Dorian for his criticism saying, "Don't talk like that about any one you love, Dorian. Love is a more wonderful thing than Art" (72). Much like his feelings on perceived deviant sexual desire and love, Basil is again discrediting the concepts of the Aestheticism movement. He values love more highly than the idea of art simply for art's own sake. In opposition to both Dorian and Lord Henry, Basil becomes the conflicted champion for Victorian ideals.

Dorian does attempt to mend his ways, in regard to Sibyl, but he does so too late to prevent her suicide. With the attempt to accept Sibyl as a person, rather than art, Dorian briefly steps away from Pater's philosophies and challenges Lord Henry's teachings. Following her suicide, however, Lord Henry places Sibyl back in the place of merely art.

The girl never really lived, and so she has never really died. To you at least she was always a dream, a phantom, that flitted through Shakespeare's plays, and left them lovelier for its presence, a reed through which Shakespeare's music sounded rich and more full of joy. The moment she touched actual life, she marred it, and it marred her, and so she passed away (87).

Lord Henry's analysis of Sibyl's life is a reflection on what he felt her to be. He tries to convince Dorian of the same feeling; that Sibyl was nothing except her art. To say that she had never really lived, much in the same way a painting, novel, musical composition, or any other type of art does not live, eliminates her status as a person. Following the aesthetic principle that art only exists for itself and has no value outside of its existence, Lord Henry reinforces Dorian's initial reaction to Sibyl "becoming human" because of her feelings for Dorian. In a sense, he pardons Dorian for his thoughtlessness and cruelty in rejecting the person, in favor of the art. It is also a pivotal moment when Dorian, who was on the edge of redeeming himself, first through his plan to apologize, make amends, and marry Sibyl, and his later grief after learning of her suicide, turns back to his deviant way of looking at and approaching the world. It is a cataclysmic moment that, in part, seals Dorian's fate.

Aestheticism is a philosophy created in large part by Walter Pater. Pater developed the concept that art is created simply for art's sake, meaning that it has no higher importance or meaning. Additionally, he encouraged the theory that experience in life is more relevant than moral behavior. The theory suggests that as long as a person is seeking new sensation and experience, then conventional morality has no place in the decisions and actions that proceed and make up the experience. Oscar Wilde agreed with Pater to some extent, but in his characterization of *Dorian Gray*, it appears he felt there is a point reached where it is essential to temper willful exploration of experience with thought of something/someone outside of self and experience.

It is this denial of Pater's theories and aestheticism that Carroll speaks of in his article detailing the connections between the movement, the novel, and Wilde's experiences and beliefs pertaining to aestheticism. He writes:

... Wilde's own mind aestheticism and homoeroticism converge into a distinct complex of feeling and value. Dorian's life turns out to be something like an experimental test case for the validity of Pater's aestheticist philosophy, and the experiment falsifies the philosophy (Carroll 292).

It is possible that Wilde wrote Basil with his opposing characterization only to serve to counteract Dorian and Lord Henry's more callous, pleasure seeking views. While the quote from Carroll pertains, in part, to homoeroticism, and not the heterosexual attraction between Sibyl and Dorian, what it says about Wilde's feelings on aestheticism is telling. If the experiences Wilde gives his *Dorian Gray* character are indeed intended to put the aestheticism philosophy on trial, it does appear that the experiment fails. As it is, Dorian's treatment of Sibyl as a work of art with not value outside of his pleasure leads to her later suicide. The main character's continued quest for pleasure takes him down a path of murder and depravity. If Carroll is correct in his assertions pertaining to Wilde's deeper feelings about aestheticism, it makes sense to consider that Wilde may have appreciated the philosophy on the surface, but not for every facet of life.

Carroll's opinion, that Wilde was actually discussing the pitfalls of aestheticism in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, is one that is shared by other scholars as well. Duggan writes that Wilde wrote the novel as much about the pleasures of seeking only pleasure, with no regard for immorality or morality, as about the dangers of taking the pleasure too far. He writes:

Opponents of a purely aesthetic lifestyle will certainly cite what they consider an inevitability: one's desires and impulses, though when acted upon result in a more pleasurable life, will at times be undeniably immoral. It is at these times that the virtues of the wholly aesthetic life become questionable. The ruination of *Dorian Gray*, the embodiment of unbridled aestheticism, illustrates the immorality of such a lifestyle and gravely demonstrates its consequences. Wilde uses *Dorian Gray* not as an advertisement for aestheticism, but rather, he uses Dorian's life to warn against aestheticism's hostility toward morality when uncontrolled. Wilde himself admits, in a letter to the *St. James's Gazette*, that *Dorian Gray* "is a story with a moral. And the moral is this: All excess, as well as all renunciation, brings its own punishment" (Wilde 248). (Duggan)

Wilde's characterization devices in the novel suggest that Duggan is correct. The trio of men, Lord Henry, Basil Hallward, and Dorian, each serve their purpose to make Wilde's point. Lord Henry serves as the embodiment of the aestheticism movement and the devil on Dorian's shoulder. Basil is the opposite, with his morality and integrity intact, he is the angel on his other shoulder. Dorian is the man in the middle. He exemplifies Duggan's description as the result of "morality when uncontrolled."

Lord Henry's influence over Dorian can be said to be transformative. The older man uses the boy much as an experiment. His control over Dorian begins early in the novel, with his bold descriptions of pleasure seeking and the non-existence of morality and immortality. In chapter 2, Lord Henry once again asserts his philosophy and watches the results of his interference. While discussing the morality of influence over another, Lord Henry says:

"Because to influence a person is to give him one's own soul. He does not think his natural thoughts, or burn with his natural passions. His virtues are not real to him. his sins, if there are such things as sins, are borrowed. He becomes the echo of some one else's music, an actor of a part that has not been written for him." (19)

Though not explicitly, Lord Henry is informing Dorian that it is his wish to influence the younger man. In a matter of speaking, he also absolves himself of any potential wrong doing by asserting that he does not necessarily believe in the existence of sins. It is also telling that he claims no responsibility for the influence; that it is not his own virtues, passions, or soul, but rather that of the person being influenced. It is an effective way of placing the blame for the influence, in this case, of the values, or lack thereof, found in aestheticism, on the influenced. Lord Henry sets the stage for a life of debauchery, cruelty, and pleasure for the young man, and avoids responsibility for it.

On the other hand, Basil Hallward, despite his romantic and sexual feelings for Dorian, is more interested in his well-being and the quality of his life, rather than using his model as an experiment. When rumors spread about Dorian's involvement with Lady Gwendolen and other high ranking people in regard to the manner Dorian influenced them and the destruction their lives came to. Unlike Lord Henry, Basil arrives on the scene to instruct and warn the young man that his destructive lifestyle has been noted, though Basil himself does not believe it.

"Mind you, I don't believe these rumours at all. At least, I can't believe them when I see you. Sin is a thing that writes itself across a man's face. It cannot be concealed. People talk sometimes of secret vices. There are no such things. If a wretched man has a vice, it shows itself in the lines of his mouth, the droop of his eyelids, the moulding of his hands, even." (126)

Though Basil is equating the outward appearance with the status of the soul, he is making a case to Dorian for restraint. He says he does not believe the rumors, yet he appears at Dorian's house to caution and warn him. There is every indication that he does at least suspect there is some truth to the claims. Basil manages to comfort himself with the belief that since Dorian still appears youthful and innocent, that it must be so, by describing the outward effects sin typically has on the guilty. Naturally, he has no way to know that his painting is the mirror of Dorian's soul and it looks anything but innocent. Regardless of his knowledge or belief in the impurity of Dorian's soul, Basil plays the opposite of Lord Henry in his attempt to draw Dorian away from the selfish, materialistic, damaging life Lord Henry instilled in the young man.

