

Calliope



California State University, Bakersfield
Department of English

Number 11—Spring 2014

California State University, Bakersfield
Department of English

Calliope

Glenda Hudson, Editor

Andy Troup, Chair
Department of English

Printed by CSUB Print Shop

Number 11

Spring 2014

Contents

Number 11—Spring 2014

Writer's Guidelines and Submissions	1
Introduction	2
Caitlin Stone Archetypal Duplicity in <i>Sir Gawain and the Green Knight</i>	3
Megan Manning Interpreting <i>Pride and Prejudice</i> : Austen's Exploration of Tradition vs. Individualism in her Era	11
Kaitlin Leathers The Intended Audience and Reception of Christina Rossetti's <i>Goblin Market</i>	19
Garrett Geisel Spiritual Narcotic: Marx's Assertion of Religion Being an Opiate of the Masses	27
Jocelyn Fechner Love in Dickens' <i>Great Expectations</i> as Understood Through Dostoyevsky's <i>Crime and Punishment</i>	33
Jacob Montecito The Dangerous Poison of Love: Unrequited Love and Violent Responses in <i>Dracula</i> and <i>Frankenstein</i>	39
Denise Hansen Mythological Objectification: Male Ambivalence and Female Power in Salman Rushdie's <i>Midnight's Children</i>	47

Dotty Burns	55
A.S. Byatt's "Body Art": A Protest	
Isaac Sanchez	61
Redefining Arnoldian Theory in McEwan's <i>Saturday</i>	
Elizabeth Herrera	69
The Geopolitical Responsibility of the Postmodern <i>Flaneur</i> in <i>Saturday</i>	

Writer's Guidelines and Submissions

Contributions in all areas of literary criticism are warmly welcomed (essays must have the recommendation of a professor). Submission of a paper to this journal will be taken to imply that it represents original work. Essays should conform to the current MLA citation system. The editor reserves the right to edit submissions as needed for publication. For more information, please contact:

Dr. Glenda Hudson, Editor
Calliope

Department of English
California State University, Bakersfield
Bakersfield, CA 93311
Email: ghudson@csub.edu

Introduction

This volume is the eleventh number of an annual publication entitled *Calliope*. It highlights some of the best works in literary history and criticism by undergraduates and graduates at CSUB.

This issue contains ten outstanding essays covering a wide range of literature from Jane Austen to A.S. Byatt and from Charles Dickens to Salman Rushdie. There are also two essays dealing with Ian McEwan's *Saturday*. The essays deal with poetry and fiction, and represent a diversity of critical approaches.

The cover design incorporates a painting by Edward Burne-Jones entitled "The Beguiling of Merlin" (1874). I would like to thank Kat O'Neill for her editorial assistance with this issue.

Glenda Hudson, Editor

Archetypal Duplicity in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*

Sir Gawain and the Green Knight is a Middle English alliterative-verse poem by an anonymous author that defies categorizing. Part quest, part moralistic tale, and part variation on Old English beheading games, critics have disagreed over the exact nature of its moral message. There is endless debate as to whether Gawain experiences an epiphany or failure at the end and whether Lady Bertilak and Morgan Le Fay are villains or positive agents of change. The Green Knight is the center of much speculation, with comparisons of his character ranging from an archetypal Satan to a type of Christ. Regardless, one of the poem's most crucial themes is that of deception. The Green Knight, Lady Bertilak, Morgan Le Fay and Gawain all play a part in subterfuge and, beyond their literal acts of dishonesty, their archetypal correspondences are in themselves sleights of hand. Gawain is not the perfect hero he seems. His quest ends in a subversion of saving the kingdom, and he actually breaks the chivalric code so relevant to readers of his time. The Green Knight appears to be a trickster but is actually an instructor. Morgan seems incidental to the poem but is its true trickster, and even Lady Bertilak, who appears as a saintly soul mate, proves to be an archetypal temptress. Nonetheless, these characters and their archetypal falsehood serve to drive home the moral point of the poem. Through their deception, the *Gawain*-poet is able to teach two very timeless lessons—that appearances can be misleading, and that even the best knights may break the code of chivalry.

The narrative of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* centers on the deception of its hero, Gawain. When the Green Knight rides into Camelot, he issues a challenge to Arthur's knights to cut off his head, promising that "in a twelvemonth and a day / He shall have of me the same" (97-98). He pledges, in a year's time, to meet whoever chops his head off and return the blow. While there is mythological significance to the year-long cycle of the seasons, this challenge,

most importantly, is the first of many deceptions. Arthur and his court have no reason to suspect that the Green Knight will survive the deadly chop. Aside from his gigantic frame and hue of green in both gear and guise (151), there is no indication that he is capable of living through it. Gawain therefore undertakes the challenge, ignorant of what will befall him, yet when the Green Knight survives the fatal strike, he unflinchingly vows to do his duty. He is resolved to meet the Green Knight "whate'er betide after, / And at this time twelvemonth take from you another [blow] / With what weapon you will, and with no man else" (82-84). Sir Gawain promises to meet the Green Knight, to fulfill his terms fully, no matter what the cost. His selfless declaration clearly sets him up as the archetypal hero of the poem, for he goes off alone, reaches an epiphany after his confrontation with the Green Knight, and then travels back to Camelot. He follows each of the classic phases of Jungian initiation, undertaking "(1) separation, (2) transformation, and (3) return" (Guerin 230). Moreover, he is a noble knight renowned for his character. As Lord Bertilak's men attest, "'great is God's grace, and goodly indeed / That a guest such as Gawain he guides to us here'" ("Sir Gawain" 920-21). Gawain's reputation precedes him so greatly that the men of Hautdesert feel honored simply to be in his presence. Deceit, therefore, seems far from his character. He is the paragon of a perfect knight and well-known for it. His perfection, however, is soon tested by his meeting with the Green Knight.

Gawain's transformation occurs at the Green Chapel, and it is here that the reader learns not only that Gawain has been deceived but that he, in turn, has deceived. The Green Knight turns out to be Lord Bertilak, a man who hosted Gawain at his castle, Hautdesert. His wife has been testing Gawain through attempted seductions, which culminate in the bestowing of her girdle to him, and Gawain, in turn, realizes that the entire scheme was a test. In taking the girdle because the man who wears it cannot be hewn down ("Sir Gawain" 53), he is guilty of deceiving his host. Critic Bonnie Lander explains Gawain's dishonesty brilliantly, for she sees the girdle as "proof not only of his collusion with [Lady Bertilak] but of his betrayal of the homosocial exchange agreement between the men, which dictates that, having accepted the girdle, Gawain should have offered

it to the Lord on his return from the hunt" (52). Gawain purposely withheld what he was obligated to give Bertilak, so he commits a sin of omission. In this sense, he can be seen as failing in the heroic quest, since he does not "overcome insurmountable obstacles...to save the kingdom" (Guerin 230) but instead fails while attempting to save himself. It is arguable that this makes Gawain almost an anti-hero, but perhaps one of the central points of this incident is that Gawain breaks the chivalric code. To the modern reader it may seem an arbitrary infraction, but it is especially crucial for understanding the moral lesson of the tale.

Chivalry was paramount to the readers of the *Gawain*-poet's time. The ability to read was often limited to the highest classes of the Middle Ages, and critic Cindy Vitto asserts that *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, aside from being a poem for adults, is "a work quite possibly written with older children—in particular, male adolescents of noble birth—in mind" (22). Male adolescents of the nobility made up most of the knights of *Sir Gawain's* period, and all of them would have been familiar with chivalric principles. It was the conduct by which noble knights were expected to live, and Barton and Hudson state that "the characteristics of humility and courtesy are often associated with the code of chivalry" (52). Gawain, then, fails to be humble and courteous, breaking two of the central tenets of chivalry. As he says of his own actions against Bertilak; "accursed be a cowardly and covetous heart! / In you is villainy and vice, and virtue laid low!" ("Sir Gawain" 74-75). By taking Lady Bertilak's girdle, he has thought only of saving his own life and not of honoring his agreement with his host. His spotless virtue has been stained, for "a good knight must hold true to his word at all costs, retain his courtesy...without falling into incivility or sin, maintain honorable relations with his host, and show courage even under life-threatening and humiliating circumstances" (Vitto 23). In other words, a true knight must always hold to the tenets of chivalry. Breaking any of them is a grievous failing on the part of any knight, and so Gawain's error would have reminded noble readers of the importance of upholding the chivalric code. At the same time, the poem shows that Gawain's trespass is not dire. As the Green

Knight declares, Gawain took the girdle because “you loved your own life; the less, then, to blame” (“Sir Gawain” 68). The desire for survival is what motivates Gawain. His imperfection is then understandable, and so the lesson that the poem imparts to its audience is that no knight is perfect, but no knight should be expected to be. As a result, the Green Knight’s deceit and Gawain’s eventual dishonesty serve as important avenues of moral instruction.

Deception’s centrality in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* is furthered by the character of the Green Knight, whose identity seems to fit the archetypal trickster to a tee. In most literature, the trickster is a roguish character who brings about trouble and disorder. He often has animalistic or wild qualities and a sense of amorality (Guerin 229). The Green Knight clearly displays these traits. He is a force working against the hero, and his very entrance into Camelot is an intrusion into order, framed in disorder. He “hurtles in at the hall-door” of Camelot, and he is green all over and possesses “a beard big as a bush” (“Sir Gawain” 136-34). There is a wild quality about him, and his very beheading is a trick on King Arthur because, after being beheaded, he is magically able to leave carrying his head with his hand (45). He has the ability to cheat death, and he subjects Gawain to not only the anxiety of facing a future beheading but other trials as well. Despite the strength of his trickster qualities, however, his entire identity is a front. He turns out, in actuality, to be Lord Bertilak, a man who is far from roguish but who is “fair-spoken”, “well-suited” and “a master of men” (847-49). Though at first he seems a force of chaos, there is a calmer, more gentlemanly side to the Green Knight. Because of this, he turns out to be more of a wise old man than a trickster. He is an instructor, and his deception is for the purpose of teaching Gawain “the impossibility of being morally perfect and of escaping mortality” (Vitto 25). The knight’s faulty honesty and love of his life are revealed through the Green Knight’s lessons. He initially seems to be the trickster of the tale, but he is ultimately a wise old man, who “tests the moral qualities of others” and “always appears when the hero is in a hopeless and desperate situation” (Guerin 229, qtd. in Jung, *Archetypes* 217ff.). The Green Knight is, subversively, the one who *puts* Gawain in a hopeless situation, but he is still there

to refine him, as both mentor and tormentor. His very identity proves duplicitous, in both a literal and archetypal sense, but it is for an important purpose.

If the Green Knight is the most deceptive character of the tale, Morgan Le Fay ranks as a close second. Her seeming insignificance in the poem is but one of her many false qualities. Gawain first meets her alongside Lady Bertilak, and the poet describes her as "short and thick of waist / Her buttocks round and wide" ("Sir Gawain" 966-67). An unflattering picture of an old lady, the description of the woman's unsightly appearance seems to mark her as nothing more than a minor character who fails to conform to any archetypal motifs. However, her innocuous nature, like Lord Bertilak's identity, is all subterfuge. The Green Knight reveals to Gawain in the Green Chapel that his power comes through Morgan Le Fay and that "she was with my wife at home, that old withered lady, / Your own aunt is she, Arthur's half-sister" (463-64). The legendary Arthurian sorceress has been behind the entire scheme of testing Gawain. Her appearance as a hag has been a mere disguise, and everything the Green Knight has done was at her behest. Morgan is revealed to be the true rogue of the poem. She is not a villain, but, like all mythological tricksters, "serves a healing function through [their] transformative influence" (Guerin 229). Though her methods are cloaked in ruse, Morgan carries out her schemes for the benefit of Gawain. Archetypal critic Edith Williams elucidates that Morgan's role truly "contains the essential elements of the trickster archetype" for "however malevolent her initial intent may have been, it has an ultimately salutary effect on Gawain because it presses him into the discovery of his own humanity" (39). Morgan's challenge of the Arthurian status quo reveals the impossibility of upholding the chivalric ideal. The moral uptightness of Gawain and, by extension, Camelot, is revealed through her tests. Thus, her seeming lack of archetypal conformity gives way to her true identity as a mythological trickster, and this deception furthers the lesson of the poem.

Lady Bertilak, though seemingly an innocent bystander, is the poem's ultimate moral agent and deceiver. Her role is in the sexual temptation of Sir Gawain, though she initially seems the last sort of lady to entice a young knight.

Indeed, her appearance is one of the ideal courtly lady because she is a woman both fair and excellent beyond all praise ("Sir Gawain" 943-44). Physical loveliness and quality of character appears to classify her as an archetypal "princess or 'beautiful lady'" characteristic of the Jungian soul mate (Guerin 229). She seems equal to Gawain in moral perfection—until her true identity is revealed. In actuality, she proves to be an archetypal terrible mother. Specifically, she functions as a temptress—a mythological femme fatale. Guerin defines the terrible mother as a woman "associated with sensuality, sexual orgies, fear, [and] danger" (228). Lady Bertilak is highly sensual and is the primary source of Gawain's danger. It is no accident that her arrival into the bedchamber to tempt Gawain happens at the same time that Lord Bertilak is stalking deer. Sheeven declares to Gawain that "I shall hem and hold you on either hand, / And keep company awhile with my captive knight" ("Sir Gawain" 224-25). Lady Bertilak is clearly there in an attempt to ensnare him sexually—hardly the portrait of an archetypal soul mate. In addition, she is the one who causes Gawain to deceive her husband by giving him the gift of her girdle. She declares that "for the man that possesses this piece of silk, / ... There is no hand under heaven that could hew him down" (851-53). The girdle is pronounced as an article of invulnerability, and Lady Bertilak presents it exactly when Gawain could use it most. He cannot help but accept it, and this marks his major breach of moral conduct and one of the main issues of the poem. Vitto sees Gawain's flaw as intertwined with the lady's clandestine gift, for "his fault is precisely his fear of mortality, the fear that prompted his acceptance of the green girdle" (25). Forgetting his courtesy and promise to Bertilak, Gawain accepts the girdle. He succumbs to Lady Bertilak's offer, thereby teaching the reader that even the noblest of knights can fail to be chivalrous. She deceives him, as the reader is deceived about her true character.

