NKU NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

PENTANGLE

Established 1992

Pentangle's History

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

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

Submission Guidelines

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

Editorial Policy

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

Contents

Portrayals of a Boy's Loneliness: C. S. Lewis' *Dawn Treader* and Philip Pullman's *The Subtle Knife*

Sara Leonhartsberger

While diametrically opposed in theological mindset, Philip Pullman's *The Subtle Knife* and C. S. Lewis' *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader* both feature an adolescent protagonist that is isolated from and must reconnect to society. In *The Subtle Knife,* twelve-year-old Will Parry struggles with the absence of parental guidance and his uncertain environment yet develops an independent personality through his struggles. In contrast to Will, Eustace Clarence Scrubb in *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader* possesses a sense of superiority fostered by the controlling influence of his parents; through the environment of certainty surrounding him, however, Eustace forms a dependent personality that proves detrimental to his adaptability. Although Will Parry's means of isolation evoke sympathy while Eustace Scrubb's isolation seems well-deserved, both boys reconnect to society by similar means of realized loneliness, unavoidable incapacitation, and mysterious power figures. However, the societies that Will and Eustace join differ in their sustainability, a final nuance between Pullman and Lewis.

Being introduced to Will's character through his act of ensuring the safety of his mentally-disabled mother, readers are alerted to

the abnormality of the situation yet immediately are encouraged to sympathize with him. Will intends to isolate himself further from society with his quest for the green leather writing case, but his reassurance to Mrs. Cooper that he will "be back soon, and I'll take her [his mother] home again, I promise" (Pullman 3) indicates his dedication to his mother. Furthermore, the interchange of Mrs. Parry's look of "such trust" and Will's look of "love and reassurance" (Pullman 3) establishes credibility for Will's identifiable character. If Will is willing to leave behind his mother that he loves for this unknown quest, readers can reasonably assume that his chosen further isolation is worthy of sympathy.

Conversely, through Eustace's unfavorable introduction as an intrusive, egotistical nuisance, readers may readily wish for him to isolate himself entirely from the entirety of *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader*. Indeed, within the opening line describing him as "a boy called Eustace Clarence Scrubb, and he almost deserved it" (Lewis 425), a blatant condemnation of Eustace's character is made by the narrator. Further revelations of Eustace's love of "bossing and bullying" and knowledge of "dozens of ways to give people a bad time" (Lewis 425) certainly detract from any reader's compulsion to sympathize with the boy, and his belittlement of Edmund and Lucy for their belief in Narnia and his persistence in "hanging about and grinning" (427) merely to irk his cousins swiftly become rather tiresome. In addition to his other isolating traits, Eustace also overhears his cousins' conversation by "listening at the door" (Lewis 427), having little regard to privacy in order to gather more material for his continued harassment of Edmund and Lucy; learning that Eustace has no name among friends for "he had none" (Lewis 425) cannot elicit much surprise from readers. Not only is Eustace isolated from *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader's* society through his repugnant behavior, but he is also excluded from readers' sympathies.

Though Will's quest in *The Subtle Knife* involves searching for his father, John Parry's physical absence and Mrs. Parry's mental absence in Will's childhood already contribute to his isolated state. Parental guidance serves a pivotal role in child development, whether positively or negatively, as the following study discovered. According to psychologist Karin Grossmann and her colleagues, children who have a secure relationship with their father and a secure attachment with their mother are more likely to overcome mental challenges and disappointments. Their findings demonstrate that fathers who played interactive games with their infants were more willingly to teach their children new developmental skills at age six, while mothers who were

more nurturing to their infants were more likely to offer emotional support later in their children's lives (Grossmann 858-859). Will, however, is not granted the positive reinforcement of his father's presence, let alone a secure relationship: John Parry "had vanished long before Will was able to remember him" (Pullman 9). Lacking a father's presence to encourage him to interact with others, Will chooses to isolate himself from all others except his mother.