Dorian frequently appears to be the pawn of Lord Henry, but there are moments in the novel when it becomes clear he sees the flaws in Lord Henry's assertions about morality, love, youth, art, all of the things that aestheticism reveres. Whether it is because of Basil's influence, or the character's observations about his portrait, the result is the same. Dorian questions his actions and aestheticism, though it comes too late. There are examples of his wavering throughout the novel. One appears in Chapter 8, when Dorian contemplates his rejection and dismissal of Sibyl Vane. Wilde writes Dorian's thoughts.

One thing, however, he felt that it had been done to him. It had made him conscious how unjust, how cruel, he had been to Sibyl Vane. It was not too late to make reparation for that. She could still be his wife. His unreal and selfish love would yield to some higher influence, would be transformed into some nobler passion, and the portrait that Basil Hallward had painted of him would be a guide to him through life, would be to him what holiness is to some, and conscience to others, and the fear of God to us all. (81)

It is interesting to note that while the thoughts of redemption are Dorian's, it is Basil's portrait that he considers the guiding influence of his life and behavior. With his plan to model his life after a creation of Basil's, it is interesting to ponder whether the identity and values of the artist had

any bearing on Dorian's redemptive decision. The fact that Dorian does not follow that path is more the influence of Lord Henry than any failing of Basil, as the epitome of Victorian morality and ethics. Again, Wilde allows Lord Henry and aestheticism to rule Dorian, but he argues against it all the same.

Ideas of good and evil, pleasure and pain, life and art, have influenced humankind since the dawn of socialization. Debates have raged over the existence of sin, morality, and ethics. In the Victorian era, decadence and aestheticism influenced aspects of society, with the emphasis on pleasure for the sake of pleasure, and art for the sake of art. In *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, Wilde is informing us of his attachment to the concepts of aestheticism, while warning us that the old adage is really true. "All things in moderation."

Works Cited

- Carroll, Joseph. "Aestheticism, Homoeroticism, and Christian Guilt in the Picture of Dorian Gray." *Philosophy & Literature*, vol. 29, no. 2, Oct. 2005, pp. 286-304.
- Denton, Nicholas. "Dare Not Speak Its Name: Bisexuality in Victorian Fin de Siècle Literature." *Journal of Bisexuality*, vol. 12, no. 4, 2012, pp. 461-482. DOI: 10.1080/15299716.2012.729426
- Duggan, Patrick. "The Conflict Between Aestheticism and Morality in Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray*." *Student Reviewers*, no. 61, 2009.
- Nunokawa, Jeff. "Homosexual Desire and Effacement of the Self in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*." *American Image*. vol. 49, no. 3, 1992, pp. 311-321.
- Wilde, Oscar. *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. Norton, 2007.

Close Reading: Hedda Gabler

Kyle Burnett

Norwegian playwright, Henrik Ibsen, has often been referred to as one of the fathers of realism, as well as having major ties with modernism in his plays. The use of these styles during the early 19th century helped develop a new, uprising style for performed plays. As a result, he is now known as one of the greatest playwrights of all time. In his play, "Hedda Gabler," we see ties to realism in the plot though the themes he presents, such as power and social status. While there are a lot of themes brought up in the play and a lot of ideas that can be discussed, one critical aspect to the play is the idea of power itself.

While Hedda's power is ultimately the reason for her strict attitudes and bored approach to life, it is interesting to see how her reputation of power can influence characters' actions. Since power is a main aspect to the work itself, majorly determining the way Hedda acts, it can also be looked at as the influence on all characters' actions as well. This play was designed to be performed, but reading it closely in text can present some overlooked ideas that Ibsen added.

Comparing the text to a performance of the play can help the audience get a feel of the tension going on. We see Hedda as a woman of an aristocratic background and the daughter of a general, hinting at her life of high class and power. Her desire for authority is even evident before she is introduced in the play. In the text, the first act begins with a description of the new house and all the items that are displayed, including critical items such as a giant portrait of Hedda's late father, General Gabler, her

old piano, and various flowers from friends and family. These items are significant because it shows Hedda's personality without her presence. As the Tesmans have just returned to their new house from their honeymoon the night before, we are introduced to Miss Tesman and Berta while George and Hedda sleep. Berta, the maid, begins a conversation with a critical line that demonstrates Hedda's ultimate power over the household and their anxieties of pleasing her. Berta speaks to Miss Tesman about the previous night and mentions that "the steamer got in so late last night" and "the young mistress wanted so much unpacked before she could settle down" (1483). Without even being introduced to Hedda, we can begin to see a picture of the type of person she is and what her priorities are. Even after such a long honeymoon and traveling, her priorities before going to bed were to make the house her own by unpacking everything she owns and making the house match her image.

By comparing the text with the 1963 film version of *Hedda Gabler*, the opening scene in the movie resonates the text's description of the house very well. We are given a view inside and all the beautiful items that Hedda placed out the night before, making this house her house. Her father's portrait displayed proudly, her old piano from childhood, and even the various flowers that were given to Hedda as congratulations. Berta and Miss Tesman are introduced as they wander around early in the morning, anxious about Hedda awaking and her being displeased. In the text, Berta states that she's "so afraid [she] won't satisfy the new mistress" and that she is "so particular about things" that she wants done (1483). The way the actress plays the role demonstrates her worry that she will not be able to please such a high-class figure and will result in her dismissal. We even see Miss Tesman adding on to the anxiety, reminding Berta that George should not be called Mister Tesman, but Doctor Tesman instead. It is obvious that just from her presence inside the house, everyone should be on high alert to please the daughter of a general. Miss Tesman even purchased a new hat so she can resemble a more sophisticated image for herself. We see these signs of anxiety by Miss Tesman and Berta by their rushing around the house, opening blinds, adding wood to the fire place, and cleaning rigorously. As Hedda's power is presented in the beginning of the first scene of the first act solely from set design and secondary characters' actions, her hidden actions later in the play helps strengthen her desire to have power over characters and the ultimate authority. Its only once she makes an actual appearance do we see why anxieties are so high as she disapproves of everything that has been done, as well as Miss Tesman's hat.

In the beginning of the second act, the text describes the room as being almost the same, but now with a writing table in the place of her piano, which was moved slightly, again hinting at the way she controls the

setting. This time Hedda is the opening character and she is loading her pistol instead of resting, physically demonstrating the power she keeps by symbolism to her guns. Judge Brack, below the window of the garden, is about to enter the house. This scene helps show the importance of power to Hedda, but also her reasons behind the way she acts. The loading of the pistol is a very significant moment to help demonstrate her power, but also her blandness with the life she is now living. Once Judge Brack sees she has the pistol pointed at him, it is clear we see who is in control of the situation, even if it is a friendly visit. Hedda responds to his pleas as "[t]hats what you get for coming up the back way," and shoots the gun and misses him (1501). Hedda has a history with threatening people with weapons and even resorts to taking her own life because of failure to control over herself and the helplessness she endures at the end of the final fourth act. She also presses the idea of suicide on Lovborg, and once he commits the deed, she defends his decision by saying "Eilert Lovborg has come to terms with himself. He's had the courage to do what had to be done" (1533). This line is very critical, as it shows her true philosophy of life and the escaping power she endures as Judge Brack reveals that the gun used is indeed from Hedda's collection. Instead of losing respect for herself and submitting to the idea that Brack now has some power over her, she chooses to end her own life instead of living one that is controlled by others.

With this conclusion to the play, it is not to go unnoticed that power has escaped Hedda, but rather that other characters are starting to have power themselves. Hedda's selfishness to be in charge eventually turns out to be her final downfall. Instead of submitting to the idea that Brack now has some power over her and her husband will be honoring Lovborg by completing his book, pushing her to the side, she ultimately has nothing to live for. She takes the last bit of power she has and uses it to turn her pistol to herself, marking the end for Hedda Gabler.

a sea-voyage to multiple islands, often beyond the human inhabited world (MacKillop). Most thoroughly explained by Lawyer, the immrama are:

[a] well established [genre]...its seafaring hero sails into the unknown west, drawn by the universal human longing for a perfect land of eternal youth, beauty, and happiness, the Island of the Blessed. His journey is hard and the outcome uncertain, but he encounters beautiful islands, wondrous animals, and supernatural personages to help him on his way. The common impulse behind these tales is the deeply human desire to attain some intangible ideal of perfection, the obverse of the all-too-familiar miseries of mortal life (1).