Despite her conformity to the mythological terrible mother, Lady Bertilak is not a classical temptress. The Green Knight reveals that he was responsible for her seductive behavior by declaring that "the count of your kisses and your conduct too, / And the wooing of my wife—it was all my scheme!" ("Sir Gawain" 360-61). Bertilak is the strategist behind the temptation of Sir Gawain. His wife

is merely a complicit accomplice, yet she inarguably plays a central role in the entire plot of deception as a beautiful lady turned femme fatale. She brings about Gawain's failing—and epiphany—and serves to show how lying, even to save one's life, is still a breach of truth. Consequently, Lady Bertilak serves to tie together all of the poem's archetypes into one. She is instructor, temptress, and trickster who, though seeming to carry the action of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, possesses little free will and almost no power. The reader is deceived about her, as well as Lord Bertilak and Morgan Le Fay. Indeed, it is deceit that proves to be the ultimate game changer for Sir Gawain. Bertilak begrudges him little for failing to uphold the chivalric code. He even invites him back to Hautdesert for festivities following his final test, "but Gawain wants only to leave the place as quickly as he can and never return again, feeling ultimately deceived and shamed by the whole affair" (Paris 146). Gawain learns his lesson, but it comes at a price. He has been deceived and tricked until he, too, deceives, and the revelation of this knot of intrigue changes him forever. As he wears the girdle outwardly, he wears this lesson inwardly, ultimately leaving the company of the Green Knight wiser, sadder, and not the archetypal hero that he seemed.

Works Cited

- Barton, Edwin and Glenda A. Hudson. *A Contemporary Guide to Literary Terms*. Boston, MA: Wadsworth, 2012. 3rd ed. Print.
- Guerin, Wilfred, et al. *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*. New York: Oxford UP, 2011. Print.
- Lander, Bonnie. "The Convention of Innocence and Sir Gawain and the Green Knight's Literary Sophisticates." *Parergon*, 24.1 (2007): 41-66. Web. 11 May 2013.
- Paris, William. "'Heroic Struggle': A Medieval and Modern Dilemma." *Journal of Religion and Health*, 27.2 (1988): 143-153. Web. 20 May 2013.
- "Sir Gawain and the Green Knight." *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight; Patience; and Pearl*. Trans. Marie Borroff. New York: W.W. Norton, 2001. 15-74. Print.
- Vitto, Cindy. "Sir Gawain and the Green Knight as Adolescent Literature: Essential Lessons." *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*, 23.1 (1998): 22-28. Web. 11 May 2013.
- Williams, Edith Whitehurst. "Morgan La Fee as Trickster in 'Sir Gawain and the Green Knight.'" *Folklore*, 96.1 (1985): 38-56. Web. 18 May 2013.

Megan Manning

Interpreting *Pride and Prejudice*:

Austen's Exploration of Tradition vs. Individualism in her Era

"It is a truth, universally acknowledged, that a single man in possession of a good fortune, must be in want of a wife," Jane Austen, *Pride and Prejudice* (3)

From the first line of *Pride and Prejudice* (1813), it is clear that the main theme of the novel is concerned with the acquisition of a good marriage. Jane Austen is a classic English author, whose use of realism and satirical social commentary continues to engage and entertain readers. *Pride and Prejudice* is one of her most influential and well-known novels. Beneath the theme, however, lies a fascinating outlook on late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century English society, particularly the middle-class. The society of this time period was in a state of flux; it was caught in a shift between tradition and individualism. Austen cleverly interweaves the issues and changing opinions on love and marriage occurring during her time with her characters in the novel. The characters embody a certain space on the spectrum between the status quo and independent thinking. Mr. Collins and Charlotte Lucas represent the stereotypical economic and social marriage of convenience. Mr. and Mrs. Bennett depict the harsh realities of a marriage of passion. While Mr. Darcy and Elizabeth, most pointedly, represent the Austen's ideal union of the extreme opposites: Elizabeth is very independent-minded, while Mr. Darcy upholds aristocratic tradition. Austen explores the fall from social grace with the elopement and marriage of Lydia and Mr. Wickham. From an historical perspective, *Pride and Prejudice* is Austen's satirical social commentary on and examination of the different types of marriages common in her time, as well as the changing opinions on love, marriage, and women in society.

The marriage of Mr. Collins and Charlotte Lucas is Austen's representation of the traditional marriage of social and economic convenience;

it also comments on the limitations of marriage as one of the few outlets for women. Charlotte endures the typical scenario of the desperate woman marrying for financial security. In other words, Austen is satirizing the “old-spinster” stereotype. From Austen’s personal letters, it is clear she had an acute awareness of this issue. In a letter to her niece, she wrote that “Single Women have a dreadful propensity for being poor—which is one very strong argument in favour of Matrimony” (Teachman 87). Contemporary authors like Mary Wollstonecraft also wrote on the social limitations of women: “The few trades which are left, are now gradually falling into the hands of the men, and certainly they are not very respectable” (Teachman 95). This issue is common of Austen’s time, and a theme recurring in Austen’s works. In *Sense and Sensibility* and *Persuasion*, we see similar female characters in their upper-twenties who suffer from the demand to get married. Charlotte Lucas, as a twenty-seven year old woman of the gentry class still living with her parents, is considered a burden to her family. This is why she willingly and eagerly accepts Mr. Collins’s proposal, “Without thinking highly either of men or of matrimony, marriage had always been her object, it was the only honourable provision for well-educated young women of small fortune, and however uncertain of giving happiness, must be their pleasantest preservative from want” (Austen 138). Therefore, Charlotte marries for financial security and protection. Ironically, Mr. Collins is just as desperate to marry as Charlotte because it was suggested to him by his patroness, Lady Catherine de Bourgh, who “advise[d] him to marry as soon as he could” (Austen 74). In this couple’s union, Austen is satirizing marriages of social convenience, and specifically how both Charlotte and Mr. Collins are conforming to the demands of society by marrying each other.

Austen explores the negative consequences of unsuitable couples in the marriage of Mr. and Mrs. Bennet, who married because of blinding infatuation. Historian G.E. Mitton observes that “Many and many a man takes a rash step into marriage, solely on the ground of external attraction, to gratify a youthful impulse” (Mitton 136). Mr. Bennet took a similar “rash step” because he had

been "...captivated by youth and beauty and the appearance of good humour... he had married a woman whose weak understanding and illiberal mind, had very early in their marriage put an end to all real affection for her..."(Austen 262). This infatuation with Mrs. Bennet's looks was soon disregarded after the wedding because of their clashing personalities. Mrs. Bennet lost the respect and esteem she deserved as a wife and mother. Instead, "her ignorance and folly had contributed to his amusement." Mr. Bennet never addresses or corrects the behavior of his wife or daughters; instead, he gains entertainment from it throughout the novel. From a historic document, Lady Sarah Pennington's *An Unfortunate Mother's Advice to Her Absent Daughters* (1761), we understand a common contemporary belief was that,

'mutual esteem is as necessary to happiness in the married state, as mutual affection: - without the latter, every day will bring with it some fresh cause of vexation, till repeated quarrels produce a coldness which will settle into an irreconcilable aversion; and you will become, not only each other's torment, but the object of contempt to your family and to your acquaintance' (Teachman 67).

This perfectly describes the marriage of Mr. and Mrs. Bennet. Austen is satirizing this realistic marriage by depicting it as tiresome and poisonous. Without mutual esteem, a marriage is doomed to be miserable for everyone. While the Bennet's provide some comic relief, there are definitely consequences to their actions, particularly with Mr. Bennet. Instead of taking an active position as the head of household, he often retreats to his study. His poor judgment and lack of involvement causes the family a lot of grief. Austen uses the Bennet's marriage and its effects on the family to reflect her negative opinion on marriages based solely on passions. Meanwhile, she portrays marriages based on knowledge and mutual love as far more successful, which is realized in Elizabeth and Mr. Darcy's relationship.

Austen incorporates the shift in English ideology concerning marriage in the union of Mr. Darcy and Elizabeth Bennet, who also represent Austen's

ideal marriage of individualism, a sound understanding of life and society, and moral integrity. Mr. Darcy represents the traditional aristocratic class from his demeanor, his wealth, and his family's estate at Pemberley. As critic Maaja Stewart suggests, "The numerous allusions to Darcy's dead father...confirm that Pemberley represents a site where power is transmitted from father to the oldest son" (Stewart 18). Therefore, Darcy is representative of the patriarchal social customs typical of England. Elizabeth, meanwhile, is a member of the middle-class with practically no upper-society connections. She is independent minded, free-spirited, and extremely clever. Her free nature is most clearly realized in the scene at Rosings. There is an obvious dichotomy between tradition and the new attitudes Elizabeth embodies in the dialogue between Elizabeth and Lady Catherine. Lady Catherine, rather offended, claims that Elizabeth gives her "opinion very decidedly for so young a person" (Austen 187). Elizabeth clearly represents the new generation of women who refused to strictly adhere to the social norms which had only entrapped them for decades. Instead, Elizabeth is very intelligent in her understanding of life and her society, and more importantly, she possesses a deep moral integrity. This is evident in her confession that "she had been blind, partial, prejudiced, absurd" (Austen 230). Her acknowledgment and desire to fix this quality show her maturity and moral character. Darcy also undergoes a personal transformation when he acknowledges his pride, and takes steps to alter it. As James Sherry states, "Elizabeth, then, reveals the energy, the impulsiveness, the respect for personal merit which characterizes individualism, while Darcy, with his sense of propriety and his noble family connections, stands for "society" or the established social codes" (Sherry 611).

The marriage of Darcy and Elizabeth represents, to an extent, the changing opinions of marrying for love, instead of economic and social benefits. In Darcy's first proposal it is clear that Elizabeth's rank in society, which is significantly lower than his, is a considerable issue: "Could you expect me to rejoice in the inferiority of your connections? To congratulate myself on the hope of relations, whose condition in life is so decidedly beneath my own?" (Austen 215). This passage signifies the uncommon idea of marrying beneath one's

station. This issue is raised again at the Netherfield ball, where Mr. Darcy asked Elizabeth to dance: "amazed at the dignity to which she was arrived in being allowed to stand opposite to Mr. Darcy, and reading in her neighbours' looks their equal amazement in beholding it" (Austen 102). Their love signifies a new independence from social forces, more specifically, "Darcy and Elizabeth are said to dramatize the persistent conflict between social restraint and the individual will, between tradition and self-expression" (Sherry 609). Instead of marrying for economic or social convenience, like Charlotte and Mr. Collins, they ignore social norms and marry for love.

Austen portrays the social issue of the "fallen" woman in the hasty and scandalous union of Mr. Wickham and Lydia Bennet. Their situation represents one of the most disgraceful circumstances a woman in that time could ever find herself in (Teachman 99). For hundreds of years, the most important rule of conduct for a woman was to protect and preserve her chastity. Chastity was still considered a woman's most prized possession in Austen's time. This issue is addressed by Mary Bennet when she discusses Lydia's elopement: "draw from it this useful lesson; that loss of virtue in a female is irretrievable--that one false step involves her in endless ruin--that her reputation is no less brittle than it is beautiful" (Austen 319). While it is never explicitly stated as to whether or not Lydia did surrender her virginity, it is implied because she was living with Wickham outside of wedlock, which makes her a "fallen" woman (Teachman 99). This situation was common in Austen's era; many women were preyed upon by men who sought their affections without the desire of marrying them. An article from *Gentleman's Magazine* in 1786 elaborates on the subject: "I consider those below me as born to be subservient to me; and I think there is no harm in seducing a girl that is not entitled to expect me for a husband. If she allows liberties in such expectations, she is a fool" (Teachman 100). Lydia's actions were indeed foolish. She not only disgraced herself, but she almost ruined her sisters' chances of a good marriage (Teachman 99).

It is significant that the setting of Lydia's fall from grace is in Brighton.

During Austen's lifetime, Brighton was "one of the favorite playgrounds of the Prince Regent, whose lack of propriety, decorum, and moral behavior was legendary" (Teachman 12). Some of Austen's letters indicate her negative opinion of the Prince Regent and his actions, which also explains why she associated Brighton with immorality (Teachman 13, Lane 201). Therefore, we can assume that Austen is satirizing the moral decline of the leaders and the upper-classes of England, and the poor parenting skills of Mr. Bennet (Teachman 13). Mr. Bennet not only ignorantly allowed his immature and vain daughter to go to Brighton, but he does not take charge of the situation after the elopement. Instead, Mr. Gardiner, Lydia's uncle, finds the couple and convinces Wickham to marry Lydia by offering a large sum of money and the purchase of his commission in the militia. It is through his aid that Lydia, and the whole Bennet family, is saved from social ruin.

Austen addresses the Romantic Movement in the relationship of Jane Bennet and Mr. Bingley. The Romantic period lasted from the end of the eighteenth-century through the nineteenth-century (Murfin 416). One aspect of the Romantic Movement emphasized the idea that "humans are essentially good, namely that people are good by nature" and "that civilization corrupts this essential goodness" (Murfin 417). Both Jane and Mr. Bingley are depicted as kind-hearted individuals, who are naturally attracted to each other. Mr. Bingley is described as having "easy, unaffected manners" (Austen 10). However, both are also rather naïve. Darcy admits in his letter to Elizabeth that "Bingley has great natural modesty, with a stronger dependence on my judgment than on his own" (Austen 221). Bingley is constantly following Darcy's advice, just as Jane is always following Elizabeth's. However, it is Darcy's persuasion which causes Mr. Bingley to abandon Netherfield, and Jane. In terms of Romanticism, Mr. Bingley's amiable and trusting character becomes somewhat corrupted by society, or the social norms. Jane is also somewhat taken advantage of when she naively believed that Caroline Bingley did not interfere on her brother's behalf. When she does acknowledge her betrayal, she forgets it fairly quickly after her engagement to Bingley. Austen is satirizing the Romantic Movement with these

characters because even though they are the second central couple of the novel, their relationship is fairly simple and rather dull. Contrasting them to Elizabeth and Darcy, Austen is suggesting that their compatibility will allow them to enjoy a happy marriage, but their lack of independence and strength of character could be dangerous. As Mr. Bennett says towards the end of the novel, "Your tempers are by no means unlike. You are each of you so complying, that nothing will ever be resolved on; so easy, that every servant will cheat you; and so generous, that you will always exceed your income" (Austen 386). Therefore, Austen is addressing the Romantic Movement by comparing Jane and Bingley, who share a natural and simple love for each other, with her ideal married couple, Elizabeth and Mr. Darcy, whose intelligence and wit will provide a much more stimulating marriage. Austen is not dooming their marriage to failure, but merely encouraging her ideal marriage based on knowledge and individualism.

The first line of the novel suggests the idea that marriage in Austen's time was merely a form of business. By exploring the social issues of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth-centuries, *Pride and Prejudice* provides insight into the changing opinions and practices of the marriage market. Jane Austen brilliantly mirrors the social issues concerning the shift from tradition to individualism in her characters. She uses wit and irony to comment on couples that conform to society's standards, or fulfill a stereotypical marital scenario. Austen encourages her ideal marriage through the union of intelligent, compassionate, and honorable individuals that marry for true and honest love, like Darcy and Elizabeth. As Austen believed, "real love may begin by attraction, but must be built upon knowledge" (Mitton 145). Therefore, Darcy and Elizabeth's long and enduring journey was necessary because they gained valuable lessons about life, themselves, and each other. This beautiful love story continues to provide hope to those who desire a love so true and strong that it can overcome any obstacle.