While Mrs. Parry is physically present to provide a home for Will, her mental state is precarious, as first recognized by Will when he is seven years old. After participating in a game to avoid enemy detection by carefully placing groceries in the shopping cart, Will soon realizes that his mother finds the game to be based on "real danger" instead; yet this danger, he discovers, resides solely within her own mind (Pullman 9). At this juncture, mother and son's roles reverse, with Will vowing to protect her from the perceived danger in her mind as well as an outside world hostile to those with mental illnesses. When school boys harm Mrs. Parry for her illness, Will recounts to Lyra how he fought the lead boy responsible for the attack, breaking his arm and "some of his teeth" (Pullman 262). Fearing that his mother will be taken away from him, Will also forgoes friendship, because "friends come to your house and they know your parents" (Pullman 263), which might put her in jeopardy. As sole protector of his mother's fragile mental state and freedom, Will removes himself constantly from society to ensure her safety, her needs superseding his own. Both the physical and mental absence of his parents create a societal void within Will as social integration could not be taught to him by either parent.

In contrast to the absence of Will's parents, the controlling influence of Eustace's parents cultivates a sense of superiority in Eustace that alienates him further from society. Although brief, the description of Harold and Alberta Scrubb as "up-to-date and advanced people" who are "vegetarians, non-smokers, and tee-totallars" evokes an image of people with a heady belief in their own rightness and a disregard of opinions other than their own, no matter how widely accepted (Lewis 425). Naturally, parents are inclined to transfer their worldview to their children, which will affect their child's mentality toward society and interpersonal relationships. As psychologists Daphne Bugentel and Joan E. Grusec discuss in their article "Socialization Processes", parents serve a vital role in children's ability to connect with others; for example, parents who are harsh and authoritative with their children will produce children either unsure of themselves or aggressive toward society (369). In Lewis'

novel, Harry and Alberta Scrubb produce a child sure of himself and aggressive to any society unable to align with his worldview. Eustace does not "approve" of what he believes to be the made-up Narnia, for "he was far too stupid to make up anything up himself" (Lewis 427). Instead of admitting his lack of imagination, Eustace derides what he cannot or will not understand.

Eustace is unwilling to acknowledge the reality of Narnia because his identity is rooted in the realm of factual information learned in books. This is shown in the first entry of his *Dawn Treader* diary when he ridicules Caspian's pride in "showing off his funny little toy boat as if it was the *Queen Mary*. I tried to tell him what real ships are like, but he's too dense" (Lewis 437). Both Eustace's pride in his own factual knowledge and his belief in his resulting superiority gained over Caspian are evident; the diary entry serves as only the first of numerous instances of Eustace's mentality. Eustace's prideful attitude isolates him, eliciting many groans and much discontentment from his fellow travelers. *The Dawn Treader's* first mate Rhince even mutters "good riddance if he has" in response to the theory that Eustace might have been killed by wild beasts (Lewis 465). Through their controlling influence, Eustace's parents instill an intolerant, condescending worldview within their son that isolates him from the world of Narnia.

In contrast, because of his parents' absence in his life, Will Parry constantly resides in an environment of uncertainty, yet his resulting adaptability allows him to survive within this environment. Without his father's guidance or his mother's provision, Will alone must make decisions, awakening suspicion and hesitancy to trust anyone but himself; his view of the world is that of a pessimistic realist, not of a hopeful child. According to Bugentel and Grusec, environment heavily factors in a child's social development, either positively or negatively. (391). While his uncertain environment fosters a negative view of society, a positive facet of hope still lingers in Will's longing for his father's return, believing that "he'd [John Parry] know exactly what to do about everything—about my mother especially—and she'd get better and he'd look after her and me and I could just go to school and have friends …" (Pullman 263). Although Will cannot remember his father, he associates stability with John Parry, motivating him to seek out his father in order to change his environment of uncertainty.

Paradoxically, the adaptability that enables Will to successfully embark on the quest for his father is developed within the environment of uncertainty he wishes to escape. Acutely aware of his surroundings—a skill developed in order to protect his mother—the

boy notices an abnormality in a tabby cat's behavior, prompting him to follow it to a window between worlds. Whereas other twelve-year-olds would be hesitant to enter an unknown realm, Will does not "hesitate: he pushed his tote bag through, and then scrambled through himself, through the hole in the fabric of this world and into another" (Pullman 15). If Will had not been exposed to an environment of uncertainty throughout his life, the likelihood of him entering the window would have been lessened, limiting his chances to succeed on his journey. Although longing to escape the uncertainty his parents' absence has thrust upon him, Will gains the adaptability necessary for his survival through his current environment.