C.S. Lewis' Celtic Influence: The Voyage of the Dawn Treader as a Modern Immram

Morgan Caudill

Frequently associated with elements of Christianity and strong Biblical symbolism, C.S. Lewis' *The Chronicles of Narnia* are often interpreted as representing a primarily Christian-English version of religion. Many readers view Aslan as a Christ figure who serves as a guardian and savior to the fantasy world of Narnia. In the third book of the series, *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader*, Aslan serves as a protector to Edmund, Lucy, and Eustace. He often guides them when they stray from the path of righteousness or, in the case of Eustace, giving them an entirely new meaning to life. There's no doubt that *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader* reflects many of these Christian elements associated with the Chronicles. However, *Dawn Treader* in particular exhibits many elements that point to another, non-English influence. Elements such as a sea-voyage, visits to otherworldly islands, a cyclical narrative structure, and a number of recurring motifs common in the early medieval Irish genre known as the immrama point to a strong Celtic influence. Lewis' *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader* exhibits both structural and metaphorical characteristics reflective of early Irish immrama, revealing the Celtic influence on his writing.

For the Celtic, the immrama were a way to mix elements of Irish mythology with the Christianity of the time. Many immrama reflect a blend of pagan and Christian ideas (Huttar 14). The genre itself refers to

These journeys, as noted by Lawyer, are driven by a spiritual desire, making the journeys both physical and spiritual in nature. Since these tales do not revolve around the conflict of good and evil (though evil is present) the central conflict is a conflict within (McColman xvii-ix).

Medieval immrama feature a particularly cyclical narrative structure that is also found in *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader*. The typical elements include: a story beginning and ending in the mundane world, exile either as the result of a crime or from a desire to become closer to God, voyage by sea to various islands, a move from transgression to repentance, and reconciliation with God (Swank 3). As for *Dawn Treader*, the story both begins and ends in "the back bedroom in Aunt Alberta's home at Cambridge" (Lewis 270). Eustace, Edmund, and Lucy are pulled into the painting during the "crime" of verbally fighting and into the world of Narnia, away from the mundane world in Aunt Alberta's home. According to Clancy, "[in] Irish law, punishment for certain crimes included not only exile but the casting adrift of a criminal at sea" (200). While a disagreement among children would certainly not be among these crimes punishable by exile, the idea that the sea serves as "a purgative force" and "a place of repentance" comes across initially in the exile of Lucy, Edmund, and Eustace and continues throughout the tale (Clancy 194). However, Lucy and Edmund are delighted to be back in Narnia, suggesting that the journey does not serve as one of punishment but as one out of desire for personal growth. On their voyage, they visit seven different otherworldly islands and along the way each of the children (Eustace most noticeably) are moved from an act of transgression to repentance and a desire for salvation that ultimately leads them to a strengthened spiritual relationship with Aslan (who is representative of Christ). These spiritual challenges are ones which many face. As described by Lawyer, "on the Lone Islands Caspian finds a regime based on betrayal and connivance with slavery...Caspian and Edmund learn the perils of

greed on Deathwater Island... On Dufflepod Island Lucy wages a losing struggle with vanity in the Magician's study" (332). While mixed with a fantastic journey, these challenges are a part of reality for many indicating that this journey, while fiction, is filled with many truths and elements of reality.

Two notable immrama, *The Voyage of Mael Duin's Curragh* and *Navigatio Sancti Brendani Abbatis* contain a vast number of similarities to Lewis' *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader*. Lewis was particularly influenced by the *Navigatio* (also known as *The Voyage of St. Brendan*). Scholars have noted these Celtic influences in Lewis' work. Hutter and Lawyer both write of similarities between Dawn Treader and the Irish immrama. Lawyer notes that Lewis was Irish and "at home in Irish lore and literature" (33). From a young age Lewis was exposed to Irish myth and folklore, often being told stories by his nanny when he was a child. Downing writes that Lewis' early notes reveal that he "envisioned it as a sea voyage, what he called a "very green and pearly story" (43). He argues that Lewis "drew a great deal on the lesser-known odyssey, the medieval legend of St. Brendan and his voyage to the Land of Promise" (43). In fact, Lewis' notes show that he envisioned a journey where "various islands of the Odyssey and St. Brendan can be thrown in" (Swank 2). Even the title of Lewis' work is reflective of the medieval immrama, emphasizing the sea-voyage. *The Navigatio Sancti Brendani Abbatis* is a widely read medieval voyage tale, dated to around A.D. 800 (Lawyer 320). The narrative centers on the historical St. Brendan of Clonfert. While a historical figure, the story of St. Brendan's life gained a number of additional fantastical elements over time. *Mael Duin* was shown to be the immediate source of *St. Brendan* thus tying the three tales together (Dillon 124).

The concept of the "otherworld," as represented in *Voyage of The Dawn Treader's* magical islands, comes from Celtic mythology. The otherworld could exist in a variety of places: parallel or underneath the physical world, or in the case of the immrama, beyond the ocean (McColman xv). A significant element of the immrama is the journey to various otherworldly islands or islands beyond the world of human inhabitation. Patch describes that this voyage to many islands is often "narrated by a survivor in such a way as to emphasize the element of the marvelous" (29). In total, Mael Duin visits thirty-one islands, Brendan twelve, and the Dawn Treader seven (this is excluding the Lone Islands, which are very much inhabited by humans and prior to the storm that plagues the Dawn Treader). While the numbers of the islands vary, the islands themselves exhibit a large number of similarities.

Various episodes in *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader* appear to have been influenced by those of these early medieval tales. In *Mael Duin*, the voyagers come upon an island with a small palace. Within the palace is a wealth of

treasure guarded by a cat. Three of the men that accompany Mael Duin are his foster brothers. The first foster brother takes a gold bracelet from this pile of treasure. The cat "[springs] on him like a blazing, fiery arrow" and "[reduces] it in a moment to a heap of ashes" (Joyce Ch. XII). This episode possesses similarities to Eustace and the dragon's lair where Eustace also steals a golden bracelet. Instead of being reduced into a heap of ashes, however, Eustace is turned into a dragon. While Eustace's fate is not nearly as dire as the fate of Mael Duin's foster brother, their motives are the same: greed. Eustace thinks to himself, "They don't have any tax here... and you don't have to give stuff to the government. With some of this stuff I could have quite a decent time here" (Lewis 93). Both Eustace and Mael Duin's companion are tested and tempted by treasures and both fail.

However, Eustace's greed does not damn him like it does Mael Duin's foster brother. It instead leads him down the path of salvation. A similar episode occurs in the *Navigatio*. While Brendan sleeps, one of his men steals a silver bridle from a dining hall in which the men have eaten. The next day the man confesses, throwing himself at Brendan's feet while he cries, "O father, I am guilty; forgive me, and pray that my soul may not be lost" (O'Donoghue Ch. VII). A devil is expelled from the man and he dies while his soul ascends to heaven. Like Eustace and Mael Duin's brother, Brendan's companion was tempted by and gave into greed. However, while Mael Duin's brother appears to have been offered no chance for salvation, both Brendan's tale and Eustace's tale provide hope for the wicked. In the *Navigatio* a soul ascends into heaven while in *Dawn Treader* Eustace is transformed into a "different boy" through physical and spiritual transformation.