Works Cited

- Austen, Jane. *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jane Austen: Pride and Prejudice*. Ed. Pat Rogers. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006. Print.
- Lane, Maggie. *Jane Austen's England*. Great Britain: Robert Hale Limited, 1986. Print.
- Mitton, G.E. *Jane Austen and Her Times*. Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat Press, 1970. Print.
- Murfin, Ross, and Supryia M. Ray. *The Bedford Glossary of Critical and Literary Terms*. 2nd ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2003. Print.
- Sherry, James. "Pride and Prejudice: The Limits of Society." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*. 19.4 (1979): Autumn 1979. Print.
- Stewart, Maaja. *Domestic Realities and Imperial Fictions: Jane Austen's Novels in Eighteenth-Century Contexts*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1993. Print.
- Teachman, Debra. *Understanding Pride and Prejudice: A Student Casebook to Issues, Sources, and Historical Documents*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1997. Print.

Kaitlin Leathers

The Intended Audience and Reception of Christina Rossetti's *Goblin Market*

One of her most notable works, Christina Rossetti's *Goblin Market*, composed in 1859, has been analyzed through a great variety of lenses that focus on a broad spectrum of themes and motifs including Rossetti's Catholic beliefs, exchange and capitalism, and gender roles. One of the most blatant and arguably the most fascinating aspect of *Goblin Market* is the one that is often overlooked: its intended audience. There are some critics who would claim that Rossetti's *Goblin Market* is a fairy story of simple moral instruction aimed at a child audience; others still would allege that it is a tale of temptation, sexuality, and religious allegory that is to be received by a more mature, adult audience. A brief exploration of the history of the fairy tale and the Victorian revitalization of myth and folklore may aid in deciphering the confusion regarding the interpretation and reception of Rossetti's *Goblin Market*. However, to fully appreciate this masterpiece, it must be approached for what it is: an ambiguous fairy tale that targets both child and adult audiences simultaneously and whose interpretation relies heavily upon both the accompaniment of illustration and the time period to which the audience belongs.

The Victorian period in England bore witness to a revival of the fairy tale genre that had been absent for centuries. The origins of fairy tales or folktales precede the modern era by a great deal. In an age predating Christianity, there was a time when the fairy folk were very real to the inhabitants of the British Isles. While the modern idea of a fairy is generally a beautiful humanoid creature of slight stature with fine, translucent wings, the term "fairy" may be applied to any magical creature, including pixies, sprites, goblins, gnomes, dwarves, mermaids, and a variety of other mythological creatures. The helpful, attractive fairies of modern children's literature are a relatively new invention, as traditional folklore depict these tiny beings as being rather mischievous and often malicious in temperament. Indeed, much of traditional folklore serves as a warning against the

interaction with fairy-kind. These cautionary tales are in abundance in European folklore, and their outcomes are generally tragic or even fatal. Katherine Briggs notes that “the plot of [*Goblin Market*] is a variant of three main fairy themes: the danger of peeping at fairies, the taboo against eating fairy food, and the rescue from Fairyland” (Watson 69). The original title intended for Rossetti’s *Goblin Market* was actually *A Peep at the Fairies*, a title and concept that renews “the real folk fear of the fairies as tempters with poisonous gifts to offer” (Briggs 208).

To the Victorians, fairy lore provided a sense of nostalgia, a longing for an age long passed in which the stuff of myth was alive and well. As the fairy folk are not subject to the ravages of time, they convey a sense of agelessness, a permanent state of childhood innocence and sensibility. Because of this, fairy tales stood as a symbol that represented the boundary between childhood and adulthood, but these tales also possessed an old-world fancy that was admired by both (Wood 282). Two prominent features of nineteenth-century literature are the great spread of novel reading and the development of books for children (Briggs 202). In her critical essay regarding folklore in nineteenth-century English literature, K. M. Briggs notes that “on the whole the [Victorian] novel tended towards realism, though as the century went on we have an upsurge of fantasy, but in children’s literature fairy-lore and witchcraft were important” (202). Briggs goes on to comment that the fairy tale was implemented as an instrument of moral instruction due to the scantiness of available children’s literature (202). However, it would be incorrect to assume that all fairy tales are then intended for an audience of children. Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm’s *German Popular Stories*, for example, are fairy tales that would be considered by the modern standard as inappropriate for a young audience, as they are more sexualized and violent in nature. Despite this, however, the Grimm tales became appropriate reading for children in Victorian England due to the success of Edgar Taylor’s English translations and, perhaps even more significantly, the accompaniment of illustrations by George Cruikshank which aided in making the tales more accessible to children (Susina 230).

The Grimm fairy tales were published in the early nineteenth century, only

decades prior to the publication of *Goblin Market*. With its sing-song rhyming patterns and fanciful content, Christina Rossetti's *Goblin Market* was met with confusion and was initially treated as a fairy tale for children. In many ways, Rossetti's *Goblin Market* is an innocent fantasy that satisfies the imagination and is very much in accordance with what is generally expected of a fairy tale. The two young sisters featured in the tale, for example, are the pure, beautiful youths that generally suit the role of the fairy tale hero. The elder sister, Laura, is described in terms that exemplify her beauty and purity: "[She] stretched her gleaming neck / Like a rush-imbedded swan, / Like a lily from the beck, / Like a moonlit poplar branch" (Rossetti 1467). Lizzie, too, during her confrontation with the goblin men, is described in terms and phrases that inspire a sense of beautiful piety:

"White and golden Lizzie stood,
Like a lily in the flood, –
.....
Like a beacon left alone
In a hoary roaring sea
.....
White with blossoms honey-sweet
.....
Like a royal virgin town
Topped with gilded dome and spire" (ll. 408-419).

Lizzie's confrontation with the goblin men and her role as savior to her elder sister is quite unextraordinary in the realm of fairy tales, as it is common that the heroes of fairy stories are often the youngest and most innocent (James 339). It is just as common that the villains of these tales are often some sort of wicked monster.

The villains of Rossetti's *Goblin Market* are, as the title of the poem indicates, the fruit-peddling goblins. It is essential to notice that while the sisters are innocent and beautiful, the goblins are described as being rather ugly in appearance and conniving in nature. The presence of the goblins themselves

in *Goblin Market*, as creatures of pre-industrial folklore and myth, is not at all surprising at this point in Victorian literature. Indeed, the presence of monstrous creatures with qualities of both animal and man is a staple of many a folktale and fairy-lore (Talairach-Vielmas 272). In Rossetti's poem, the goblins have a variety of animal features:

“One had a cat’s face,
One whisked a tail,
One tramped at a rat’s pace,
One crawled like a snail,
One like a wombat prowled obtuse and furry,
One like a ratel tumbled hurry skurry.” (ll. 71-76)

While it is known that Rossetti loved the natural world and had a fondness for all sorts of animals, the animal features which she bestowed upon the goblins are from creatures that are not particularly cuddly or admired (Grass 358). In fact, most are weasel-like creatures or rodents who are often viewed as scavengers, pests, and tricksters. In addition, the imagery of a snail rouses a sense of sliminess and thus the goblins are perceived as lowly, wretched beings with sly, underhanded intentions. This notion is further reinforced by the lines:

“When they reached where Laura was
They stood stock still upon the moss,
Leering at each other,
Brother with queer brother,
Signalling each other,
Brother with sly brother.” (ll. 91-96)

The pure heroines and the impure villains of *Goblin Market*, along with themes of good triumphing over evil, coming of age, and, of course, the “happily ever after” ending, make Rossetti's poem an ideal fairy story for children. However, while these elements of an acceptable fairy tale exist in Rossetti's *Goblin Market*, the poem itself is not far from crossing into the bounds of what is considered to be very much adult. From the date of its publication, there has been much speculation as to whether the intended audience of Rossetti's fairy story

was meant to be the adolescent or the mature. A multiplicity of reproductions of Rossetti's *Goblin Market* currently exist that range from quite innocent to perverse and even pornographic in nature. Fascinatingly, much like what had occurred in the Grimm reproductions, it is the accompanying illustrations and not the actual textual content that undergoes alteration. Like the Grimm tales, the core text of Rossetti's *Goblin Market* is generally reprinted in full; instead, it is the accompanying illustrations that determine how the tale is to be interpreted and by whom it is to be read (Kooistra 249).

The original illustrations for *Goblin Market* were drawn by Christina Rossetti's brother, the pre-Raphaelite artist Dante Gabriel Rossetti. These images are not overtly sexual in nature, though both Dante Gabriel and William Michael Rossetti, Christina's brother and editor, did admit to finding "the incidents ... suggestive," and encouraged an interpretation at a deeper level than that of a fairy tale fantasy (Packer 375). One such incident that the Rossetti brothers refer to must undoubtedly be the scene of the poem in which Lizzie is viciously assaulted by the goblin men when she declines to eat of their fruit:

"[They tore] her gown and soiled her stocking,

.....
Held her hands and squeezed their fruits
Against her mouth to make her eat.
[She would] not open lip from lip
Lest they should cram a mouthful in:
But laughed in heart to feel the drip
Of juice that syruiped all her face,
And lodged in dimples of her chin,
And streaked her neck which quaked like curd" (ll. 403, 406-407,

431-436)

Unquestionably, this excerpt may be interpreted as being quite sexual in nature, and it is this scene that is often highlighted in the more modern pornographic versions of the poem. One such illustration depicts small, ugly goblin men thrusting, instead of fruit, a disembodied phallus and breasts at Lizzie. This and

more obscene illustrations by Arthur Rackham were displayed in a 1976 Playboy publication of Rossetti's *Goblin Market*, which was a rendition undoubtedly intended for adult, specifically male, readers.

As society evolves and issues of sexuality become more liberally discussed, the interpretations of works of literature such as *Goblin Market* lose a certain quality of hidden sensuality that it may have at one time possessed. This covert kind of sexuality found in the poem allows for it to be read, and pleurably so, by a wide range of age groups. To go so far as to assert that Rossetti's *Goblin Market* is a text restricted to a solely adult audience is to completely overlook the fairy tale variety of moral instruction which it exudes. To include pornographic imagery with the text only serves to sexualize it and thus remove the ambiguity of the poem which allows for alternate interpretation. The hypersexualization of well-known and very old fairy tales and fables is not an entirely uncommon occurrence in modern literature. In 1979, Angela Carter published a collection of short stories titled *The Bloody Chamber* whose tales find their origins in classic children's stories. These stories are filled with fantasy elements, yet are quite dark and sensual. In the short story titled "The Company of Wolves," Carter retells the tale of Little Red Riding Hood. The intentions of the wolf, who is more of a man than a beast in Carter's retelling, were quite different from those of the wolf in the original tales. Instead of wishing to devour the young girl, the wolf desires to bed her. The heroine, while young and innocent in the original tale, is noted to be sexually mature in Carter's recreation: "Her breasts have just begun to swell ... she has just started her woman's bleeding" (113). "The Company of Wolves" concludes with the young female character instigating sex with the wolf.

While Rossetti does not push the envelope quite as far as Carter, her *Goblin Market* most definitely possesses a repressed sexual quality. Though, when attempting to define an audience, it is certainly difficult to determine to which Rossetti herself meant for *Goblin Market* to be read. Some critics assert that Rossetti herself claimed the poem was a simple child's tale, while others affirm that she had never intended the poem to be read to children in the first

place. It is most likely that the poem was originally taken for a child's tale during its time. Particularly in the Victorian era, it would be only natural to assume that a woman writer, especially one who writes rhyming fairy tales, is writing for children (Kooistra 251). In spite of the multitude of conflicting perspectives, Christina Rossetti's *Goblin Market* is most assuredly meant for dual reading. As Seven Connor asserts in his critical essay regarding the poem, "[*Goblin Market*] addresses its adult audience, as it were, over the shoulders of its child audience, and is then able to compact innocence and awareness, the happy ending with the disturbing inconclusiveness of language as process" (448).

Works Cited

- Briggs, K. M. "Folklore in Nineteenth-Century English Literature." *Folklore* 83.3 (1972): 194-209. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 May 2013.
- Carter, Angela. "The Company of Wolves." *The Bloody Chamber and Other Stories*. New York: Penguin, 1993. 110-18. Print.
- Connor, Steven. "'Speaking Likeness': Language and Repetition in Christina Rossetti's 'Goblin Market'" *Victorian Poetry* 22.4 (1984): 439-48. *JSTOR*. Web. 18 May 2013.
- Grass, Sean C. "Nature's Perilous Variety in Rossetti's 'Goblin Market'" *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 51.3 (1996): 356-76. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 May 2013.
- James, Clarese A. "Folklore and Fairy Tales." *Folklore* 56.4 (1945): 336-41. *JSTOR*. Web. 18 May 2013.
- Rossetti, Christina. "Goblin Market." *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. By Stephen Greenblatt and M. H. Abrams. 8th Ed. Vol. 2. New York: W.W. Norton, 2006. 1466-1478. Print.
- Susina, Jan. "Dealing with Victorian Fairies." *Children's Literature* 28 (2000): 230-37. *Project MUSE*. Web. 18 May 2013.
- Talairach-Vielmas, Laurence. "Beautiful Maidens, Hideous Suitors: Victorian Fairy Tales and the Process of Civilization." *Marvels & Tales* 24.2 (2010): 272-96. *Project MUSE*. Wayne State University Press. Web. 20 May 2013.
- Wood, Juliette. "Filming Fairies: Popular Film, Audience Response and Meaning in Contemporary Fairy Lore." *Folklore* 117.3 (2006): 279-96. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 May 2013.

Garrett Geissel

Spiritual Narcotic: Marx's Assertion of Religion Being an Opiate of the Masses

Religion provides contentment to individuals seeking to find solace from suffering on earth; however, religion can also serve many negative functions and have adverse effects on individuals. In "Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right," Karl Marx, a renowned Prussian-German sociologist and philosopher, opposed religious doctrine by articulating, "[r]eligious suffering is, at one and the same time, the expression of real suffering and a protest against real suffering. . . . It [religion] is the opium of the people" (Marx). Marx's infamous quote challenges religion, and, through his strong lexical choice, he metaphorically equates religion with a sedative drug that paralyzes mental states. While a painkiller only offers transient relief and delays problems until later, medically speaking, religion offers relief in the afterlife for suffering on earth, instead of directly assuaging quandaries present in one's earthly existence. It can be argued that the Bhagavad Gita, the Bible, and the Qur'an all serve as an opiate of the people through the direct texts of these works, as well as the rhetorical techniques implemented.