Eustace Scrubb, by contrast, dwells within an environment of certainty which debilitates his adaptability to unknown situations. Constricted by his narrow world view and dependence upon informational books, Eustace desires either to destroy or deride what he cannot comprehend, as demonstrated by his reaction to the picture in Aunt Alberta's spare bedroom and to Reepicheep. When the picture begins to come alive within the spare bedroom, Eustace declares that he will "smash the rotten thing," unwilling to accept the possibility of its existence as an independent, unknown realm (Lewis 428). Likewise, upon Reepicheep's arrival, Eustace scornfully insults the mouse by exclaiming that "performing animals [are] silly and vulgar and—and sentimental" (Lewis 430). By comparing the talking mouse to a circus act, Eustace attempts to align Reepicheep's presence with his idea of reality. To ease his unaccustomed uncertainty, the boy resorts to destruction and insults to reassert his dominance in this new world.

Eustace's certainty in his factual knowledge further hinders him when confronted by the dragon. The narrator tells the readers that Eustace "had read only the wrong books. They had a lot to say about exports and imports and governments and drains, but they were weak on dragons" (Lewis 464). Eustace's inability to recognize the dragon or to consider the curse commonly associated with dragon's gold derives from his certainty that "factual" knowledge is the only worthwhile sort of knowledge. Entrenched within his own environment of certainty, Eustace is inherently incapable of adapting to unknown environments, situations, and ideas.

Caused by his existence in an environment of uncertainty, Will Parry forms an independent personality that enables self-preservation. Psychologist William W. Hartup explains that independence within children rarely occurs unless they are forced by sudden, tragic means to assert independence (353). Although caring for his mother served

as the beginning of Will's independence, the catalyst for his fully realized independence occurs after Will accidently kills a man who breaks into Will's house (Pullman 6-7). The sudden act forces Will to flee to Oxford, where he begins his life of self-preservation (Pullman 13). The culmination of his ability to survive arrives in the form of his fight with Tullio in Ci'gazze; although his opponent is older and taller, Will is able to win the fight (Pullman 173-176). Will's independent personality, formed by his parents' absence, enables him to survive in his tumultuous world, allowing him to navigate through difficult situations.

Furthered by his environment of certainty, Eustace exhibits a dependent personality through his faith in his parents and in institutions. Eustace's faith in his parents appears in one of his diary entries that describes his argument with Caspian that Lucy should not be treated differently from the rest of the crew; Eustace refers to Alberta's belief that women being treated with deference is "lowering girls" (Lewis 438). Even within a separate society, Eustace draws upon his mother's beliefs as the truth instead of forming his own opinion. Related to Eustace's faith in institutions, educational psychologist Louis A. Chandler, argues that a dependent child "adopts a more assertive, demanding manner to have [his] needs met" (Chandler 52). This "demanding manner" is shown when Eustace frequently demands to be brought to the British Consul, convinced that an institution that he is familiar with and trusts will better provide for his needs than the crew of the *Dawn Treader* (Lewis 442, 452). Eustace's entire mindset is governed by a blind faith in both his parents and in familiar institutions.

Although dissimilar in personality and environment, both Will and Eustace travel down an identical path to integration within society. Psychologist Roy F. Baumeister and his colleagues explore the role of emotion in decision making in their studies of social thinking and behavior, including the statement that "current emotions can alter decisions" (147). After realizing their isolated state through the emotion of loneliness, Will and Eustace both desire to reshape their role in society, longing for inclusion after lives of seclusion. Aligning with psychologists John Clausen's and Judith Williams' belief that "incorporation in relationships with others" and "formal instruction . . . given by a specialist" are required components for child socialization (63), Will and Eustace both form interpersonal relationships to begin interacting with society and receive instruction from authoritative figures to fully integrate within society.