Another motif that Lewis takes from the immrama is the holy hermit. In *Mael Duin* the voyagers encounter a man "so very old... that he was covered all over with long, white hair... and never ceased praying" (Joyce Ch. XXXIII). The hermit tells them his story and the men discover that the hermit used to be a cook for a monastery but he was wicked, selling part of the food to buy things for himself and making secret passages into the church to steal valuable items. A figure appears to him and demands he throw his treasures into the sea but the hermit refuses. He is then fated to pay penance for his sins, living on a rock and surviving on small portions of food for many years. After telling his story he foresees that the voyagers are to return safely home and that they will find the man that kills Mael Duin's father but instructs they are not to kill him "as God has delivered [them] from many dangers" (Joyce Ch. XXXIII). The holy hermit is not unique to the tale of *Mael Duin*. Brendan also comes upon the island of a hermit named Paul the Spiritual. Like the hermit in *Mael Duin*, he is "covered all over from head to foot with the hair of his body" (O'Donoghue Ch. XXVI).

For sixty years the hermit has lived on the island, also described as a rock, on small portions of food. Paul greets each man by name, demonstrating his prophetic spirit. After telling the men the story of how he came to the rock, he too foresees the remainder of their journey and gives his blessing, telling them, “Proceed now on your voyage...you shall proceed to that land you seek, the most holy of all lands...after which [God] will guide you safely back to the land of your birth” (O’Donoghue Ch. XXVI). Both men demonstrate an adherence to God’s will, whether it be by choice, and a prophetic spirit that allows the protagonists of their respective tales to near the end of their journey.

The travelers among the Dawn Treader encounter a holy hermit very similar to the hermits of the *Navigatio* and *Mael Duin*. Like the other two, “[h] is silver beard came down to his bare feet in front and his silver hair hung down to his heels behind” (Lewis 221). Again, he relays information to them, telling Caspian that in order to break the enchantment of the sleeping lords they must “sail to the World’s End...and must come back having left at least one of your company behind” (Lewis 225). Like the hermit from *Mael Duin*, it appears this hermit (Ramandu) has committed an act of sin. However, it is not made known what he has done for “it is not for you...to know what faults a star can commit” (Lewis 227). In each of these tales, the holy hermit serves as a prophet towards the end of the journey. His hair long, signifying his age and wisdom, and his holiness serve to cement the value of his prophecy indicating that the men are close to the end of both their physical journey as well as their spiritual journey and that God will continue to guide them.

An encounter with a sea-monster is another common motif found among these three tales. Brendan and his crew encounter a “fish of enormous size...swimming after the boat, spouting foam from its nostrils, and ploughing through the waves in rapid pursuit to devour them” (O’Donoghue Ch. XVI). Brendan prays for God to help them and a monster appears and kills the massive fish. Mael Duin encounters two monsters: a great fish that his men mistake for an island and later another monster upon their arrival to an undersea country. The Dawn Treader also encounters its own sea-monster. An “appalling head [rears] itself out of the sea” that belongs to what they realize is a great sea serpent (Lewis 123). As the serpent attacks them, the entire crew attempts to fight it off, eventually succeeding. According to Lawyer, “in medieval bestiaries the whale mistaken for an island is usually equated with the devil, who lures the unwary from the safety of their ship, the church” (325). Here, only one monster is mistaken for an island. However, in all three tales the monsters present a large physical threat to the ships and the crew on them, threatening their safety and the continuance of their journeys.

While many of the islands encountered provide fantastic sights and sustenance for the travelers, the voyages of Brendan, Mael Duin, and the Dawn Treader are not without sorrow and despair. Describing an incident on Brendan’s ship, Lawyer writes:

...before reaching the Promised Land of the Saints the voyagers must also look into hell. Sailing north twice the usual forty days they come upon a noxious volcanic outgroup. Brendan tries to avoid contact, but the devils on the shore hurl flaming stones at his coracle. The noise and stench are terrible, even from a distance. They escape safely, but at a neighboring island, also volcanic, one of the monks is dragged away by demons and lost forever (326).

Similarly, Mael Duin comes upon an island of despair. The inhabitants wear all back and wail unceasingly. His second foster brother is sent to investigate but once he steps foot upon the island “he also [grows] sorrowful, and [falls] to weeping and wringing his hands, with the others” (Joyce XVI). *The Dawn Treader* comes upon an island of darkness and overwhelming despair where they hear a cry of “some inhuman voice or else a voice of one in such extremity of terror that he had almost lost his humanity” (Lewis 195). They soon discover that this is “the Island where Dreams come true” (Lewis 197). However, this is an island of nightmares rather than daydreams. The ship seems to have come too close to the island and is unable to make progress sailing until Lucy whispers a prayer to Aslan, begging for his help. No sooner does Lucy finish her prayer than a speck of light appears, indicating a path of escape. In each journey, the ship encounters these dark and hellish islands closer to the end of their journey rather than the beginning. The darkness and despair of these islands thus directly contrasts with the light and hopefulness that each group finds at the end of their journey.

Finally, the ending of the journeys of these immrama also have similarities. Shortly before reaching the holy realm, the voyagers come upon crystal clear waters. Mael Duin’s voyage describes:

...after a time, they came to a sea like green crystal. It was so calm and transparent that they could see the sand at the bottom quite clearly, sparkling in the sunlight. And in this sea they saw neither monsters, nor ugly animals, nor rough rocks; nothing but the clear water and the sunshine and the bright sand. For a whole day they sailed over it, admiring its splendor and beauty (Joyce Ch. XXII).

Similarly, in *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader*:

[Lucy] realized that the great silvery expanse which she had been seeing...for some time was really the sand on the sea-bed and that all sorts of darker and brighter were not lights and shadows on the surface but real things on the bottom...But now that she knew it was on the bottom she saw it much better (Lewis 239).

This change of environment indicates that the ship has passed into the territory of the holy realm. In both *Mael Duin* and *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader* the ship is nearing the end of its voyage. In *Dawn Treader* this is accompanied by a physical change where those on the boat who drink this crystal clear water feel themselves more alert, less hungry, and are able to see more light. In this beautiful and holy realm, God provides for them at the end of their long journey.

In all of the immrama, the voyage ends in a somewhat unexpected manner. Lucy, Edmund, and Eustace speak with Aslan where Lucy and Edmund discover that they will never return to Narnia and must find Aslan in their own world. Mael Duin discovers that he will encounter the man who killed his father (the initial purpose for his voyage) but is instructed not to kill him. Brendan finds that he cannot cross over the river into the island because “Christ our Lord wished, first to display to you His divers [sic] mysteries in this immense ocean” (O’Donoghue XXVIII). In each tale, the protagonists are met with unexpected and even arguably disappointing results. However, while the end of each of their journeys may not be what they expect, they come to a spiritual realization and growth. Lucy and Edmund discover that they are old enough now to find Aslan in their world rather than in the world of Narnia, Mael Duin discovers that vengeance is not the right path against those who have wronged him, and Brendan discovers the importance of his journey by the guidance of God rather than the importance of the destination.

The influence of the immrama on Lewis’ writing are apparent in these vast similarities, however, one key difference is often questioned. Why is Lewis’ Otherworld located in the east rather than the west like in the Irish immrama? Huttar even refers to *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader* as “Lewis’s immram – a journey to the utter East, not west” (15). According to Patch, “The Other World of the Celts was in any case located on this earth, often in the west” (27). This is because the west is “often perceived as the place of the dead in mythology” (Matthews 14). Huttar provides two potential explanations for this difference. The first is that Lewis’ real life may have influenced the directions. Lawyer writes:

One guess might be that all through boyhood in the environs of Belfast, the sea was in the direction of the rising, not the setting sun, and this became so fixed in his imagination that when he first devised the geography of Narnia he give it that orientation, by the time the Dawn Treader set sail, it was too late to change. (22)

In this first explanation, Lewis was so accustomed to the sea being in the direction of the sun rising that he did not consider it a possibility that it could be in the opposite direction in Narnia. Since *Dawn Treader* is not the first book in the Chronicles, it was impossible for Lewis to change once he decided to write a tale influenced by Irish folklore.