The Bhagavad Gita, one of India's most influential and sacred texts, serves as a guide to moral and spiritual action; however, there is an ulterior motive present within this religious text that justifies a hierarchal system and subdues the masses from revolting or questioning their role within their caste. Arjuna, a preeminent warrior, questions why he should kill his former mentors and friends, and Krishna, an incarnation of a Hindu deity, replies:

Look to your own duty;
do not tremble before it;
nothing is better for a warrior
than a battle of sacred duty. (Second Teaching 31)

Although Arjuna is dejected about the slaying of his kin, Krishna articulates that

to not fulfill one's duty is to gain evil and therefore shame oneself, and Krishna says that there is nothing worse for a man than being shamed. The overt message that the Bhagavad Gita teaches is to act according to Dharma, or sacred duty, regardless of what your duty commands you to do. The suffering that Arjuna undergoes is ameliorated only by Krishna saying that "bodies are known to end,/ but the embodied self is enduring" (Second Teaching 18). Krishna assures Arjuna that his fulfillment of his Dharma will ensure his goal of Moksha, or release from the cycle of death and rebirth, but this does not provide solace to Arjuna during his life on earth; it rather delays his relief to the afterlife. This concept of justified oppression is explicitly evident in the Bhagavad Gita; however, the Qur'an also provides pertinent passages illustrating oppression justified by religion.

There are also passages within the Qur'an, the sacred text of Islam, that advocate oppression and promote mental paralysis concerning the role of individuals in society. An example of this oppression is seen in Sura 4 of the Qur'an as the text of the Qur'an articulates, "[m]en have authority over women because God has made the one superior to the other... Good women are obedient. They guard their unseen parts because God has guarded them" (4:34). The Qur'an serves an opiate to women because it encourages them to be subservient to their male counterparts and not to subvert a man at any point. This concept explicitly voiced in Sura 4 of the Qur'an is the source of interminable suffering for women, but this suffering again is justified by the religion of Islam. The suffering on earth is necessary to reach the spiritual paradise, and the oppression of women is vindicated by the reward of Heaven. The Qur'an shares a close similarity with the Bible in terms of temporal suffering being resolved in the hereafter.

The concept of suffering on earth to attain elation in heaven is omnipresent in the Bible. The Bible is laden with instances describing the promise that suffering on earth will be alleviated by God in the afterlife. Heaven is symbolic of absolute happiness, and it often serves as solace for those suffering or in distress on earth. This is overtly evident in the sixth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew in the New Testament. An excerpt from this chapter relays:

...Take no thought of your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on...But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you. Take therefore no thought for the morrow: for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. (Matthew 6:25, 6:33, 6:34)

This excerpt from the New Testament affirms Marx's declaration that religion is an opiate because Matthew advocates a paralyzed mental state over self-preservation. This mental state refers to the acceptance of God, as Matthew relays that one does not need to worry about food, drink, or clothing because God will provide all of these things for those who accept him. Judged just on this excerpt, it appears that God will offer this relief in Heaven as the rhetoric again implements the idea of solace in the afterlife without addressing problems in the current life. Although religious groups view blessings from God relating to positivity in life on earth, for the purpose of argument, it is unrealistic to think that God bestows food, drink, and clothing to individuals who accept him and the Christian faith. Another example that strengthens Marx's quote deals with Dante Alighieri's *Inferno* and the Old Testament.

Dante's *Inferno* was indubitably inspired to an extent by the Bible, and it is laden with examples that directly and indirectly relate to religion, as Dante was an orthodox Roman Catholic. An interesting mention of homosexuality exists in *Inferno* that corresponds to problems that modern day America is experiencing. Dante places homosexuals in the third ring of the seventh circle in Hell based solely on their sexual preference. The low placement of homosexuals by Dante partly generates the loathful attitude of how homosexuality is viewed within conservative religious contexts. Although the topic is laboriously debated, the Bible can also be interpreted to condemn homosexuality. The Book of Leviticus in the Old Testament expresses, "[i]f a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them" (Authorized King James Version, Leviticus 20.13). On the topic of Marx's quote, the Bible serves the function of placing

society in a comatose state because it encourages closed mindedness when it comes to sexual orientation, and it paradoxically does not promote acceptance. While not all Christians agree with the condemnation of homosexuality, the direct text of the Bible asserts strong oppression over those with a homosexual preference. The Bible serves as solace for many from suffering; however, in some cases, like homosexuality, the Bible is the source for oppression and suffering.

Karl Marx's powerful quotation criticizes religion for not addressing suffering in life on earth, but he also criticizes religion as being a source of the suffering, which is evident in all three of these religious texts quoted above. However, it is crucial to note that these religious texts are only viewed as oppressive by non-believers because, in the case of the oppression of women in the Qur'an, Islamic believers do not recognize this injustice towards women. It is important to note that religion can also be used very negatively by people who are in power to justify wrong doing, similar to the way Dharma justifies inequality in life in the Bhagavad Gita. Marx accuses religion of promoting an illusory happiness, and he argues that believers do not question their situations or suffering because they believe that it has been administered by a higher power. While Marx's quotation highlights the negativity that accompanies religion, it can also be interpreted as expressing some positivity in religion. While an opiate offers only transient relief, it is still relief that is much needed by those who are suffering, and although Marx voiced explicitly against religion, his quotation contains some ambiguity.

Works Cited

- Marx, Karl. "Marx, A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right 1844". N.p., n.d. Web. 5 Mar. 2013.
- The Bhagavad Gita*. Davis, Paul, Gary Harrison, David M. Johnson, and John F. Crawford. *Compact Bedford Anthology of World Literature: The Ancient, Medieval, and Early Modern World, Beginnings-1650*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2009. 934-940. Print.
- The Holy Bible, King James Version*. New York: Oxford Edition: 1769; *King James Bible Online*, 2008. Web.
- The New Testament. Davis, Paul, Gary Harrison, David M. Johnson, and John F. Crawford. *Compact Bedford Anthology of World Literature: The Ancient, Medieval, and Early Modern World, Beginnings-1650*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2009. 1029-1032. Print.
- The Qur'an. Davis, Paul, Gary Harrison, David M. Johnson, and John F. Crawford. *Compact Bedford Anthology of World Literature: The Ancient, Medieval, and Early Modern World, Beginnings-1650*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2009. 1068-1070. Print.

**Love in Dickens' *Great Expectations* as Understood Through
Dostoyevsky's *Crime and Punishment***

There have been moments in history when the sentiment of an era is so overarching, so representative of the time, that it cannot be contained within the borders of any one nation. The time that, for Britain, was called the Victorian Era was one such epoch. It is true that in this era, from approximately 1837 – 1900, England and her subjects were undergoing tremendous changes, such as the colonization of foreign territories, that promulgated social issues and tensions particular to the nation. However, some of the great questions that arose during this time, an individual's place in society, or new social mobility, for example, were being considered world-wide. The French historian, Alexis de Tocqueville (1805–1859), influenced by industrialism in Britain, developmental prosperity in France, and an extended tour of the nascent United States of America, saw the hollowness of material prosperity in each of these major nations and described “individualism,” a term he coined (Gale). Similarly, Charles Dickens, in his novel, *Great Expectations* (1861), examines the value of an individual's ambition toward self-improvement by juxtaposing Pip against the underworld of criminality. By this contrast, a sincere and hard-working young man manipulated by his mysterious and criminal benefactor, Dickens offers that human worth is not necessarily found in education and elevated social status, but, rather, in the virtue of inner nobility, in loving and in compassion. Interestingly, the Russian novelist, Fyodor Dostoyevsky, in his work, *Crime and Punishment* (1865), deliberates, although from a slightly different direction as Dickens, the same question, with Raskolnikov's purposeful descent into crime and isolation that ends with his regeneration born of love. Regarding *Great Expectations* in tandem with *Crime and Punishment* further illuminates some of the challenges the Victorians faced and clarifies Dickens' response that it is in love that answers to those issues can be found.

Initially, Pip and Raskolnikov, and the environments they live in, may seem worlds apart. Pip, a small orphan child, who living a rural English life under the tight control of his overbearing sister, craves self-improvement. He resents his "thick boots" and "coarse hands" (Dickens 60) and longs to learn to read. Raskolnikov, on the other hand, a grown man living in the large, bustling city of St. Petersburg, deliberately casts off all notions of society, leaves off his education and shuns as much human association as possible. Raskolnikov's degeneration into isolation and crime contrasts starkly with Pip's desire for elevation which is brought on by the heavy guilt from being an accomplice to crime. Simply put, Pip makes efforts toward a moral and socially upward life while Raskolnikov sinks into depravity and alienates himself from society. It is exactly this juxtaposition, though, that helps bring understanding to the journey Pip makes from lowly beginnings, through higher society and an unwitting association with the underworld, back again to his humble origins where he, at last, finds satisfaction. However different the chosen paths of these characters are, they lead to a remarkably similar end.

Pip's early childhood, which he comes to resent and distance himself from, is formed with crime literally on the horizon as he learns that "the Hulks are prison-ships, right 'cross th' meshes" (14). Further, he is upbraided with the threat that because he asks questions, he himself will inevitably end up on the Hulks (15). After his frightful encounter with the convict and his subsequent guilt, compounded by the shame he feels at Estella's insults, Pip is determined to make a life for himself far away from his blacksmith home on the marshes. He feels the sting of being "much more ignorant that [he] had considered [him]self . . . and generally that [he] was in a low-lived bad way" (65). It is from this deplorable condition that Pip strives to free himself as he welcomes the opportunity from his unknown benefactor to become a gentleman. Unlike Pip, Raskolnikov comes to resent the schooling that has thus far been afforded to him, and as he turns his back on his education, he also distances himself from his family who has sacrificed enormously to pay for his education. Each character then, renounces that from which they came in favor of something they each believe will bring

about greater enlightenment. Raskolnikov hopes to test his mettle against cold-blooded leaders like Napoleon to determine how “extraordinary” (Dostoyevsky 308) he is, while all Pip wants to do is to raise himself up out of the forge to find wealth, status, and the love that he thinks will come along with gentlemanly success. Raskolnikov’s corrupt withdrawal from his community highlights Pip’s aspirations for the approval of higher social standing.

It is interesting then, to consider the names Dickens and Dostoyevsky chose for their protagonists. “Pip” is both a diminutive and a merging of the boy’s given and family names. Raskolnikov is a name derived from the Russian word meaning “split.” Both names have strong associations with duality, and mirror the dialectic themes of each novel. Doubles are a motif that Dickens and Dostoyevsky use extensively to introduce complex ideas into their narratives. Binary opposition to Pip’s dreams of gentility is offered in his forced relationship with Magwitch. It is ironic that Pip, with disdain for crime, and, in fact, aversion to all things lowly, is given the opportunity to raise himself up with, unbeknownst to him, ill-gotten money. As he becomes more accustomed to his new elevated station in life, he further removes himself from his family. When Joe comes to visit Pip in London, Pip is sensitive to having him meet Drummle, for whom Pip is prepared to commit his “worst weaknesses and meannesses” (Dickens 218) with his inhospitable treatment to Joe. Here, Pip denies who he is, where he has come from, and all connections that tie him to virtue. Similarly, Raskolnikov denounces his mother and sister when they come to visit him in St. Petersburg. That these two men desire and make efforts toward alienation from family is notable; the authors of both works comment here on the degradation of the family in an era that prizes individualism. In an era in which the thought that success can be attained through “pulling yourself up by the boot straps” was common, it is not surprising that both novels explore what can happen when an individual loses himself in such a pursuit.

That is exactly what happened to both Pip and Raskolnikov. Pip’s shameful upbringing and Raskolnikov’s shameless objectives direct the actions of both characters away from virtue and toward an ideal, gentleman status for Pip

and extraordinary detachment, or nihilism, for Raskolnikov. Each man progresses toward his goal, but suffers much along the way. Pip, horrified to learn who his benefactor is, explains that "the abhorrence in which I held the man, the dread I had of him, the repugnance with which I shrank from him, could not have been exceeded if he had been some terrible beast" (320). However, as Pip spends time with Wemmick and Aged P, and with Herbert, Clara and her ogre of a father, Pip begins to realize the power of loyalty and his feelings for Magwitch soften. Pip understands the nobility of Magwitch's intentions to make good come from his corrupt ways by making a gentleman out of Pip, and thereby repaying Pip's own adolescent noble act. Pip's actions take a turn away from the self-centered path he has been on as he undertakes to get Magwitch safely out of England. Further, when Joe comes to London to care for Pip, even after Pip's reception at his previous visit, Pip exclaims, "strike me, Joe. Tell me of my ingratitude" (463). Joe, showing Pip what it truly means to love, simply and resolutely replies, "you and me was ever friends" (463). Later, with this newfound compassion, Pip realizes his "worthless conduct" (323) toward Joe and Biddy and laments that "no wisdom on earth could have given me the comfort that I should have derived from their simplicity and fidelity" (323). Dickens has brought Pip full circle; Pip has learned not only that status is not what defines success in life, but moreover, that the strict definitions of good and evil, guilt and innocence that once ruled his morality, are not so clear cut and that a loving, compassionate and loyal heart are what makes a man gentle.

Dostoyevsky, like Dickens, leads his protagonist through an agonizing course of events quite different from what Pip went through, but perhaps more poignant. Raskolnikov believes he can surmount the decay, the drunkards and prostitutes with whom he lives, by killing an old pawnbroker. That he, in cold-blood, murders the woman and her sister gives evidence to his absolute narcissism that has him believing that in some heroic fashion he is ridding the world of "cursed wretches" (Dostoyevsky 101). Dickens does not go so far as to have Pip commit crime, but his initial abhorrence of Magwitch resonates with the same arrogance with which Raskolnikov acts. The reader, having experienced the

gruesome act of the double murder, better understands Pip for this exaggerated extension of conceit. Raskolnikov, with literal blood on his hands, and Pip, the beneficiary of dirty money, are both guilt ridden to the point of distraction. Pip cries that he will “never, never, never, undo what [he] had done” (Dickens 323); Dostoyevsky spends the remainder of the novel describing Raskolnikov’s dark descent into anguish and madness over what he had done.

Dickens and Dostoyevsky, unwilling to end their narratives on a note of selfish depravity, both offer redemption to their heroes. Pip goes home and professes his “humble thanks for all [Joe and Biddy] have done for [him]” (479), ready to face what may come in the way of love, be it with or without Estella. Raskolnikov has Sonya who, in mirror image of Joe Gargery, provides pure love for him, and for whom “there now gleamed the dawn of a renewed future, a complete recovery to a new life” (Dostoyevsky 655). Both men, then, find love and are redeemed from their previous selfish arrogance. The great lexicographer, Samuel Johnson, is quoted as saying “Mankind needs more often to be reminded than informed” (Jenkins). Dickens, and Dostoyevsky in compliment, working within a Victorian society that hailed individual progress and self-improvement, strives to remind the reader that sometimes virtue is best found in the purity of allegiance to family, to those who have, even in their humble manner, exhibited great nobility.