While the circumstances surrounding their isolation vastly differ,

both Will and Eustace's first step to reconnecting with society follows after a moment of realized loneliness. Although Baumeiter and colleagues caution that emotion can be "detrimental" as "the direct guidance of behavioral choices" (147), both boys are driven by emotion to realize their desire to rejoin society. For Will Parry, the moment in which he experiences the full weight of his isolated state occurs after the loss of his two fingers in Ci'gazze. Bleeding profusely from the gaping wound, Will attempts to create a window with the Subtle Knife, yet instead thinks of his mother, separated from him by an entire world. The thought of her prompts him to "crouch low, hugging his wounded hand, and cry…The sobs rack his throat and his chest…he is desolate" (Pullman 182). Now physically separated from both of his parents and unable to receive comfort from them in his wounded, weakened state, Will emotionally cracks, aware of how alone he truly is. When Pantalaimon does reach out to comfort Will, the fact that the heretofore emotionally-reserved Will allows Lyra's daemon to comfort him demonstrates a shift in Will's isolation (Pullman 182). Will recognizes his isolation and accepts the need for others.

In similar fashion, Eustace only recognizes his isolation from society after his transformation into a dragon. At first glorying in the superiority of strength that his dragon form offers, Eustace has a moment of revelation that "he was a monster cut off from the whole human race…an appalling loneliness came over him...when he thought of this the poor dragon that had been Eustace lifted up its voice and wept" (Lewis 466-467). Because he is transformed into a dragon, Eustace experiences remorse and realizes his isolated state. Physically stronger than he has ever been in his life, the boy weakens emotionally, becoming vulnerable and aware of how his past actions have led to his isolation. Eustace suddenly questions "if he himself had been such a nice person as he had always supposed" (Lewis 466). Eustace's realized loneliness immediately shifts his behavior, as he allows Lucy to "console him [and] to kiss [his] scaly face" (Lewis 470). Recognizing his isolation in this moment of dragonish loneliness, Eustace desires to connect with a society from which his behavior has ostracized him.

The second step toward reconnection with society shared by Will and Eustace follows their incapacitation; both are forced to begin reconnection when they have no alternative. Although Clausen and Williams note that often societies seek to shape their boys to exhibit "self-reliance and achievement-striving" capabilities, other societies are "characterized [by] high co-operative interaction" (66). After the loss of his two fingers, Will greatly weakens through continuous

blood loss. While previously fiercely independent, the boy must allow Lyra to aid him, as she "tie[s] a bit of rope around [his] arm [and] urge[s] him down the steps" immediately following the loss of his fingers (Pullman 177). Will's need to depend on Lyra is exhibited in a growing trust of her, as demonstrated in his instructions that Lyra "take something in your rucksack for me, in case we can't come back here. It is only letters" (Pullman 192). These letters, however, are letters from John Parry to Mrs. Parry, valuable possessions in their son's eyes for sentiment and content; Will entrusting their security to Lyra demonstrates Will's acceptance of her presence in his life. After losing further blood, Will also allows the witches from Lyra's world to attempt to heal him. Initially wary of any strangers, Will accepts Lyra's validation of the witches and "let[s] the spell go on" as Serafina Pekkala chants over him, even "urging his leaking blood to listen and obey" (Pullman 256). Because his blood loss compels him to accept aid, Will also begins to accept both Lyra and the witches' society, allowing tentative connections to form.

Correspondingly, the dragonized Eustace, unable to rejoin the human race, attempts to join himself to the crew by becoming useful. While Will allows others to aid him, Eustace aids others in ways he either refused to or was not capable of previously as a human. Dragonized Eustace flies "over the whole island and found it was all mountainous" and kills goats and swine "as provisions for the ship" (Lewis 471). The dragon Eustace brings back a "tall pine tree" for the *Dawn Treader's* mast and keeps the crew warm by both being a source of heat and starting fires with his fiery breath (Lewis 471). Eustace's negative physical transformation sparks a positive behavioral transformation, in which he becomes eager to help others. Indeed, his assistance to the crew produces a "pleasure (quite new to him) of being liked, and, still more, of liking other people [which] kept Eustace from despair" (Lewis 471). Although he is still physically separated from reintegration within the crew's society, Eustace learns how to emotionally and behaviorally connect with society through his incapacitating dragon form.