The second explanation for this key difference is one that is less accidental and more intentional on Lewis’ part. This explanation concludes that “perhaps the imagery of ‘utter East’ is best after all” since the sunset and evening star are located to the west and “speak of death” but the sunrise which is located to the east provokes “images the resurrection” (Huttar 24). This explanation concludes that, since Aslan is representative of Jesus Christ, it is natural and fitting for the Otherworld to be located in the direction of the east, associated with resurrection and new life. While there is no way to know the true explanation for Lewis’ Otherworld to be located to the east while the Otherworld of the immrama is located in the west, it is important to note that Lewis’ work, while heavily influenced by Celtic mythology, does not incorporate all aspects and details of the medieval immrama. Lewis’ modern immrama still takes its own creative liberties and mixes tradition with ideas of his own.

Influenced by medieval Irish immrama such as *The Voyage of Mael Duin’s Curragh* and *Navigatio Sancti Brendani Abbatis*, C. S. Lewis’ *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader* reflects several elements of this genre. A cyclical narrative structure that begins in the mundane world and ends with a reconciliation with God; recurring motifs such as the holy hermit, various otherworldly islands, and encounters with sea monsters further point to this Celtic influence in Lewis’ writing. These journeys mix Christian and pagan elements which further show that while Lewis’ journey is often seen as very Christian in nature its Celtic influence is still present. This sea-journey tells not only of a fantastic story, but a story of spiritual growth in which the sea serves as a “purgative force” where the characters eventually come to terms with their wrongs and their deep need for God and the salvation that he provides. Despite a major directional difference, Lewis’ work appears to be directly influenced by the ancient immrama as shown by his past and upbringing, as well as the evidence provided that displays these similarities.

Works Cited

- Bray, Dorothy Ann. "Allegory in the Navigatio Sancti Brendani." *The Otherworld Voyage in Early Irish Literature: An Anthology of Criticism*, edited by Jonathan M. Wooding, Four Courts Press, 2000, pp. 175-86.
- Clancy, Thomas Owen. "Subversion at Sea: Structure, Style and Intent in the Immrama." *The Otherworld Voyage in Early Irish Literature: An Anthology of Criticism*, edited by Jonathan M. Wooding, Four Courts Press, 2000, pp. 194-225.
- Dillon, Myles. *Early Irish Literature*. The University of Chicago Press, 1948.
- Downing, David C. *Into the Wardrobe: C. S. Lewis and the Narnia Chronicles*. John Wiley & Sons, 2008.
- Joyce, P.W., translator (2011). *The Voyage of Maíle Duin*. Project Gutenberg, <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/38041/38041-h/38041-h.htm>. Accessed 13 Nov 2017.
- Huttar, Charles A. "Deep Lies the Sea-Longing': Inkings of Home." *Mythlore*, vol. 26, no. 99/100, 2007, pp. 5-27.
- Lawyer, John E. "Three Celtic Voyages: Brendan, Lewis, and Buechner." *Anglican Theological Review*, vol. 84, no.2, 2002, pp 319-43.
- Lewis, C.S. *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader*. HarperCollins, 1952.
- MacKillop, James. *Myths and Legends of the Celts*. Penguin, 1st edition, 2005. Credo Reference, http://proxy1.nku.edu/login?url=http://search.credoreference.com/content/entry/penguin_mlc/voyages_to_the_beyond/0?institutionId=1873. Accessed 13 Nov 2017.
- Matthews, Caitlin. *The Celtic Book of the Dead: A Guide for your Voyage to the Celtic Otherworld*. St. Martin's Press, 1992.
- McColman, Carl. *The Lion, The Mouse, and the Dawn Treader: Spiritual Lessons from C. S. Lewis's Narnia*. Paraclete Press, 2011.
- O'Donoghue, Denis, translator (1893). *Navigatio Sancti Brendani Abbatis [the Voyage of St. Brendan the Abbot]*Brendaniana, <http://markjberry.blogspot.com/StBrendan.pdf>. Accessed 13 November 2017.
- Patch, Howard Rollin. *The Other World: According to Descriptions in Medieval Literature*. Harvard University Press, 1970. pp 27-59
- Swank, Kris. "Extracts from: *The Voyage of The Dawn Treader & the Voyage of Roverandom*." *Mythmoot III: Ever On: Linthicum, Maryland*, 2015.

Close Reading: Splintering of Identity in Viet Thanh Nguyen's *The Sympathizer*

Rachel Sizemore

The conclusion of Viet Thanh Nguyen's *The Sympathizer* is one that both neatly ties up the rest of the novel while continuing the tone of the novel in which the reader feels the constantly looming danger. It's incredibly effective in this way; while the narrative is being wound down, the reader gets no break from the tension that is rife through the novel. This is integral to the book, as the narrator also gets no break from the tension and danger, in fact, in the conclusion he is faced with his greatest foe yet, both physically and mentally.

Nguyen's novel challenges the idea of identity many times throughout, and the final chapters are incredibly important to furthering this theme. Tortured within an inch of his life, the narrator is forced to not only ask why this is happening to him, but also why this is happening to *him*. The tiny difference between the two phrases is important: the first is the surface reaction, why is this being done to him? why has his brother-in-arms Man seemingly abandoned him and condoned his torture and pain? But the second question is what the conclusion really digs into. Why is this happening to *him*? What has *he* done to deserve this? He was a sympathizer the whole time, but these people don't see this because he was also an enemy to the entire war, except he wasn't *really*. Although he killed their people, it was to help the cause, but can he really be considered a communist? What is the point of his role that he played if not to escape his

torture, and so on and so forth? As someone who has been dancing on the head of a pin throughout the narrative, the idea of identity is already one that is fragile at best for the narrator, and his extreme deprivation of sleep, as well as the other tortures he experiences, forces him to reevaluate every aspect of himself. There are many ways Nguyen portrays this splintering of mentality and the failing idea of identity through many changes that is seen in the narrator during these final chapters, such as sudden change in point of view between interrogation chapters and the literal dual nature of the narrator that emerges once the man is released from the torture.

Throughout a large portion of the novel the narrator is directly addressing a third party, a "dear Commandant" (1), in what appears to be a confession. This is revealed to be the case in the conclusion, as the commandant himself appears to revise the confession and judge its writing quality. Knowing this, the unique writing style and the conversational tone of the novel is justified. There is little to no marked places of dialogue, the passages ramble with the heavy monologues of the narrator, and the narrative pulls little of its proverbial punches of the truth of the situation, as it is the narrator speaking directly to or at someone who he is trying to convince of both his slight innocence and his fidelity to the communist party. Just as soon as this trope is illuminated it is also shattered, as the twenty-first chapter switches abruptly to third person, addressing the narrator as "the prisoner" (339). Here you can argue many reasons: perhaps, as the written confession is determined to be finished and no longer required, the book is no longer written in a journal-style, though, of course, this would be challenged by the following chapters that do return to the first person confessional style. However, to address the idea of identity and the massive thematic moments that the conclusion lends to the book, the change could also represent the splintering of the narrator's mind under the unending torture he is enduring. As we approach chapter twenty-one, the narrator has just realized that his best friend and confidant, Man, has a large hand in his torture and will do nothing to cease the pain, and he has also realized that the guards are going to keep him awake until he breaks. Already, the fissures within his mind are beginning to show: after many, many nudges by a guard's boot to ward away sleep, the narrator rambles about how the offending appendage "was judge, guard, and executioner" (328, pledging his allegiance and faith to feet if he could only be released. While this moment is humorous and calls back to times of the novel in which the narrator works in humor to alleviate the mood, there is a distinct feeling of panic and desperateness. To delineate for just a moment, this particular scene is incredibly interesting if considering his ease in denouncing faith to one group of people and clinging to another, in this case the heartless foot. What does this say about the narrator's allegiances to Man, the


communists, or Bon and the General? As the narrator has never before been exposed to the field of combat and the real life danger of torture and capture, would his will have crumbled just as easily if he had been found out by the General? Would he denounce communism and Man in order to escape being prosecuted? Already, he has denounced the General and his army as a bunch of fools, but is this because he is a communist or because he is simply under their supervision? These questions furl into many more regarding identity and more specifically how the narrator sees himself, which is something that, in these last chapters, is in genuine flux.