Works Cited

- Dickens, Charles. *Great Expectations*. New York: Penguin Books. 1996. Print.
- Dostoyevsky, Fyodor. *Crime and Punishment*. New York: Penguin Books. 1991. Print.
- The Thomas Jefferson Hour*. Clay Jenkins. National Public Radio, 2012.
- Alexis Charles Henri Maurice Clérel de Tocqueville. *Encyclopedia of World Biography*. Vol. 15. 2nd ed. Detroit: Gale, 2004. 250-251.

Jacob Montecino

The Dangerous Poison of Love: Unrequited Love and Violent Responses in *Dracula* and *Frankenstein*

Love can both inspire and poison the mind. The Gothic literature genre spends a deal of time exploring the perversions of love and marriage by focusing on how they can infect the mind. In Bram Stoker's *Dracula* and Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, two iconic creatures show to the fullest extent the potentially devastating aspects of love and marriage. Dracula and Frankenstein's unnamed creature (henceforth referred to as the Creature) have both been portrayed as timeless monsters who haunt the night, but psychologically, these characters have a tormented history that plays into their motivation. Feeling isolated and full of feelings of unrequited love, these characters take a clear path of revenge against characters that have experienced the love and camaraderie that these "monsters" envy. Mary Shelley's Creature and Bram Stoker's Dracula deal with an apathetic refusal of love from society and from God in a way that drives these characters to embark on a revenge quest against the beloved characters of their societies. The novels highlight the innate desire to love and to be loved while portraying the perverse jealousy that accompanies love.

Stoker portrays Dracula as if he were in between man and beast, and this quality identifies Dracula as an "other," thus separating him from nature and society; he is a godless creature without the love or acceptance of God. Stoker describes Dracula as being rejected by God and spiritually "unclean," a phrase often uttered by Mina Harker that connects with Levitical law and the separation that man has from God through sin (Stoker 388). The symbolic nature of vampirism making one spiritually unclean ties into how the person (in this scene Mina) has been separated from God and from his love, and this clearly highlights that Dracula has been separated from God. Furthermore, Dracula's immortality acts like a mockery against God it separates him from heaven. Stoker uses the duality of immortality to suggest that Dracula does not need Christ;

therefore, Dracula rejects the love of Christ. This does not indicate that Dracula personally hates Christ since Stoker does not provide a sufficient back story for Dracula's origins; however, Clive Leatherdale offers a commentary in "*Dracula as Christian Parody*" to suggest that "Stoker's insistence that Dracula can sleep only in consecrated ground" suggests a "yearn[ing] to rest permanently among Christ's believers." This sufficiently explains why Dracula would need to sleep in consecrated ground because he recognizes his separation from heaven and from God's love despite his demonic sentimentality (Leatherdale 178). Dracula sleeping in consecrated ground suggests that he is steeped in a perpetual state of uncleanness. He cannot truly achieve purification since he cannot touch sacred objects such as the crucifix or the communion wafer, which Van Helsing uses to "sterilise this earth [Dracula's cases of earth]," rendering it inhabitable to the vampire for making the earth "more holy still," or holier than what Dracula can stand because of his separation from God's love (Stoker 407). The two holy relics employed throughout the novel suggest how God has removed himself from Dracula, leaving Dracula in a demonic position and essentially in a perpetual hell because he does not and cannot experience God's love because of his immortality. Dracula finally experiences the love of God through death, where "there was in the face a look of peace" (514-515). At this point in the novel, it is apparent that Dracula does desire rejoining with Christ, and that he simply cannot because of his curse. Like Dracula, Shelley's Creature experiences the same sort of isolation as Dracula, but in an inverse relationship, with the Creature suffering more from a yearning and systematical denial of love from society and a family over yearning for God's love.

Even though Shelley devotes some attention to the Creature's relationship to God and his desire for integration into God's design, she focuses more on society, and how it dictated whether or not the Creature could integrate into society. As seen throughout the novel, society does not love the Creature, something that Shelley demonstrates through the feelings of such characters as Felix, Agatha, William, and Victor. These characters shape the Creature because he never chose isolation for society's love; rather it was forced upon him even

though the Creature expresses his constant desire to love when he cries after Victor's death:

‘But it is true that I am a wretch. I have murdered the lovely and the helpless; I have strangled the innocent as they slept, and grasped to death his throat who never injured me or any other living thing. I have devoted my creator, the select specimen of all that is worthy of love and admiration among men, to misery” (Shelley 274).

Both Dracula and the Creature exhibit by the end of the novel a clear desire to love society and God, something that Dracula displays through his peace in death, while the Creature realizes that he tormented those worthy of love, making himself unlovable. In both of these cases, the monsters suffered during their life, but chose to torture and victimize society as a response towards their desperate yet unrequited search for love.

Victims of the wrath of Dracula include such characters as Mina and Lucy who represent a sexual nature through the symbolic rape and marriage associated with Dracula's bite. The use of rape and marriage reflects the vengeance that Dracula takes against God for perverting the Christian sense of sex within marriage. Both Mina and Lucy represent rape victims because Dracula steals their purity from them and distorts their sexuality, robbing them of a nineteenth-century sense of feminine purity. The sexually charged image of the rape is prominently seen in Dracula's initial attack on Mina where “Stoker is describing a symbolic act of enforced fellatio...where a chaste female suffers a violation that is essentially sexual,” and Stoker then paints a picture of Dracula holding “both Mrs. Harker's hands, keeping them away with her arms at full tension; his right hand gripped her by the back of the neck, forcing her head down on his bosom” (Bentley 29). This hyper-sexualized scene demonstrates the un-Christian behaviors of Dracula as he takes a vengeance against the women, taking advantage of their virginity and robbing them of it, leaving them locked in an anti-Christian marriage with a demon. The marriage between Dracula and the women in the novel is more evident in the figure of Lucy, who takes on the role of an anti-Christian mother by making herself a family for Dracula, and in this

way emphasizing Stoker's link between Dracula's attacks on women in and his reaction to a loveless relationship with God.

Stoker's treatment of Lucy and her symbolic marriage to Dracula illustrates a perverted marriage, which underscores Dracula's mockery of Christian ideals as vengeance for his separation from Christ's love. The symbolic marriage that occurs between Lucy and Dracula has a perverse structure since Lucy as a vampire "spends most of her time attacking children" which seals them as "new victims and multiplying the evils of the world" (Weissman 75). The scenes in which Lucy takes advantage of the children shows how Stoker has demonized Dracula in the way that he perverts pure Christian women by mutating them into child molesters. This reveals how Dracula has a tormented vision of love and marriage, and Stoker uses this as a way to visualize Dracula's vengeance against the biblical accounts of love through this demonized marriage.

In *Frankenstein*, Shelley shows the Creature's actions being direct responses to society's apathetic disownment of him much like Dracula's actions against women. Similar to Dracula's revenge against God, the Creature directs his attacks towards society and families, targeting members who enjoy security and love from the family or societal setting. In the chapters depicting the Creature explaining his motives and his background story, Shelley portrays the violence of the Creature and depicts his victims as specific targets who enjoy privileges, describing the Creature as "declar[ing] everlasting war against the species [man]" for the cruel way they have treated him throughout his life (Shelley 162). This declaration then gives meaning to the unexplained murders found previously in the novel, since the audience discovers that the Creature targets characters who enjoy the benefits and love of a family. The De Lacy family then becomes his first set of victims because "he has never felt any type of familial love." Moreover, the Creature experiences the harsh rejections of unrequited love when "the Monster begins to lavish on them the love that he desires to obtain for himself by trying to ease their financial suffering" only to be rejected by them when Felix "tore [the Creature] from his father" in a violent and pathetic mannerism (Lancaster 136). This form of rejection then evolves

into the Creature's inspiration to attack his surrogate family by burning down their cottage in a violent "stroke of vengeance against the human race that has, throughout his short existence, rejected him because of his intimidating stature and incredible ugliness" (Thompson 28). This scene highlights the shift in thought of a gentle loving creature (or a creature attempting to love) to a dark character full of hatred and jealousy. After this scene, the Creature then begins his rampage against society for their rejection by targeting the characters who receive society's greatest sympathies.

The Creature's main adult victims, Justine, Henry, and Elizabeth, depict a different aspect of the Creature's jealousy because they represent a different aspect of society's love since they were integrated into a family after being displaced, a joy and a privilege denied to the Creature because of his soulless, lonesome state. Shelley describes Justine, Henry, and Elizabeth as having "survived what the Monster could not, the lack of a loving family" because of their orphaned or disadvantaged status (Lancaster 138). These characters' histories underscore the unfair position of the Creature because of the discrepancy between his desire to love and society's continual denial of it. It drives the Creature "to strip them of their good fortune just as Frankenstein and society choose to strip the Monster of his chance at happiness" (Lancaster 138). Ultimately, Shelley shows how love can be perverted through the lens of jealousy in the Creature, and she continually adds depth to the pasts of the Creature's victims in connection towards their similarity to his situation. For instance, while Shelley connects Elizabeth to the Creature because they have orphaned status, she also shows a link between the Creature's desire to love and to be married, something that Elizabeth gets to enjoy, but the Creature does not. At the point of Elizabeth's death on her wedding night, Shelley underscores the perversion of love. In the cases of other victims such as Justine and Henry, these characters did not deserve the Creature's wrath; however, since they symbolized love to the Creature and the family of Victor, the Creature "is monstrous [towards them] specifically because love is denied him... he destroys Victor's intimates...a playing out of the consequences of...denial of love"; in other words, Shelley categorizes the Creature's victims as his response

against Victor for having a family but denying him one (Haggerty 41).

Love can create some of the beauties of the world while also exposing the darkest parts of the human psyche. The novels *Dracula* and *Frankenstein* accurately depict how unrequited love or the absence of love can create some of the most terrifying and memorable monsters in literature. Stoker and Shelley detail through their characters the effect of God's love on a character and their cravings for love from society and from the family. In both *Dracula's* and the Creature's case, they were denied the experiences enjoyed by their human counterparts, and as a result of psychological torment, they enact symbolic revenge against the agents who denied them the feelings of love. For *Dracula*, his separation from the love of God and the salvation of Christ drive him towards robbing that eternal joy from the women in society. Even though he deeply desired purity, he instead chose to pollute the image of marriage in the female characters as his form of revenge. Likewise, the Creature took his revenge against society by targeting its most precious members, the child, the virgin woman, friends, and family. His attacks stem from a deep desire to find acceptance, but his reaction demonstrates the effects of the absence of love on an intelligent creature. He snaps and attacks those around him just like *Dracula*. Instead of finding the love they so desperately craved the Creature and *Dracula* become demons in society because they were denied a chance to find love.

Works Cited

- Bentley, Christopher. "The Monster in the Bedroom: Sexual Symbolism in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*." *Dracula: The Vampire and the Critics*. Ed. Margaret L. Carter. London: UMI Research Press, 1988. 25-34. Print.
- Haggerty, George E.. " 'Dung, Guts, and Sodomy': Sodomy, Abjection and Gothic Fiction in the Early Nineteenth Century." *Gothic Studies* 8.2 (2006): 35-51. 28 Oct. 2012. Web.
- Lancaster, Ashley Craig. "From Frankenstein's Monster To Lester Ballard: The Evolving Gothic Monster." *Midwest Quarterly* 49.2 (2008): 132-148. 28 Oct. 2012. Web.
- Leatherdale, Clive. "Dracula as Christian Parody." *Dracula: The Novel & The Legend*. The Aquarian Press: Wellingborough, 1985.176-191. Print.
- Shelley, Mary. *Frankenstein; or, The Modern Prometheus*. 1818. New York: Simon & Schuster Paperback, 2004. Print.
- Stoker, Bram. *Dracula*. 1897. New York: Barnes & Noble, 2003. Print.
- Thompson, Terry W.. "Wrapped in Darkness: Hecate in Chapter Sixteen in *Frankenstein*." *English Language Notes* 33.3 (1996): 28-32. 28 Oct. 2012. Web.
- Weissman, Judith. "Women and Vampires: *Dracula* as a Victorian Novel." *Dracula: The Vampire and the Critics*. Ed. Margaret L. Carter. London: UMI Research Press, 1988.69-77. Print.

Denise Hansen

**Mythological Objectification:
Male Ambivalence and Female Power in Salman Rushdie's *Midnight's
Children***

In Salman Rushdie's *Midnight's Children*, the narrator's perceptions and representations of women and womanhood, and of female nature and women's roles in men's lives, are the often troublesome underlying currents which shape the events of the novel, while moving the story forward. His female characters are key elements of the novel's political mythology, beginning with the story of the courtship of the narrator's grandparents, which itself begins with his grandmother completely hidden behind a sheet representing the non-modern version of the feminine aspects of Indian culture, its old superstitious and repressions. Saleem's grandmother is so steeped in sexually conservative, backwards cultural ideals that she is unable to let her husband see her naked and refuses to wear modern, western clothing at his forward thinking suggestion. She is equally scandalized by his suggestion that she "only move, I mean, like a woman" when they are in bed together (*MC* 33). The interaction of Saleem's grandparents grounds his mythological narration in personal history and sets up the foundational tension in the novel between the traditional India of the past and the modern, increasingly westernized India of the future; their conflict previews the larger political and ideological conflicts of the novel which culminate in Rushdie's representation of The Emergency and Indira Ghandi's dramatically violent attempt to forcibly sweep away the old to build a new India.

As Saleem tells Padma about his marriage to Parvati, he lays out the idea which is crucial to the mythologizing that goes on in the novel: "Women have made me; and also unmade [me]. From the Reverend Mother to the Widow, and even beyond, I have been at the mercy of the so-called (erroneously, in my opinion!) gentler sex. It is, perhaps, a matter of connection: is not Mother India, Bharat-Mata, commonly thought of as female? And, as you know,

there's no escape from her" (*MC* 404). This idea of India being an inescapable, all-encompassing divine mother, a force of creation and life itself, is such a fundamental part of Indian and Hindu thought that it is only natural for Saleem to view and describe his life as being completely made and controlled by women. This idea of the all-encompassing, inescapable female force as central instigator of the novel's action and mythology is most fully developed in the character of The Widow.