Both Will and Eustace are painfully healed and decisively reintegrated into society by a mysterious power figure, whose appearance marks the final step in their reconnection with society. As Clausen and Williams mention, a "designation of agents charged with the responsibility of child care and tutelage" is an integral step in the socialization process of a child (63). Almost delirious through blood loss after the witches' spell fails to stop the bleeding, Will decides to climb up the looming mountainside, impelled by

"a need to move and keep moving" so that "he hardly noticed the pain in his hand anymore" (Pullman 316). Once he reaches the top, the boy is confronted by "a grip on his right arm" and combats his unknown assailant, the darkness masking the man's identity. The man even lands a "dizzying blow on the back of [Will's] head" (Pullman 317) and leaves "every nerve in [Will's] body ringing and dizzy and throbbing" (Pullman 318). However painful their initial encounter, the man, Stanislaus Grumman, proves to be the only one who can heal Will's wound, applying a salve that sends a "marvelous soothing coolness" into Will's hand (Pullman 318). Grumman serves a further purpose by imparting his knowledge of the Subtle Knife to Will, instructing him to deliver the knife to Lord Asriel as the weapon to defeat The Authority (Pullman 319-320). In this way, Grumman not only saves Will's life but also give him new purpose. As the Subtle Knife's wielder, Will has a potential purpose within Asriel's rebellion, should Will choose to deliver the knife to him; however, he would have been unaware of this purpose without Grumman's guidance. Through his healing and instruction, Grumman provides Will the means to escape his isolated state.

Likewise, Eustace returns both to his human form and the society of the crew through the painful yet necessary intervention of Aslan, known to the *Dawn Treader's* crew, yet an unknown figure to Eustace. As Eustace relates to Edmund after the events transpire, "a huge lion…told me to follow it…We came to the top of a mountain…with a well" (Lewis 474). Although the lion asks him to undress before entering the well, Eustace is unable to completely peel off his dragon skin, leading to Aslan's action of "pulling the skin off," though to Eustace "it hurt worse than anything I've ever felt" (Lewis 474-475). The lion completes the healing process by throwing Eustace into the well and providing clothes for him; this allows Eustace to return to the others' society, even prompting Eustace to "apologize…I'm afraid I've been rather beastly" (Lewis 475). Aslan's plunging of Eustace into the well not only clears away the dragon skin but also cleanses Eustace of his rotten, sour-faced behavior. Eustace begins the process of his integration into humanity through his useful acts as a dragon, but it is Aslan alone that can restore him to his human form and remind him of his changed role in society.

Despite all the similarities between Will's and Eustace's paths, Pullman and Lewis diverge in their depiction of lonely adolescents: while both Will and Eustace integrate into a society, the nature of those societies vastly differs. Whereas Will enters a disrupted, uncertain society, Eustace joins a stable, certain society. After Will's

potential role in Asriel's army is revealed to him by Grumman, Will is left uncertain if his newfound role will be wrenched away with that society's very possible downfall. Also, in rapid succession, the boy witnesses his father's murder, descends the mountainside to discover chaos and destruction awaiting him, and is separated from his most viable connection to society, Lyra (Pullman 322-326). The same uncertainty of environment that prompted his initial isolation follows Will to his integration within society.

Eustace, by contrast, is granted a stable state of society; he continues on the voyage of the *Dawn Treader* (Lewis 476), reunites with his parents (Lewis 541), and is essentially promised a return visit to Aslan's world by Aslan (Lewis 541). Eustace once again exists within an environment of certainty, yet his environment has expanded to further horizons or worlds. Instead of being confined to the worldview of his parents, Eustace gains insight into the world of Aslan, allowing him to navigate two societies instead of one alone.