To actually address the third person point of view in chapter twenty-one, there must be awareness that there is no real understanding available in the novel for how much time might have passed before the narrator broke. It could have been hours, could have been days, could have been much longer if the writer was pushing the limits of biology to get the point of torture across. It doesn't seem to take much in order to break the narrator's idea of identity other than isolating him with his own thoughts, which turn out to haunt him enough to break him before the questioning begins. He is blinded, deafened, and strapped down motionless on a pallet, forced to think and only think for hours on end. Thus, he begins disassociating. He becomes the third party, watching over himself as he is held in a vulnerable state of constant awareness. Then, the person strapped on the pallet and tortured becomes someone *other*. He becomes the "prisoner" (339), the man captured and the man questioned, but not the same man as the narrator, or so he believes. This rift continues as the man, in third person, remembers his childhood with Man and goes through the horrific interrogation with Man and the other commanders, and becomes a "traitor, a counterrevolutionary" (341), someone who no longer remembers his own name. In the following chapter, the separation between body and mind becomes even more pronounced as the narrator begins referring to the torture victim as "you" before he corrects himself to referring to it as his body, he becomes "divided, tormented body below, placid consciousness floating high above" (355).

He becomes as much of a specter, a hallucination, as the crapulent major and Sonny, who have been plaguing him in his sleeplessness as physical embodiments of his guilt and betrayal to the cause. His identity is being ripped from him, quite literally, thrown into the rafters where only the ghosts of his victims are. Below, his body is a corpse not yet dead, and he can no longer see himself within it. No longer belonging to any cause, being tortured by the one he thought would save him and being abandoned by the one he had hid within, the narrator no longer understand where he belongs. The communists have basically rejected him, and therefore he can no longer look at himself as a communist. He is no longer needed for the war. His whole entire mission was for naught. He belongs to no one, and

no one belongs to him. The stripping of the communist label leaves him a man without a cause, as he doesn't believe in the one he had been using as a cover. This leaves him with the barest of his identities, that of the bastard. Not only a bastard, but one of mixed race. Throughout his childhood and his adult life, this has led to him being split into the westernized, English-masquerading man and the Vietnamese one. For all his life the two have been balanced in a tumultuous battle of identity, and has led to a crisis of identity for our narrator on more than one occasion. Following his torture and eventual release, however, his mind has split permanently into a double identity, almost two distinct personalities, which the narrator acknowledges and welcomes.

The narrator believes himself to be a "man of two minds" (376), and from hence forth refers to himself as 'we'. The entire war and everyone in it wanted to "drive [the two minds] apart from each other" (376), to divide the man into just one or the other, however the torture and the revelation of 'nothing' reunited them into one brain. This might be many things; the European half of him and the Vietnamese half, the communist and the enemy, the commander and the civilian. The final line, too, follows this change, a confession, the last confession, of only knowing one thing in particular, that "we will live" (382).

Regardless of identity or lack thereof, the narrator survived his ordeal and continued to throughout the end of the novel, no matter how fragile his mental state. The conclusion was incredibly provoking both emotionally and mentally, and demanded hours of mulling over what identity meant if it meant anything at all and whether it was important for someone to have. While the novel had worked its way to a conclusion such as this with its heavy symbolism and the importance throughout talking about the dual nature of the narrator, the final chapters were ones that leave the reader shaken and surprised by the events. 

Works Cited

Nguyen, Viet Thanh. *The Sympathizer*. Grove Atlantic, 2015.

Classicism Issues in *Jonathan Strange and Mr. Norrell*

Fai Alsayegh

How does social class and discrimination take place in *Jonathan Strange & Mr. Norrell*? This is a significant question because this work normalizes these negative aspects. Discrimination, according to Oxford English Dictionary is to "make an unjust or prejudicial distinction in the treatment of different categories of people." Discrimination is a global issue that makes many people suffer. In this paper, the negative outcome of classism is being analyzed through Susanna Clarke's novel, *Jonathan Strange & Mr. Norrell*.

Classism is a significant word in relation to *Jonathan Strange and Mr. Norrell*. Alexander Colbow explained that classism "is traditionally viewed as negative attitudes and behaviors directed at those who are poor." (Colbow 571-2). People who practice classism tend to do it to protect and maintain their status within their social group by marginalizing those of lower social class. Classism has several types, including internalized classism and downward classism. Colbow defines internalized classism as "feelings of anxiety, depression, anger, and frustration arising from not being able to maintain one's social class standing;" (572) downward classism, moreover, "refers to negative attitudes or behaviors held by people in, or perceived to be in, power or higher social classes that are used to marginalize and discriminate against those in, or perceived to be in, lower social classes" (Colbow 572). Colbow also explained:

Classism is related to other forms of discrimination such as racism and sexism. These relations might be due in part to system justifying beliefs, which function to maintain the status quo, help people make sense of the world, and allow individuals to feel confident in engaging long-term goals.

In the story, among the characters who practice downward classism are Mr. Norrell and Henry Lascelles. Both consider themselves gentlemen, and both treat people unfairly because of the social statuses. Stephen Black, in the other hand, is experiencing internalized classism, as well as John Segundus.

We can see that Mr. Segundus is experiencing internalized classism. It is said in the novel that, “Mr. Segundus did not lack curiosity about Mr. Norrell” (Clarke 46). In Mr. Segundus’s mind, it said “A gentleman in Mr. Norrell’s position with a fine house and a large estate will always be of interest to his neighbors and, unless those neighbors are very stupid, they will always contrive to know a little of what he does” (Clarke 46). Segundus is overwhelmed due to not being in Mr. Norrell’s neighborhood, which is a fine one. We know that it is a fine neighborhood because Mr. Norrell’s fine house is there. The way Norrell is described shows that Segundus is not near it. If he were in that fine neighborhood, he would have had the luck to know what Mr. Norrell is doing in terms of magic; he does not live there, however, and this is why he is overwhelmed. He, moreover, will not be able to be near his house, nor will he be able to know what Mr. Norrell is doing. This is one way in how Segundus is experiencing internalized classism.

Mr. Norrell is using downward classism in the way he treats people. He looks down at people because he is a magician. When Norrell first met Christopher Drawlight, he disliked the idea of meeting with him because he thought that he might have a high social status. But he changed his mind about it, “Mr. Norrell though confident now that his guest was no great magician or great magician’s servant, was still not much inclined to take Childermass’s advice” (Clarke 65). Mr. Norrell was glad that Drawlight did not have a high social status like he does, which is a negative attitude. He wants to have his high position as a magician. In addition, he felt satisfied when Drawlight praised him because it made him feel that he has a high position, which Drawlight did not have. He does not have a high social status because Childermass explained to Mr. Norrell “that [Drawlight] possessed not a single good quality.” (Clarke 64). In this way, Mr. Norrell possessed the quality of downward classist.

One feature of downward classism, which can be found in Mr. Norrell, is his greed. Colbow states that people who are typed as downward classists tend to “hold higher levels of materialistic values.” (Colbow 573). Mr.