Indira Ghandi, India's first female Prime Minister, is renamed The Widow in Rushdie's novel. During her political reign, Ghandi intentionally promoted the image of herself as a Great Mother figure, encouraging people to identify her with the concept of Mother India itself. Tom M. Kuchta quotes Rushdie, who says of Ghandi, "Her use of the cult of the mother—of Hindu mothergoddess symbols and allusions—and the idea of Shakti, of the fact that the dynamic element of the Hindu pantheon is represented as female—was calculated and shrewd [...]" (Rushdie qtd in Kuchta 213). Rushdie's Widow is a mythological incarnation of the historic female leader; in his novel, she is no mere politician, but an embodiment of a spiritual concept. Making much of Ghandi's striking physical characteristic of black hair shot through with thick white streaks, Rushdie develops her character into a mythological representation of the eternal spiritual battle between light and darkness.

This spiritual tension between the light, or the force of good, and darkness, the force of evil, is inextricably connected with the cycle of destruction and recreation in Hinduism. There is a definite pattern in Hindu myths of the eternal battle between good and evil being periodically acted out through a period of destruction, followed by a period of restoration of peace and a movement into new creation. In his book on Indian symbolism, Jyoti Sahi writes, "The epic themes so favoured by classical Hindu art are based on extremely ancient folk legends in which the battle of light against darkness, good against evil, forms the warp and woof of existence" (31). Sahi goes on to discuss common rituals and religious celebratory ceremonies which express the Indian spiritual connection between destruction and creation: "It is important to understand the relationship

in folk thought between apparently cruel and aggressive sport and fertility. Destruction is itself a part of the creation of a new order" (31). In Rushdie's novel the Indian Emergency—the two-year period during which India was declared to be in a state of emergency and Indira Ghandi was allowed to take whatever measures she thought necessary to restore economic and political function to the country—can be viewed as the period of destruction which precedes a new beginning. This interpretation of The Emergency is especially significant when considered in light of the mythological relationship Rushdie creates between Ghandi and The Emergency.

Rushdie, through Saleem, actually identifies The Widow herself with the Emergency, as if they are parts of the same creature. As Saleem says, "if the Mother of the Nation had had a coiffure of uniform pigment, the Emergency she spawned might easily have lacked a darker side. But she had white hair on one side and black on the other; the Emergency, too, had a white part – public, visible, documented, a matter for historians – and a black part which, being secret macabre untold, must be a matter for us" (*MC* 420-421). Within the framework of Hindu mythology and Indian cultural systems of belief, the Widow is evocative of the Hindu Mother/destroyer goddesses Durga and Kali, who are associated with destruction and death. In Rushdie's rendering, Ghandi declares the Emergency in an attempt to destroy the old India and any opposition to her power. Her dictatorial desire is to create a new nation completely under her control.

In Hindu mythology the concept of a divine mother with two distinct aspects—one loving, all giving and compassionate, and one an unstoppable force of raging destruction—is well established. The divine mother is the great embracer and balancer of the universe; she creates and she kills. The Widow is clearly playing this dual-natured mother role in her destructive aspect during Saleem's mythological rendition of the Emergency. The Widow is also called "Mother of the Nation," and Mother India demands obedience and sacrifice from her children, the citizens of India (*MC* 420). Indira Ghandi's rule expressed the concept central to "the modern cult of Bharat Mata (Mother India), in which all Indians are called sons or children of India and are expected to protect

their mother without regard for personal hardship and sacrifice" (Kinsley 181). The Midnight's Children, individuals born at the moment of India's political independence who Saleem believes are telepathically connected and supernaturally gifted, become the rebellious offspring of Mother India in Saleem's mythologized version of reality, the ones who must be forced into submission to the great mother through the sacrifice of their fertility. Saleem says that because the Children of Midnight do not view The Widow as a deity but as an evil dictator, she wants to destroy them: "That and that only, is why we, the magical children of midnight, were hated feared destroyed by the Widow, who was not only Prime Minister of India but also aspired to be Devi, the Mother-goddess in her most terrible aspect, possessor of the Shakti of the gods" (MC 438).

The idea of castration has its roots in Hindu mythology as well. In her book *Women, Androgynes, and Other Mythical Beasts*, Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty discusses numerous Hindu myths in which castration occurs. While the specific details in each of these myths vary, she says, nonetheless, that all of "these myths are about the relationship between human and divine forces, and on this level castration, in itself symbolized by various euphemisms and distortions, is in turn symbolic of the loss of other, more general powers.... Castration may symbolize the loss of the power of imagination" (86-87). In his retelling, Saleem equates castration with a loss of hope: "I reveal the Widow's finest, most delicate joke: instead of torturing us, she gave us hope. Which meant she had something – no, more than something: the finest thing of all! – to take away. And now, very soon now, I shall have to describe how she cut it off" (MC 437).

The sterilization through castration of Saleem and the other Midnight's Children is the culmination of the mythical battle between good and evil forces in the novel. With Indira Ghandi as The Widow, the terrible aspect of The Great Mother, the destroyer and creator, and with the Children of Midnight as the helpless mortals consigned unwillingly by fate to be her enemies, Rushdie imbues historical events with mythological significance. The Midnight's Children have been tirelessly pursued and marked for punishment by forces so powerful and unstoppable that they seem divine: "the truest, deepest motive behind the

declaration of a State of Emergency was the smashing, the pulverizing, the irreversible discombobulation of the children of midnight" (MC 427). Saleem, in other words, views the physical setting of his sterilization through a mythological lens.

The widow's hostel where Saleem's sterilization takes place is a chthonic labyrinthine womb; the hostel is the frightening, dark and unknowable center of the divine female mystery. This is clear from the imagery Rushdie uses in the description of the widow's palace: "It is a vast building, a labyrinth of tiny rooms" (MC 433). The mazelike atmosphere is essential to understanding the mythological significance of this place where Saleem's reproductive capacity as well as his capacity for hope is destroyed. As Jyoti Sahi writes in his book *The Child and the Serpent*, "The maze reproduces, in its spiraling forms, the way between womb and tomb – the journey of man from birth to death. Mystically, the maze is itself an image of the womb" (43). There is great significance, therefore, in the Widow's Palace being a labyrinth where Saleem's future is destroyed.

The palace is the place where his life's destiny coalesces; the story that has been written for him while he was still in his mother's womb is now being played out in the tomblike maze of the hostel. The geographical location of the palace itself is likewise mythically significant: "on the shores of the Ganges in the oldest living city in the world—City of Divine Light, home of the Prophetic Book, the horoscope of horoscopes, in which every life, past present future, is already recorded.—In the home of horoscopes, I reached the moment prophesied in a rooftop room" (MC 432). In this womblike or tomblike structure Saleem is held prisoner of the Great Mother in her terrible aspect, The Widow, and he is entirely helpless.

There are a number of widows who live in the hostel and who must remain forever in their roles of mourning because India is now a modern country where they can no longer perform Sati and kill themselves after their husbands' deaths. The ritual of Sati itself originated with a Great Mother myth: "Sati who

passes through ritual suicide in fire to Muneswara, lord of munis, who is Siva. Siva himself in his original form is a forest god, or wild huntsman, Rudra. The muni practices *tapas* which is a word deriving from the root *tap*, meaning fire. Thus the Earth Mother comes to him by setting herself ablaze" (Sahi 153). Rushdie's frightening and unreal depiction of the widows in the palace renders them almost inhuman: "In the palace of the widows lives a tribe of women whose chests are irremediably bruised by the power of their continual pummellings, whose hair is torn beyond repair, and whose voices are shredded by the constant, keening expressions of their grief" (MC 433). These women are representative of the old India and live within the protection of The Widow's power; they live in "the private heart of her terrible empire" (MC 433). Here their mourning is almost an act of worship, a testament to what the Widow herself is and also illustrative of how she has broken out of the traditional role of a widow in India. The contrast between the widows who remain trapped and limited by their own and their traditional cultural ideas about what they should be, and The Widow Indira, who has become prime minister of an entire country, expresses the conflict between the old and new India.

Also found within the labyrinth of the Widow's Palace is The Widow's Hand, the pretty, voluptuous woman who is responsible for Saleem's castration. The woman Saleem calls The Widow's hand is significantly portrayed as extremely feminine, using sexualized language. Saleem describes her as a "gorgeous girl with big, rolling hips" (MC 437). Her voluptuous femininity makes her even more terrifying and repellent. Because of her position of authority, Saleem is totally helpless against her, and because she is a beautiful woman, traditionally an object of sexual dominance and gratification, it is particularly horrifying that she will be causing his sexual impotence. The other highly significant aspect of The Widow's Hand's physical appearance is her association with the color black. The goddess Kali, who is associated with death and destruction, is described as "always black or dark" (Kinsley 116). The character of The Widow's Hand, with her traditionally femininely attractive appearance

combined with her darkness, perhaps even more than the Widow expresses the male fear of female power in the novel.

Rushdie's portrayal of women in *Midnight's Children*, particularly his portrayal of Indira Ghandi, is a powerful commentary on male ambivalence toward female power. In being both horrified by and fascinated with the Widow, and with her 'Hand' and the Widows of the hostel, Saleem's magnetized dread reveals the novel's underlying atmosphere of conflict and insecurity in dealing with the nature of femaleness and the relationship between femininity, power, culture and progress. The identification of the Widow's hair color with the Emergency itself, the sexual attractiveness of the Widow's Hand, the horrifying, inhuman character of the culturally misplaced widows, and the objectification and mythologizing of these female characters allow Rushdie to maximize the horrors of the emergency while minimizing the historical feminist impact of Indira Ghandi's rule.

Works Cited

- Desai, Anita. *Indian Fiction Today*. Daedalus, Vol. 118, No. 4. Another India (Fall 1989, pp.206-231). Print.
- Jain, Jasbir. *Daughters of Mother India in Search of a Nation: Women's Narratives About the Nation*. *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 41, No.17 (April 29-May 5, 2006, pp. 1654-1660). Print.
- Johnson, Linda. *Daughters of the Goddess The Women Saints of India*. St. Paul: Yes International Publishers, 1994. Print.
- Kinsley, David. *Hindu Goddesses Visions of the Divine Feminine in the Hindu Religious Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986. Print.
- Kuchta, Todd. *Allegorizing the Emergency: Rushdie's Midnight's Children and Benjamin's Theory of Allegory*. London: Palgrave, 2000.
- O'Flaherty, Wendy Doniger. *Women, Androgynes, and Other Mythical Beasts*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980. Print.
- Phillips, Charles. *The Eternal Cycle: Indian Myth*. London: Duncan Baird Publishers, 1998.
- Rushdie, Salman. *Midnight's Children*. London: Vintage, 1997. Print.
- Sahi, Jyoti. *The Child and the Serpent Reflections on Popular Indian Symbols*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980. Print.
- Spiegelman, Dr.J. Marvin and Vasavada, Dr. Arwind U. *Hinduism and Jungian Psychology*. Falcon Press. Phoenix, Arizona, USA. 1987. Print.
- Strand, Eric. *Ghandian Communalism and The Midnight's Children Conference*. ELH. Vol. 72, No.4. (Winter, 2005) pp.975-1016). Print.

Dotty Burns

A.S. Byatt's "Body Art": A Protest

In A.S. Byatt's short story "Body Art," an unusual relationship develops between a stolid middle-aged gynecologist and an impoverished artist who is the victim of a botched abortion. On the surface, Daisy is a bereft, and literally a "starving artist," and out of human obligation Damien is trying to rescue her from her dismal plight as well as herself. In actuality, Daisy is striving to transcend the patriarchal conceptions of "women" by unconsciously protesting through anorexia in an attempt to deconstruct her feminine identity and gain autonomy. Furthermore, the self-destructive hyper slenderness draws attention to her unrequited mutilation. Eventually, Daisy becomes more aware of herself and her cause and exposes the dehumanizing effects of the patriarchy through willful, more constructive, artistic manifestations. However helpful Damian appears next to Daisy in her silent crusade, he is in fact a representative of the oppressive western patriarchy. For Damien, women have no identity apart from the body; the doctor can't help but associate his love interest Martha and his lover Daisy with the condition and the contours of their bodies. Also, he is the adversary of Daisy's protest, for he constantly urges her to eat and asserts that she forfeits the rights to her body once she becomes pregnant with his child. Despite Damien's antagonism, Daisy does find her voice and exposes the ills of the patriarchal regard for women, albeit momentarily. Although she puts up a strong fight she inevitably succumbs to Damien and becomes his mortified prisoner out of desperation. Nevertheless, her infant daughter Kate redeems her and proves to Damien, whereas Daisy's artwork couldn't, that a woman is not merely a body, but a person.

When Daisy Whimple enters the life of Damien Becket the first impression the reader might obtain of her is hardly that of a tortured artist protesting against cultural norms. The first faint glimpses of her offer nothing

more than an anorexic art student who has picked up a part-time job decorating the Gyna ward of the hospital. Like the reader at first, Daisy is unaware of the significant political statement her “skinny ankles” are making (49). According to Susan Bordo, anorexics don’t have to have a critical perspective in order to have an unconscious dissatisfaction (2370). As Daisy’s case history regarding her miscondacted abortion surfaces and the way she haunts the Gyna ward becomes apparent, it’s discernibly indicated that she uses her body to dispute the patriarchal order and:

[question] the cultural ideals around which her life is organized. Through embodied rather than deliberate demonstration she exposes and indicts those ideals, precisely by pursuing them to the point at which their destructive potential is revealed for all to see. (Bordo 2370)

Although her silent protest is counterproductive and ambiguous, she inevitably does lose the defining attributes of the traditional feminine form, and, in effect, she assumes the shape of a lanky boy and loses her “vulnerability in having a female body” (Bordo 2372). When Damien first encounters her, he doesn’t appreciate supple feminine curves; rather, he notices her body is young and “tautly constructed” (Byatt 52).

On some level, Damien realizes Daisy is rejecting the symbolic order of the patriarchy. As the archetype of the patriarchal society, Damien believes “fertile female bodies are the ultimate natural resource” (Wooley 20). For him, women are to be consumed like low-calorie food; without guilt or consequence. This is evident throughout the text, for he is unable to identify women beyond delicate bodies encased in garments. Even his colleague and love interest, Martha, is reduced to a “women with good clothes on [her] body” (Byatt 76). Damien prefers Martha to Daisy because he indulges in looking at her and seeing “a lot [more] female flesh [...] provocatively pouting and posturing at him” (76). As far as his interest in Daisy, he regards her with morbid fascination and pity rather than benign affection. Daisy represents damaged goods to Damien, for he constantly associates her with her “ruined tubes” (76). Furthermore, he considers her as

disposable as trifle consumer products until she becomes pregnant with his child. In spite of his languid regard for Daisy, he vehemently resents her defiance of the domestic and sexualized ideal of femininity, particularly her emaciated body and her piercings. For the patriarchal man, it's a crime for her to fail at being beautiful and standardized just as it is a crime if he fails at being dominant (Wooley 18). Naturally, Damien seeks to thwart her self-expression and autonomy. Aside from eventually taking control of her pregnant body, he outright asks her to get rid of her piercings, claiming, "there's a considerable possibility they're carcinogenic" (85), and he urges her "to eat more" (52).