Though brought into existence by authors whose worldviews are opposed, both *The Subtle Knife's* Will Parry and *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader's* Eustace Clarence Scrubb experience a similar state of isolation and a nearly identical path out of it. Will Parry isolates himself as a method of self-preservation, a reaction to an uncertain environment and absent parents; his isolation leads to an independent personality that adapts to adverse situations. Eustace Scrubb, on the other hand, is isolated by his sense of superiority fostered by a certain environment and controlling parents; his isolated state forms a dependent personality that is unable to adapt to unrecognized obstacles. Neither are able to reconnect with society until they are confronted by a shared realization of their loneliness, an inability to rely solely on themselves, and mysterious power figures that both heal their incapacitation and provide societies for the boys to enter. Still, Will's and Eustace's entrances into society are in stark contrast: the instability of Will's reintroduction to society contrasting with the stability of Eustace's integration into society. As Pullman's and Lewis' views contrast in nearly every aspect of their literature, the shared method of reintegration into society within their literature may reasonably point to an inherent truth of humanity. From Will and Eustace's similar journey from isolation to integration, one can infer the existence of a common human desire to be included, to belong to someone or something. Reasons for isolation differ, but all eventually seek similar means to belong.

Works Cited

Baumeister, Roy F., Kathleen D. Vohs, and Dianne M. Tice. "Emotional Influences on Decision Making." *Affect in Social Thinking and Behavior.* Ed. Joseph P. Forgas. New York: Psychology Press, 2006. 143-159. Print.

Bugentel, Daphne and Joan E. Grusec. "Socialization Processes." *Handbook of Child Psychology.* 6th ed. Vol. 3. Ed. Nancy Eisenberg, William Damon, and Richard M. Lerner. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 2006. 366-429. Print. 4 vols.

Chandler, Louis A. "Behavioral Responses of Children to Stress." *Stress in Childhood.* Ed. James H. Humphrey. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1984. 47-62. Print.

Clausen, John A. and Judith R. Williams. "Sociological Correlates of Child Behavior." Stevenson, Kagen, and Spiker 1963. 62-107.

Grossmann, Karin, Klaus E. Grossmann, Heinz Kindler, and Peter Zimmermann. "A Wider View of Attachment and Exploration: The Influence of Mothers and Fathers on the Development of Psychological Security from Infancy to Young Adulthood." *Handbook of Attachment: Theory, Research, and Clinical Applications.* 2nd ed. Ed. Judy Cassidy and Phillip R. Shaver. New York: The Guliford Press, 2008. 857-880. Print.

Hartup, William W. "Dependence and Independence." Stevenson, Kagan, and Spiker 333-364.

Lewis, C. S. *The Chronicles of Narnia.* New York: Harper Collins, 2008. Print.

Pullman, Philip. *The Subtle Knife.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997. Print.

Stevenson, Harold W., Jerome Kagan, and Charles Spiker, eds. *Child Psychology.* Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education, 1963. Print.

"Street angel and house devil"; Performative Gender and Identity in Nighttown

Hayley Kirley

    James Joyce's 1922 novel *Ulysses* shows a day in Dublin, 1904. The experimental novel is broken up into eighteen episodes. One of these episodes, "Circe", takes place in the red-light district of Dublin called Nighttown. All the events in "Circe" can be understood as a performance, and most of the characters that appear within Ulysses perform a part within "Circe". In the episode, the action, dialogue, and description of characters takes the form of a stage play. However, the play would be impossible to stage in part because of the fantastical nature of the costuming. For instance, throughout the episode characters undergo costume changes that would be impossible in real life. The descriptions of the costume changes are written in the stage direction without any consideration for whether or not the changes are feasible. Joyce purposefully does not account for the feasibility aspect of these costume changes. He uses the costume changes to indicate gender for his characters at that point in the performance. Since the characters' gender changes at a later point, he is signifying the fluid nature of gender identification. Analyzing the costuming and accessories in "Circe", especially those used by Mrs. Breen, Bella/Bello Cohen and Leopold Bloom provides insight into how Joyce questions

societal views on gender. He specifically uses costume changes and dialogue in "Circe" to show the performative nature of gender within Ulysses as well as in a broader concept of gender.