Norrell has a high-level greed of materialistic values when it comes to books. He owns his own private library at Hurtfew. We know that he is highly involved with books, as Mr. Thrope says, “We know little about Mr. Norrell – we have all heard of the rare texts he is supposed to have” (Clarke 23). He uses his ownership of books to discriminate against people who would want to read them. After Segundus’s visit to the library, he felt excluded:

Mr. Segundus had handled the thing very ill and upon one subject at least – that of Mr. Norrell’s wonderful library – they did seem remarkably stupid, for they were not able to give intelligible reports of it. What have they seen? Oh, books, many books. A remarkable number of books? Yes, they believed they had though it remarkable at the time. Rare books? Ah probably. Had they been permitted to take them down and look inside them? Oh no! Mr. Norrell had not gone so far as to invite them to do that. (Clarke 25)

Clearly, Mr. Norrell is preventing his guests from reading because he highly values his books. Segundus is upset due to Norrell’s attitude of not inviting him, nor Mr. Honeyfoot to open the books he has. Thus, Norrell is typed as a downward classist because he refused to let his guests read his books in addition to his having many books, which is what is defined by Colbow as materialistic values.

Not only did Norrell discriminate against his guests, but he prevented many people from reading books, “[He] had bought up all the books of magic in the Duke of Roxburghe’s library so that no one would else could read them” (Clarke 883). He is defined as classist due to owning all the books. Books as mentioned are Norrell’s materialistic value. He, moreover, is a classist because he prevents people from reading books of magic just because he thinks that he is the only magician of England, which is considered a high status in his eyes.

Mr. Norrell, additionally, discriminates against Childermass. Childermass works as an assistant to Mr. Norrell, but he is seen as a servant. In the end of the novel, when Mr. Norrell was waiting for Mr. Strange to come to Hanover-Square, he was concerned about Lascelles being late. He said to Childermass, “I place great reliance on Mr. Lascelles. You know I do. He is my only advisor now’ ‘You still have me,’ said Childermass” (Clarke 904). Mr. Norrell did not agree with Childermass. Norrell “blinked his small eyes rapidly. They seemed to be half a sentence away from, *but you are only a servant*. Mr. Norrell said nothing” (Clarke 904). Norrell is discriminating against Childermass because he sees him as a servant only. This is downward classism because Norrell acts in a negative attitude towards Childermass, who, by Norrell, is defined as a low-class person because he is a servant.

In addition to Norrell being a discriminator, Lascelles, too, discriminates against Childermass. Knowing that Lascelles has a message for him and Norrell, Childermass says:

‘I ask you for the last time, Mr. Lascelles,’ said Childermass, ‘Will you give me what is mine?’ ‘How dare you address a gentleman in such a fashion?’ Asked Lascelles. ‘And is it the act of a gentleman to steal from me?’ replied Childermass. Lascelles turned a dead white. ‘Apologize!’ he hissed. ‘Apologize to me or I swear, you whoreson, you dregs of every Yorkshire gutter, I will teach you better manners’ (Clarke 919).

Lascelles is using downward classism as he accused Childermass of being a whoreson. A whoreson is a low-class person, in the way it is said by Lascelles. He thinks of himself highly and would not allow Childermass to accuse him of theft.

Childermass was excluded from his rights because of his low status. When he got accidentally shot by Lady Pole, there were no concerns about his health. Mr. Norrell explained to Childermass that he won’t press charges against her because of his relationship with her husband. It is explained in the novel that

[he] did not trouble ascertain Childermass’s wishes upon this point. Despite the fact that it was Childermass who was lying upon the bed sick with pain and loss of blood, and that Mr. Norrell’s injuries had consisted chiefly of a slight headache and a small cut upon one finger (Clarke 658).

Mr. Norrell did not consider Childermass’s feelings because he is his servant. Nor did he appreciate how Childermass risked his life to save his life. He ignored everything that was done for him. Childermass is experiencing internalized discrimination because he did not do anything to avenge himself against Lady Pole.

Drawlight is a person who discriminates in many ways. There was a scene when Mr. Strange and Mr. Norrell met for the first time. After Mr. and Mrs. Strange left Norrell’s place, Drawlight said

I do not know what may be your opinion, but I never was more astonished in my life! I was informed by several people that he was a handsome man. What could they have meant, do you suppose? With such a nose as he got and that hair. Reddish-brown is such a fickle color – there is no wear in it – I am quite certain I saw some grey in it. And yet he cannot be more than – what? – thirty?

Thirty-two perhaps? She, on the other hand, is quite delightful! So much animation! Those brown curls, so sweetly arranged! But I though it a great pity that she had not taken more trouble to inform herself of the London fashion (Clarke 289).

Drawlight is using two types of discrimination, including age and class. He argues that Strange is in his thirties; he implies that he is too young to be a magician. He also mentioned that Strange has grey hair, which usually seen in older people, to discriminate against him. He, additionally, discriminates against Mrs. Strange in term of class because she is not as fashionable as the people in London. It is implied by him that London itself has a fashion, which Mrs. Strange did not fit into, and by implying that he is discriminating against her because London has a higher status than other places, including the place where she came from.

Clarke’s work also has several misogynistic scenes. Misogyny is “the label for all of the fears, anxieties, stereotypes, and stigmatizing behavior that characterize men’s image of women” (Gilman 406). The York magicians are misogynistic. We can see how misogynistic they are during the day before Mr. Norrell was due to perform his magic to prove that it did not disappeared from England:

[The York society] watched in silence as servants poured their coffee, broke their warm white-bread rolls, fetched the butter. The wife, the sister, the daughter, the daughter-in-law, or the niece who usually performed these little offices was still in bed; and the pleasant female domestic chat, which gentlemen of the York society affected to despise so much (Clarke 30).

It is unclear why the women’s domestic chat is despised by the gentlemen except that it is related to female. Because they dislike the women’s chat, they are considered misogynistic. It has a negative outcome. The narrator says, that their talk “was in truth the sweet and mild refrain in the music of their ordinary lives” (Clarke 30). So it is understood that because of their misogyny, they miss what is considered a sweet talk about the women’s lives.

In England, there were laws that discriminate against women and prevent them from having any wealth, which was depicted in Clarke’s work. In the 19th century, “when a woman got married her wealth was passed to her husband” (Simkin) which is why Mr. Pole wanted to marry Miss Wintertowne. Women in upper and middle classes were supposed to depend on men all the time. This is sexist because these laws have given men privileges in developing themselves financially. Being poor, Sir Walter Pole decided to marry Miss. Wintertowne not because he loves her, but because

of her wealth. This was indicated by Drawlight when he first came to see Mr. Norrell to tell him about Miss Wintertowne's death:

Sir Walter's bride, Miss Wintertowne, is dead. She died this very afternoon. They were to be married in two days' time, but poor thing, she is quite dead. A thousand pounds a year! – Imagine his despair! Had she only contrived to remain alive until the end of the week, what a difference it would have made! His need of money is quite desperate... (Clarke 95).

Drawlight is not sad because a human being died – Drawlight is sad because Mr. Pole did not receive the money he needed to develop himself financially. This tells us that English women in middle and upper classes in that era were seen as financial resources, rather than human beings.

What also proves this point more is Sir Walter's thoughts after she is revived. Being more active than usual, Miss Wintertowne was liked by Sir Walter. In addition, he liked her for being an understanding person to his lifestyle, a businessperson. Sir Walter "had begun to suspect that, setting aside the money, she might suit him very well as a wife." (Clarke 120). This proves that he was going to marry her for financial reasons only, and not because of his knowledge about and care for her personality.

Miss Wintertowne was not the only character who had the experience of being a financial resource, but Mrs. Strange as well, Jonathan Strange's mother. With £900/year, she and her husband got married. With her money, he "repaired his house, improved his lands, and repaid his debts." (Clarke 159). He did benefit from his relationship with her. When his life, moreover, got better and started to make money, he "could no longer be at the trouble of shewing his bride much attention." (Clarke 159); this shows that she was only used as a financial tool, rather than a human being who has feelings and needs. She lived in Shropshire, where she did not know anyone. When she died, moreover, he did not care about her. The only thing he cared about is the inheritance, which is supposed to belong to their son. Mr. Strange, however, "claimed that every penny of his wife's money was his to do with as he liked." (Clarke 160), which shows more that she was a financial tool to him, rather than a wife.