Although Daisy unknowingly uses her body to demonstrate self-mastery much to Damien's disdain, her protest is somewhat paradoxical because the anorexia renders her voiceless and physically weak. Nevertheless, Daisy is forced to resort to it because, according to Michelle Mary Letwica in *Starving for Salvation*,

many people find themselves with few resources for dealing with the vicissitudes of their lives, for mediating their grief and joys [...] for challenging the dehumanizing forces and imagining how things might be different [...]. (95)

The anorexic may actually find they don't master their lives by becoming inarticulate and inaudible (95). It is evident in the text that Daisy does fully realize this, and even gets a chance to vent her outrage over women being regarded as the walking uterus. At one point, when Damien is explaining to her that the beds in the ward are in short supply she bitterly reveals her disdain for the context of motherhood and the women's body: "I know all about that," she snaps, "[...] bad wombs next to good wombs and no-wombs mixed in [...]" (65).

Eventually, Daisy gives up anorexia and "gauze flowers" for an effective political discourse to expose her plight and confront the maltreatment and surgical representation of the women's body. Daisy creates a grotesque rendering of the goddess Kali as her materialized protest. She depicts her as the terrifying mother of life whose very fingers are "tools of nineteenth-century obstetricians, midwives and abortionists" (89). Naturally, Damien finds Daisy's undertaking outrageous

and disgusting. For Damien the statue is both confusing and horrifying because women are being portrayed as the life giver rather than the body that serves the patriarchy. Martha, being a woman, appears to naturally empathize and responds with rapport. Martha also realizes that art expresses “real pain, a sense of human harm, and threats to the female body” (91). It’s because Martha is a woman that “Damien shout[s] at Martha as though Martha was Daisy” (91). Damien conjoins them as one because Martha condones the art’s representation of motherhood and acknowledges Daisy’s dilemma she has faced as a woman. However, it is Martha that is adeptly insulted, rather than Daisy, in that Damien not only refuses to empathize with Daisy’s protest and representations, but also condemns her for it.

Despite Daisy’s willingness to protest against the patriarchal conception of women, she doesn’t rise up against Damien. Yet Daisy does make strong attempts to establish her autonomy in their relationship once she becomes pregnant with their child. During their fight over her body she remarks to him “it’s not your body, it’s nothing to do with you now. So get out of my life” (94). Damien retorts and sanctions her body his property because it now carries his child: “It’s my baby. It is my body. It’s turning into my flesh and blood in there [...]” (94). Damien relentlessly domineers over Daisy, upholding the old patriarchal order that designates women’s bodies as the prize of dominance. Damien finally states in an imperialistic fashion “[...] I can and will look after you” (95). From this point Daisy puts up a fleeting struggle, but inevitably succumbs to his coercion. She obliges Damien and becomes his humiliated prisoner because, like other anorexics, she has “become enmeshed in collusion with forces that sustain her own oppression” (Bordo 2364).

As with most prisoners, the fight in Daisy eventually dissipates when the forces overwhelm her and this occurs as her pregnancy progresses. Even Damien notes, “the defiance had gone out of her, and was replaced by an unnerving combination of resignation and fear” (102). Fortunately, the birth of their daughter mitigates this type of relationship between them. Both Daisy and Damien designated themselves the providers of their daughter Kate. Furthermore, Damien unexpectedly changes more than Daisy with the arrival of their daughter. When

Damien is faced with his own daughter, who is a narcissistic extension of him, he makes an exception and reveres a woman as a person. Damien is "overcome with dreadful love and grief. She was a person. She had not been there and now she was there, and she was the person he loved" (105).

Daisy's infant daughter, Kate, is the only female Damien ordains as a person by virtue of her being his daughter, and therefore he can feasibly conceive of himself in her. Daisy may have had better luck in winning the battle of gender politics if she had, like her daughter, convinced men to see themselves in her rather than using her body to undermine the patriarchy and signify women's baneful social condition. Her protest began as an unconscious crusade, and she was expressing with her body what she was unable to say. Nevertheless, women already occupy the realm of the body. For centuries, the women of western civilization have been using their bodies to express themselves, whereas men have used their minds. It's an unequivocal truth that the mind governs and domineers over the body.

Works Cited

- Bordo, Susan. "Unbearable Weight." *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. New York: Norton and Company, 2001. 2362-2376.
- Byatt, A.S. *Little Black Book of Stories*. New York: Vintage International, 2003. 47-107.
- Lelwica, Michelle Mary. *Starving for Salvation*. New York: Oxford UP, 1999. 95
- Wooley, O.Wayne. "...And Man Created Woman": Representation of Women's Bodies in Western Culture." *Feminist Perspectives on Eating Disorders*. New York: The Guilford P, 1994. 17-52.

Redefining Arnoldian Theory in McEwan's *Saturday*

McEwan's *Saturday* follows a day in the life of Henry Perowne, a successful neurosurgeon whose plans for a flawless day are disrupted by an altercation with Baxter, "a man who believes he has no future" (217). Baxter raids Perowne's home and threatens his family, until he is suddenly tranquilized by a recitation of Arnold's "Dover Beach." But as the primary intertext to *Saturday*, "Dover Beach" has a more distinct function than tranquilizing Baxter and transforming him into a hopeful being. As a Victorian text, it interweaves Victorian values, specifically the values of Matthew Arnold, in McEwan's novel. Arnold's theory that a cultured person "tends towards sweetness and light" is most pertinent to *Saturday* (*Culture* 832). "Sweetness and light," or beauty and knowledge, is essential to McEwan's discussion of modern ethics. Furthermore, McEwan constructs his novel to correspond to the themes and structure of the poem. For instance, the speaker of the poem is a critical observer, a role McEwan assigns to Perowne. Moreover, the overall melancholy and anarchy of the poem also has relevance to the novel. McEwan interweaves "Dover Beach" in *Saturday* as a means to redefine Arnoldian theory, and to demonstrate the increasing complexity of modern ethics.

To understand Arnold's notion of "sweetness and light," one must consider his idea of culture, and his view of the role poetry plays within a culture. In *Culture and Anarchy*, Arnold states that "[c]ulture is then properly described [...] as having its origin in the love of perfection; it is a *study of perfection*" (826, original emphasis). This "perfection" is an essential human quality that tends toward "removing human error, clearing human confusion, and diminishing human misery" (826). In other words, it is "a passion of doing good" (827). Moreover, human perfection is very much an "*internal condition*," as the intelligent individual should accept new ideas, as long as these ideas avoid extremes, and maintain disinterestedness (828, original emphasis). In "The

Function of Criticism at the Present Time," Arnold defines disinterestedness:

And how is criticism to show disinterestedness? By keeping aloof from what is called 'the practical view of things'; by resolutely following the law of its own nature, which is to be *a free play of the mind* on all subjects which it touches. By steadily refusing to lend itself to any of those ulterior, political, practical considerations about ideas [...] which criticism has really nothing to do with. (814, emphases added)

For Arnold, the disinterested individual maintains an objective view that is free from outside forces; the individual's only purpose is to pursue human perfection. However, an individual's free play of ideas must be in a "finely tempered nature" (*Culture*, 831). As one ventures toward extremes, anarchy and distraction from perfection and beauty are inevitable. Furthermore, Arnold asserts that "the idea of beauty and of a human nature perfect on all its sides" "is the dominant idea of poetry" (832). Therefore, poetry is the ultimate, disinterested pursuit of perfection—the ultimate engagement with "sweetness and light."

McEwan manifests Arnoldian theory by shaping the novel's structure and themes to correspond to "Dover Beach." For instance, the speaker in the poem is free to analyze his surroundings and venture toward "sweetness and light." The speaker's disinterestedness is evident from the first line: "The sea is calm to-night" (Arnold 1). Not only is this line the speaker's first observation, but it is also a foreshadowing of further analysis. Later in the poem the speaker declares, "Listen! you hear the grating roar / Of pebbles which the waves draw back" (9-10). By distancing himself and assessing the scene objectively, the speaker engages in free play of the mind. He concludes that the sound is an "eternal note of sadness" in a world that is "[s]o various, so beautiful, so new" (14, 32). Although he hears "sadness," he realizes that there is an essential beauty in the world. Thus, the speaker's disinterestedness leads him toward "sweetness and light" because he perceives the human condition through a natural medium—the beautiful, yet paradoxical, rhythm of the tide.

McEwan renders disinterestedness in *Saturday* through narrative

technique. The free indirect discourse of the novel allows McEwan to present Perowne as a potential critical observer. It allows the reader to delve into the conscience of Perowne, and readily analyze his free play of ideas. Like the speaker of "Dover Beach," McEwan provides Perowne with several opportunities to reflect upon his surroundings. It is the role of the reader to decide whether Perowne is a disinterested interpreter. For example, after witnessing a burning cargo plane, Perowne questions his *own* effectiveness after he immediately concludes that he has witnessed a terrorist attack:

This past hour he's been in a state of wild unreason, in a folly of overinterpretation. It doesn't console him, that anyone in these times, standing at the window in his place, might have leaped to the same conclusions. Misunderstanding is general all over the world. How can we trust ourselves? (40)

This passage has two functions: First, it demonstrates Perowne's free play, albeit in the form of speculation, with the image of the burning cargo plane; second, it is a challenge to the reader to be critical of Perowne's analyses. If Perowne questions his own reasoning, then McEwan suggests that the reader should as well. Furthermore, McEwan incorporates disinterestedness during Perowne's squash match with Jay Strauss. As Perowne quickly falls behind in the match, he takes a break in the locker room to clear his mind: "[I]t seems to Perowne that to forget, to obliterate a whole universe of public phenomena in order to concentrate is a *fundamental liberty*" (McEwan 110, *emphases added*). McEwan blatantly applies Arnold's theory to the text. Regardless of the outcome of the match, the significance of this passage is that McEwan privileges the free play of ideas.

Aside from the manifestation of disinterestedness, McEwan incorporates the themes of civil unrest and anarchy. In "Dover Beach," the "grating roar" the speaker hears is essentially the roar of humanity. In the second stanza, the speaker imagines Sophocles associating the sound with the "turbid ebb and flow / Of human misery" (Arnold 17-8). The speaker pleads to his lover to "be true," because there is no "certitude, nor peace, nor help for pain" (29, 34). In the final lines of the poem, the speaker states that they are on a "darkling plain" "[w]here

ignorant armies clash by night" (35, 37). Beneath the "calmness" of the sea, there is civil unrest and anarchy. Arnold would argue that the anarchy generates from the absence of culture—the absence of perfection. Humanity has ventured toward extreme ideas, and has lost the "passion of doing good." Thus, humanity is caught in the reflux of misery.

McEwan incorporates the themes of civil unrest and anarchy in three facets of the novel. First, the anti-war protests that surround Perowne's Saturday are an obvious form of civil unrest. The protests indicate a sample of the population's discontent with the government's foreign affairs. Moreover, they convey a clash of opinions that exists amongst citizens. For example, when Perowne's daughter, Daisy, arrives home, she has a verbal altercation about the potential war with her father: "'Daddy, you're not *for* the war, are you?'" (McEwan 192) The conversation escalates as the two fervently defend their political stances. Secondly, the two confrontations between Perowne and Baxter are another form of civil disruption. They are literal forms of civil unrest because of the violence that is present, but they also represent disruption between classes—between the privileged and the unprivileged. Thus, McEwan juxtaposes civil unrest based on socio-economic status with that based on political association. Thirdly, the potential Iraq War indicates *global* anarchy. McEwan illustrates how globalization has complicated foreign affairs, as the decisions of one nation affect the decisions of many. He suggests that the reflux of human misery is very much relevant in the modern age.

But the reader must examine the *purpose* of intertextuality in *Saturday*. Why does "Dover Beach" have such an influence on the narrative form and thematic configuration of the text? What is the relevancy of Victorianism in a contemporary novel? The answer lies in the manner in which McEwan redefines some of the main premises of Arnoldian theory. For example, McEwan redefines Arnold's idea about poetry through Baxter's transformation. The immediate impression of Baxter is that he is an angry individual, who is insecure about his early display of Huntington's Disease and his socio-economical background. His

physical altercation with Perowne derives from a predisposition to assert physical control as a means to counter his deteriorating mind and body. This is illustrated when Baxter prevents his friend from stealing Perowne's wallet: "'We don't want his money'" (93). For Baxter, the purpose is not to rob Perowne, but to attain physical dominance. Baxter's desire for physical superiority causes him to pursue Perowne at the end of the novel. His intention to rape Perowne's daughter, Daisy, is, once again, an opportunity to assert physical control. However, his intentions change after Daisy recites Arnold's "Dover Beach," which he believes is a poem she wrote. During the recitation, Perowne notices Baxter "listening to the waves 'bring the eternal note of sadness in'" (230). Suddenly transfixed by the poem, Baxter repeats in admiration, "'You wrote that'" (231). Arnold would suggest that Baxter was transformed by the poet's disinterestedness—the poet's engagement with "sweetness and light"—and the essential beauty of the poem. Although McEwan privileges the poet, he does so in a manner which is not consistent with Arnoldian theory. Baxter states that the poem "'makes [him] think about where [he] grew up'" (231). In his first altercation with Perowne, Baxter reveals that he is from Folkestone, which is conveniently in the same county as Dover. Therefore, Baxter is moved by the poem because he finds parallels to his life. The underlining melancholy associated with the "ebb and flow" of the tide has personal relevance to him. Without these "ulterior" forces, which Arnold argues to dismiss, perhaps Baxter's antagonism would not have readily subsided. Thus, McEwan redefines Arnold's ideas about poetry to suggest that one's perception of beauty is influenced by one's history. It's not that Baxter appreciated the beauty of the poem for itself, but rather because it had significance to his youth and internal misery.