Many scholars have studied 'Circe' in relationship to its costuming and a performative gender reading. Crowley asserts that in "Circe", Joyce portrays, "costume as role" and "costume as pornography" (Crowley 3). By writing this chapter as a performance within another piece of work, Joyce gives himself permission to address taboo subjects by virtue of the fact that they are not literally 'real'. Bullough also supports this idea in his book on the commonplace cross-dressing in stage play. Bullough says that the gender ambiguity in cross-dressing, "allowed those greatly concerned with respectability to explore sexual boundaries at least on a subliminal level" (Bullough 227). Joyce explores these sexual and gender boundaries in a much more straightforward way. Not only do some of the characters 'cross-dress' but their gender also changes throughout the narrative. Examining the gender and gender signifying costume changes of the characters greatly enhances our understanding of *Ulysses* as a whole. Through the physical appearance of his characters, Joyce compels the reader to think about how gender influences their perception of the person. As Krouse says, the "bodies of these characters" can be seen, "as texts to-be-read" (130). Their physical appearance serves to give a better analysis of how the novel represents their gender overall.

It may, at first reading, seem like Bloom provides the stage direction in "Circe" since the chapter focuses on Bloom and his experience. A closer examination, however, shows that the stage direction comes from an omniscient narrator or the author himself. This is a more likely interpretation as the stage direction illustrates the overall gender representation within *Ulysses* rather than Bloom's personal views. When Mrs. Breen is first introduced within "Circe", she is described as, "Mrs. Breen in man's frieze overcoat with loose bellows pockets, stands in the causeway, her roguish eyes wideopen, smiling in all her herbivorous buckteeth" (Joyce 442). Joyce puts Mrs. Breen in a man's frieze overcoat, a masculine costume, to show outwardly masculine characteristics. Interestingly, he uses the possessive "man's frieze overcoat" which is purposefully unclear. This could mean a masculine styled overcoat or a coat that was actually owned by a man. There is nothing inherently masculine about an overcoat. Cultural norms decide what signifies costumes as masculine and feminine and these norms change over time. Regardless, Mrs. Breen is first described with masculine costuming, therefore signaling masculine traits. Mrs. Breen's outward appearance also appears "roguish"– a

typically masculine trait. Her entrance is akin to a young rake arriving in Nighttown. However, this outwardly masculine appearance inverts in the last part of this quote. Mrs. Breen is described as "smiling in all her herbivorous buckteeth". This description implies a predatory baring of the teeth or perhaps a derisive smile. Joyce turns the masculine aspect of this description on its head by putting the word "herbivorous" in front–which lightens the predatory aspect of baring of teeth. Although Mrs. Breen give the impression of a roguish masculine predator, she is not actually carnivorous. She has buckteeth rather than fangs. In this way, the description re-establishes the weaker, more feminine aspect to Mrs. Breen's appearance—her herbivorous nature as well as her buckteeth—in contrast to her outwardly masculine costume. Mrs. Breen's character performs masculine as well as feminine traits. Neither feminine nor masculine traits as shown by appearance are inherent to Mrs. Breen and this illustrates the performative nature of gender.

In a similar way, Mrs. Breen gives the impression of masculinity through her dialogue while simultaneously acting submissively— typically thought of as more feminine. Mrs. Breen initially accuses Bloom of decadence for being in Nighttown. She says, "Mr Bloom! You down here in the haunts of sin! I caught you nicely! Scamp!" (Joyce 443). These accusations are initially predatory and accusatory towards Bloom. However, soon after this exchange and Bloom's subsequent flaky excuses, Mrs. Breen says of Bloom, "You were the lion of the night with your seriocomic recitation and you looked the part. You were always a favourite with the ladies" (Joyce 444). In this statement, Mrs. Breen exaggerates the performance of masculinity— by mentioning a 'seriocomic recitation' and telling Bloom that he 'looked the part'. Mrs. Breen re-establishes Blooms outward expression of masculinity and now associates it with sexual prowess. Krouse supports this interpretation saying in "noting the favor that Bloom holds with women, Mrs. Breen marks Bloom as the object of female sexual desire" (Krouse 124). At first, she looks down on Bloom for being in Nighttown but soon after and without a real change in the flow of conversation submits to the idea that Bloom's being in Nighttown proves his masculine sex appeal. Immediately after this statement, the stage direction describes Bloom as, "Squire of dames, in dinner jacket, with watered-silk facings, blue masonic badge in his buttonhole, black bow and mother-of-pearl studs, a prismatic champagne glass tiled in his hand" (Joyce 445). Bloom now wears an overly ornate costume, exhibiting the type of peacock-like masculine traits that Mrs. Breen is first described as embodying but more deeply