Misogyny was used against Mrs. Brandy. In the novel, it is said, "my readers will smile to themselves and say that women never did understand business" (Clarke 198). Clearly this is wrong, because "Mrs. Brandy understood her business very well" (Clarke 198). This idea of women not understanding business contradicts successful women. There are men who are successful and others who are not successful just like women. Hannah Baker explained that although being a female had a significant impact on

the women's businesses, it did not mean that gender predetermined the nature of this involvement, nor did all women have had the same experience, which proves that being successful in a business is not inclusive to a particular gender. On the contrary, according to Baker, many "women of business were able and willing to assert themselves" for their own advantage (134). So, whether it is agreeable or not, Mrs. Brandy, a female, is a successful businessperson.

Clarke's work has scenes which are defined as sexist. Sir Walter is overwhelmed after getting married:

"[Sir. Walter] would soon discover that married people often quarreled. It was nothing to be ashamed of – even the most devoted couples disagreed sometimes, and when they did it was not uncommon for one partner to pretend an indisposition. Nor was it the lady who did so" (205).

Because it is implied that the women were not the only ones who argue with their husbands, it is understandable that it was stereotypical that women caused problems. We understand, stereotypically, that men were the calm peaceful ones. Otherwise, why would it be implied? It is implied because during this era, the British society valued gender roles highly. Sara Delamont and others explained that during this period, "the educational pioneers created two new female roles, the celibate career woman and the wife who was an intellectual partner to her husband" (184). It's no wonder, thus, that women were stereotyped. They have to act in an ideal way to please their husbands. But husbands do not have to be ideal men to their wives, which is sexist. Because of the way women were sexualized, Sir Walter is overwhelmed by how disagreeable he is with his wife.

Mr. Norrell is a misogynistic person. It is not because he cared about Lady Pole that he revived her, he revived her so he can gain success and make Sir Pole his ally. After discovering that the gentleman with the thistledown hair have cheated him, Norrell argued with him:

I do not care one way or the other. What is the fate of one young woman compared to the success of English magic? No, it is her husband that concerns me – the man for whom I did all this! He is brought quite low by your treachery. Supposing he should not recover! Supposing he were to resign from Government! I might never find another ally so willing to help me. I shall certainly never again have a Minister so much in my debt! (Clarke 212).

This shows how careless he is about Lady Pole's life, a woman. The only thing he cares about is his relationship with Sir Walter, the man who works in the government and can help him become the successful magician of England. Confessing for being careless when it comes to Lady Pole's life makes him a misogynistic person.

The narrator is frequently being misogynistic. The misogynistic scene occurred in the Shadow House as Mr. Honeyfoot and Mr. Segundus were wandering in it. The narrator said that "No great events in English magical history took place there; furthermore, of the two magicians who lived in the house, one was a charlatan and the other was a woman – neither attribute likely to recommend its possessor to the gentleman-magicians and gentleman-historian of recent years" (Clarke 266). The narrator here is sexist. We are told that to be a great English magician is to be a man. A woman cannot be a great English magician. This is sexist because women are deprived from the magic practice just because of their sex.

Colbow explained that racism is a form of classism. Özlem Senson and others explained that "*Racism* is a form of oppression in which one racial group dominates over the other" (123). We can see how racism takes place when it comes to Stephen Black. He is an African butler whose family were taken by the colonies. He worked for Sir Walter Pole. Racist people contradict Stephen Black frequently throughout the book just because of the color of his skin. In the 19th century, according to Clarke's work, "Of course in many households there is a servant who by virtue of his exceptional intelligence and abilities is given authority beyond what is customary. But in Stephen's case it was all the most extraordinary since Stephen is a negro" (Clarke 174). Seeing through this quote, we understand that many of the Africans are not given the chance such as the one given to Stephen as a house servant just because of their race.

Servants of Sir Walter were racist when interacting with Stephen Black. They disliked being under his service just because of the color of his skin. "[they] were surprised to find they were put under a black man – a sort of a person that many of them had never even seen before." (Clarke 175) Because of his color the disadvantage here is occurring by the way he is treated by the other servants. When he gives orders to the servants, "they would return him a very rude answer" (Clarke 175). It is then understandable that racism causes hate and harm between people. It causes hate even though the skin color is beyond the human's own control.

Another racist scene occurred when Stephen Black left Lady Pole in Segundus's care so that she can be treated for her madness, which caused her to nearly kill Mr. Norrell. Stephen was attacked by a man with a carriage:

Just as Stephen was passing the entrance to the house, a carriage came suddenly out of the sweep and very nearly collided with him. The coachman looked round to see what had caused his horse to shy and forced him to rein them in. Seeing nothing but a black man, he lashed out at him with his whip. The blow missed Stephen but struck [his horse] just above the right eye (Clarke 670).

It is clear here that the man is racist. He just saw a man with a different color than him, which caused the attack. It is a disadvantage for Stephen to be a black man. He would not have been attacked if he were a white person.

In addition to this racist incident, Stephen was contradicted due to his race because his horse looked too fancy to be owned by him. After the horse was injured, Stephen did not have the heart to kill it. A cart carrier passed by and killed Stephen's horse, Firenze, for him. Feeling sad, the cart carrier said, "She's a valuable beast – dead or alive. Your master won't be pleased when he finds soom other fella has got t'horse and t'money" (Clarke 672). And Stephen confessed, "She was mine" (Clarke 672). By saying that, he denies the idea of having a master. He owned a fancy horse just like the dominant group. This shows that the cart carrier was a racist because he swiftly thought that Stephen had a master.

In conclusion, discrimination's outcomes have been analyzed. We saw how Segundus experienced internalized classism because he cannot even be close to Mr. Norrell. We saw how unprivileged people are, the ones who want to read, when it comes to Mr. Norrell. Mr. Norrell uses downward classism against people when it comes to the book he owns. In addition, he discriminates against Childermass for being a servant. Lascelles also treats Childermass in a negative attitude because as a gentleman he refused to be accused of theft. Drawlight has a negative attitude towards Mr. Strange and his wife which makes him a discriminator. We also saw how Clarke's book has many misogynistic aspects. It discriminates against women chattering. It excludes women from being successful business persons. Lady Pole and Mrs. Strange, Jonathan Strange's mother, were used as financial resources to their husbands. Finally, we know Stephen have had many experiences in which he was contradicted by the dominant group just because of his race. It was thought that Stephen had a master before the cart carrier realized that the fancy horse was owned by him. Servants disliked him just because he was dark colored, and he almost got injured by the man who almost collided with him.

Works Cited

- Barker, Hannah. *The business of women: female enterprise and urban development in Northern England, 1760 - 1830*. Oxford University Press, 2011.
- “English Dictionary, Thesaurus, & grammar help | Oxford Dictionaries.” *Oxford Dictionaries* | English, Oxford Dictionaries.
- Clarke, Susanna. *Jonathan Strange & Mr. Norrell*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2004.
- Colbow, Alexander J., et al. “Development of the Classism Attitudinal Profile (CAP.” *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, vol. 63, no. 5, Oct. 2016, pp. 571-585.
- Delamont, Sara, and Lorna Duffin. *The Nineteenth-Century Woman: Her Cultural and Physical World*. Croom Helm, 1978.
- Gilman, S. L. “*Misogyny: The Male Malady (review)*.” *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, vol. 76 no. 2, 2002, pp. 406-407. Project MUSE.
- Sensoy, Özlem and Robin J. DiAngelo. *Is Everyone Really Equal?: an Introduction to Key Concepts in Social Justice Education*. Teachers College Press, 2017.
- Simkin, John. “Marriage in the 19th Century.” *Spartacus Educational*, Spartacus Educational, Sept. 1997.