McEwan continues to redefine Arnoldian theory through the circumstances surrounding Perowne's operation on Baxter. After Baxter is distracted, Perowne and his son, Theo, shove Baxter down a flight of stairs. Baxter is rushed to the hospital, and soon Perowne is called in to perform an emergency operation. Perowne is faced with a dilemma: He can choose not to operate on Baxter, even though he is the most qualified person to save his life; or he can operate on Baxter

and save the life of a man who threatened his family. As previously mentioned, McEwan provides Perowne with several opportunities to be a disinterested observer. However, throughout the novel, the reader must question Perowne's effectiveness. Ultimately, one can argue that the only time Perowne displays disinterestedness is at the end of the novel when he decides to operate on Baxter. He is able to objectively view the situation without the hindrance of outside forces. He upholds Arnold's assertion that a cultured person has a "passion of doing good." Perowne tells his wife that he "'want[s] to go'" and operate on Baxter (246). Regardless of what Baxter has done, Perowne views the situation, within itself, as an opportunity to do "good" and remove human suffering. But McEwan redefines Arnoldian theory in the ambivalence Perowne feels after the surgery. Perowne finds himself sitting by the unconscious Baxter:

But now he's here, almost by accident, he has to stay a while, and he won't doze off because he's feeling too many things, he's alive to too many contradictory impulses. [...] Feelings have become in this respect like light itself [...]. (271)

This passage pertains to Arnold's idea of "sweetness and light." There is "sweetness" in saving a life, but what can account for the "contradictory impulses" Perowne feels? McEwan suggests that there is knowledge, "light," to be gained in this ambivalence. As his night comes to an end, the free indirect discourse reveals that Perowne "knows how the system works—the difference between good and bad care is near-infinite" (288). In other words, there is a thin line between good and bad actions. Although Perowne has saved Baxter's life, perhaps he has paved the way for a lifelong struggle with Huntington's Disease. Thus, McEwan suggests that Arnold's ideas of "doing good" and pursuing "perfection" are not as practical as Arnold believed them to be. There is a "near-infinite" complexity to the fundamentals of human ethics.

The intertextuality in *Saturday* has a bearing on the overall structure of the novel. McEwan shapes *Saturday* according to the themes and structure of "Dover Beach." Since Arnold interweaves his cultural theory in his poem, those ideas are pertinent to *Saturday*. McEwan uses the opportunity to redefine some of

Arnold's main premises. However, McEwan is not directly criticizing Arnold's ideas. The fact that he incorporates Arnold's poem and theory in his novel indicates an admiration for Arnold's work. Arnold's ideas have already been revised and expanded upon by many cultural theorists. McEwan simply suggests that there is attractiveness to the fundamentals of Arnoldian theory. The humanist approach to do "good" and tend "towards sweetness and light" is at the heart of McEwan's discussion of modern ethics. However, as McEwan demonstrates in the consciousness of Perowne, it is difficult to discern good actions from bad, as globalization has made ethical decisions evermore complex.

Works Cited

- Arnold, Matthew. "Dover Beach." Reprinted in *Saturday* by Ian McEwan. New York, Anchor: 2005. Print.
- Leitch, Vincent B., et al., eds. *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. Norton: New York, 2001. Print.
- Arnold, Matthew. "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time." Leitch, et al. 806-25.
- Arnold, Matthew. From *Culture and Anarchy*. Leitch, et al. 825-32.
- McEwan, Ian. *Saturday*. New York, Anchor: 2005. Print.

The Geopolitical Responsibility of the Postmodern *Flâneur* in *Saturday*

Ian McEwan's *flâneur* novel, *Saturday*, follows the urban pedestrian, Henry Perowne, observing postmodern London from his plush, 7,000 square foot flat. A privileged neurosurgeon, Perowne often misreads the world he sees beneath him. Unlike Baudelaire's *flâneur*, Perowne unsuccessfully interprets the various situations he encounters throughout his Saturday in the city. During his "mismeeting" with Baxter, a lower class, diseased thug, Perowne's misguided interpretation only prolongs a later confrontation, as he is forced to face Baxter again in his home. But *Saturday* is more than a novel about the post-modern *flâneur*; it is also an allegory for the first world, characterized by Perowne, and its ethical responsibility to developing countries, figured as Baxter. Through Perowne's unsuccessful *flânerie* and his unjust treatment of Baxter, McEwan concludes that the West is failing geopolitically. While Perowne heroically restores Baxter to health as the novel closes, he has only made a minor restitution, and has not completely developed his ethical responsibility from a position of privilege.

Henry Perowne is not a successful *flâneur*, according to Baudelaire's implication in Mary Gluck's essay, "Reimagining the *Flâneur*: The Hero of the Novel in Lukacs, Bakhtin, and Girard." According to Gluck, Baudelaire assesses that the *flâneur* is more than "[a] passive consumer of the urban spectacle. [He is, more importantly,] a meticulous observer and recorder of experience in the city" (Gluck 3). Baudelaire's *flâneur* was a medium for the actions taking place in the city, properly perceptive and receptive to his surroundings. Perowne, however, is a sub-standard *flâneur*, for he mostly observes the postmodern city (symbolic for the globe) not from the street, connected to the city and its people, but from his padded flat. Amusing himself in the middle of the night, the narrator relates to the reader:

Standing here...gazing towards Charlotte Street...Henry

thinks the city is a success, a brilliant invention, a biological masterpiece—millions teeming around the accumulated and layered achievements of the centuries, as though around a coral reef, sleeping, working, entertaining themselves, harmonious for the most part, nearly everyone wanting it to work (McEwan 3).

Henry fails to understand the complexity of the city (and the world) and therefore glamorizes it. He only sees the city from his privileged perspective, characterizing it as beautiful and perfect, and fails to recognize the poverty, the filth, and the crime coexisting with his utopian vision.

Not only does Perowne misread the actions in the city, he also literally misreads the literature Daisy suggests for him. After reading *Anna Karenina* and *Madame Bovary*, “What did he grasp, after all? That adultery is understandable but wrong, that nineteenth-century women had a hard time of it, that Moscow and the Russian countryside and provincial France were just so” (65). Perowne reduces the masterpieces to their plots and settings, and fails to properly interpret the details, just as he fails to properly interpret his social world.

Lacking imagination and imposing a misconception of his world, Perowne fails to act ethically toward his foil, Baxter. During the jarring accident that interrupts his day off, Perowne again misinterprets what is unfolding. He sees the confrontation with Baxter as “play-acting”. At their first meeting after the accident, Perowne arrogantly believes he will control the situation. Beginning in indirect discourse followed by free indirect discourse, the narrator relates Perowne’s inability to see the danger in the confrontation:

But here on University Street it’s impossible not to feel that play-acting is about to begin...He is cast in a role, and there’s no way out. This, as people like to say, is urban drama. A century of movies and a half a century of television have rendered the matter insincere. It is pure artifice....And despite the varied and casual dress code, there are rules as elaborate as the politesse of the Versailles court that no set of genes can express (86-7).

Even in this encounter with a man who will later terrorize his family, Perowne

is uninvolved and passive. He thinks nothing will happen, that he will escape danger, because he does not believe that a person of Baxter's social status could possibly challenge or harm Perowne's status and privilege as a neurosurgeon. If Perowne had seen so many films involving confrontation with criminals, he should realize that he is in danger. Instead, he again misreads the situation, imposing his view that it is "pure artifice," that no harm will come to him. This passage exposes Perowne as a failing *flâneur*, according to Martina Lauster, who thinks that a successful *flâneur* "passes on his ability to capture his own dynamic present...in a moment of insight" (141). Perowne is nowhere near his own dynamic present; he is instead visualizing his encounter with Baxter as though it were a television show.

Because Perowne is emotionally distant from Baxter, he does nothing to help him, even though Perowne knows that Baxter is physically damaged by Huntington's disease and cannot be held completely responsible for his actions. Perowne pretends to offer help to Baxter, but then abandons him in the street. In the same way, it can be said that Britain and the U.S. have offered to "liberate" struggling nations and peoples, but have also not completely followed through with the offered help, later abandoning the nations. Perowne and Baxter's allegorical status, geopolitically, is identified through the novel's backdrop: the march against the Iraqi war. This context situates *Saturday* with Virginia Woolf's *flâneur* intertext, Mrs. Dalloway. In *Saturday*, McEwan explicitly dialogues with Mrs. Dalloway's criticism of the Post-WWI predicament, which abandoned the Armenian population as a result of Britain's agreement with Turkey that resulted in the creation of Iraq as a nation. By reminding readers of British history in the Middle East in terms of genocide, McEwan suggests a moral and ethical responsibility to act justly in geopolitics. For Daryl Charles, this means the West "[has] a crucial role to play in helping bring about restitution for those who have suffered gross injustice..." (87). Just as Perowne will later discover his own obligation to restore Baxter, so too does the West have a "moral obligation proceed[ing] from charity [to take responsibility for the Third World, including Iraq] in the context of social-politic[s]..." (87). Furthermore, through *Saturday*,

McEwan supports the belief that “the justness of the cause is irrelevant;... no individual state may presume to take even the cause of justice into its own hands...” (Murray qtd. in Charles 89). For McEwan, it is unethical to force liberty on developing countries, even if it seems just.

But Perowne cannot see his obligation to Baxter because he imposes a view that Baxter is not his responsibility. To Perowne, it is mere chance that Baxter has Huntington’s disease, and he believes he can do little to help him. Perowne constantly reaffirms his belief that influence and social position have no effect on a person’s outcome. As he reflects on the differences he sees in his children, Perowne remarks to himself:

It’s a commonplace of parenting and modern genetics that parents have little or no influence on the characters of their children... Opportunities, health, prospects, accent, table manners—these might lie within your power to shape. But what really determines the sort of person who’s coming to live with you is...[their biology]; it can be quite an affront to parental self-regard...On the other hand, it can let you off the hook (25).

Perowne wants to see life as a matter of biological chance, because the belief in random assigning of biologically determined factors releases him from any responsibility for his children, and for Baxter. If he can’t control or influence his own children, according to Perowne, then how can he have any effect on the life of a complete stranger? Perowne is able to walk away from the conflict reaffirmed in his belief that chance, and not social position or moral action, determines outcome.

In the same way, McEwan suggests that due to a lack of understanding about the complexity of the geopolitical world, the West also takes the position of Perowne, that peoples in the Third World are suffering because of chance. Since the inhabitants of developing countries are of lower status in comparison to Westernized countries, Westerners feel sorry for them, instead of acting hospitably from their place of privileged position. If Perowne had acted ethically to Baxter that Saturday on University Street, he would have been exerting, according to

Meyda Yegenoglu, “the ethics of hospitality, the welcome made to the other, [which] entails the subordination or putting in question of the freedom of the subject and an interruption of the self as other” (31). Perowne fails to subordinate his privilege to Baxter’s poverty. Until Perowne rejects the otherness he sees in Baxter, and accepts Baxter as an equal but opposite image of himself, he will not resolve the conflict in the novel. Baxter is only peripheral to Perowne’s centrality. Likewise, the Third World will always be peripheral to the centrality of the West, as long as the West asserts its control over developing countries and sees those countries as other.

Fortunately, but only after being held hostage in his home by Baxter and his criminal friend, Perowne realizes he must accept Baxter’s otherness and extend hospitality to him. After Baxter is injured from his fall down the stairs, Perowne decides to operate on his damaged skull, bringing Baxter back to life. He also decides not to press criminal charges against Baxter for breaking into his home and terrorizing his family. For McEwan, this is the moment of Perowne’s awakening, as Perowne realizes:

the matter must be dropped...Baxter has a diminishing slice of life worth living, before his nightmarish descent into nightmarish hallucination begins. [He] can make [...] arrangements, do what he can to make the patient comfortable, somehow (288).

For the first time on Saturday, Henry Perowne moves toward a more ethical position concerning Baxter’s fate. He finally sees that his connection to Baxter is more than just a mismeeting in the street, and operates, according to Reinhold Niebuhr, from “ ‘the compulsion of conscience, the force of the sense of obligation, operating against other impulses in the personality’ ” (qtd. in Charles 101). Perowne now faces the conflict and begins to reconcile, with Baxter, extending hospitality toward his other.

And yet, Perowne struggles with a solid sense of hospitality. After definitively deciding to help Baxter, he is comforted to know that “By saving his life in the operating theatre, Henry also committed Baxter to his torture. Revenge enough” (McEwan 288). One moment Perowne is deciding to protect Baxter’s

future and allow him to die in peace, and the next he desires revenge.

Because of Perowne's duplicity, McEwan suggests that Perowne will not remain enlightened. He will continue to act out of privilege and misinterpret his social world. For in Perowne's own words, "moments of precise reckoning are rare in real life; questions of misinterpretation are not often resolved. Nor do they remain pressingly unresolved. They simply fade" (159). Perowne relates to readers his doubleness, for even his belief in chance and genetic predisposition was apparently, not a moment of "precise reckoning". Perowne's unsuccessful *flânerie* is once more revealed, and the reader concludes that Perowne is, at best, fatally ambiguous.

Furthermore, Perowne's final thoughts give insight into his moral ambiguity. As he lays down to sleep with Rosalind, he thinks to himself, "There's always this...And then: there's only this. And at last, faintly, falling: this day's over" (289). Perowne decides that all that matters in life is the intimacy within his marriage. He hasn't retained what he learned from his encounter with Baxter: that he and Baxter are equals. He falls back into his privileged arrogance, believing there is nothing else of value in the world but his own happiness. The phrase "this day's over" foreshadows the beginning of the next day, when Perowne will inevitably wake with the same perspective he held while waking up on Saturday morning.

Through the concluding lines of the novel, which reveal Perowne's inability to remain a changed man, McEwan suggests that the West will also remain unchanged. While Britain and the U.S. will inevitably initiate war with Iraq and remove Saddam Hussein and his regime from their position of tyrannical power (in the frame of the novel), they will ultimately choose to remain another to the peoples of Iraq. The West may offer small attempts at ethical hospitality, but like Perowne, power and privilege are difficult to let go of, or even share. The West, like Perowne, will remain a failing *flâneur*, taking the position of Perowne as he lay down to sleep, that "there's only this" privilege and status. The First World will also pretend that the struggles and suffering of developing peoples and nations does not exist, because they will not disrupt the comfort of "this" life.

And if, in mismeetings with developing countries, the West has a small encounter with the suffering of the Iraqi, or other struggling peoples, McEwan concludes the West will simply remain inactive, and blame the circumstance on chance. Just like the brilliant Henry Perowne.

Works Cited

- Charles, Daryl J. "Between Pacificism and Crusade: Justice and Neighbor Love in the Just-War Tradition." *Logos*. 8.4. Fall (2005): 87-124. Print.
- Gluck, Mary. "Reimagining the *Flaneur*: The Hero of the Novel in Lukacs, Bakhtin, and Girard." *Modernism/Modernity*. 13.1 (2006): 747-764. Print.
- Lauster, Martina. "Walter Benjamin's Myth of the *Flaneur*." *Modern Language Review*. 102. (2007): 139-56. Print.
- McEwan, Ian. *Saturday*. New York: Anchor Books, 2005. Print.
- Yegenoglu, Meyda. "Liberal Multiculturalism and the Ethics of Hospitality in the Age Of Globalization." *PMC*. 13.2. (2003): 1-45. Print.