exaggerated. Mrs. Breen's change in dialogue now shows Bloom as sexually successful and masculine. Bloom's performance of gender changes simultaneously with Mrs. Breen's performance change. The gender dynamic is shown as both performative and relative. They are relative in that one performance of gender cannot exist without the other. When one switches gender performance so does the other. This exaggerates the dichotomy and ridiculousness of the gender extremes that each character exhibits in this scene.

Shortly after the above-mentioned exchange this idea becomes clearer. After they speak briefly about Ireland and London, Bloom is described as, "wearing a purple Napoleon hat with an amber halfmoon, his fingers and thumbs passing slowly down to her soft moist meaty palm which she surrenders gently" (Joyce 445). In this scene, Bloom continues to wear overly ornate and masculine costuming—to the point of bordering on over-compensation. Mrs. Breen physically surrenders to Bloom by taking his hand and Joyce alters the description of her costuming to, "in a onepiece evening frock executed in moonlight blue, a tinsel sylph's diadem on her brow" (Joyce 445). This description puts Mrs. Breen on an equally ornate footing with Bloom and yet instead of masculine it is feminine as shown by the gown and diadem on her head. Mrs. Breen's costume changes in response to Bloom's similar costume change as well as his change in dialogue. The physical appearance of both reflects the way that they perform their gender in relation to each other.

Another character that serves to show the performative nature of gender and its power dynamic is that of Bella Cohen. When Bella is first introduced, Joyce clearly designates her as female, even though she exhibits both male and female characteristics. The description of her appearance follows;

> She is dressed in a three quarter ivory gown, fringed round the hem with tasselled selvedge… Her eyes are deeply carboned. She has a sprouting mustache. Her olive face is heavy, slightly sweated and fullnosed…She has large pendant beryl eardrops (Joyce 527).

The dress is ivory—calling to mind purity and virginity. The fact that she is a whoremistress is indicated by the tasseled selvedge, a seductive element of her costume. Her eyes are ringed with black in a similar and exotic way to her black horn fan. This description also shows Bella as svelte and she sports a mustache. Opposites in gender identity and characteristics are paired in this description of Bella's

person, the virginal white, the tassels and black 'exotics' of a whore—
the eyeliner and fan. The feminine costume Bella dons contrasts with
her more masculine actions and masculine features; her sweaty, heavy,
and full-nosed face–most commonly associated with masculinity.

Joyce's text reflects bodily and mercurial changes shown in "Circe".
Palusci discusses this idea in her essay about cross-dressing in *Ulysses*.
Palusci describes how by changing names, both Bloom and Bella's
names act as "gender inflected adjectives" (Palusci 157). Through this
method, Joyce can "morph her gender through grammar" (Palusci
157). This textual aspect of identity changes simultaneously with the
changes in physical appearance and costuming.

Therefore, when Bella becomes the male Bello in the narrative
her costume changes accordingly. She is then dressed even more
strangely;

> With bobbed hair, purple gills, fat moustache rings round his
> shaven mouth, in mountaineer's puttees, green silverbuttoned
> coat, sport skirt and alpine hat with moorcock's feather, his
> hands stuck deep in his breeches pockets, places his heel on
> her neck and grinds it in (Joyce 531).

This passage shows Bello's costume to be strange and colorful.
Bella's feminine costume was quite plain in comparison. The
feminine aspect mixes even more with the masculine in this passage.
As Bella, the character's hair was not described. Bello sports a
bob—an androgynous cut. Bella has a mustache. Bello is shaven.
The purple gills offset the green coat in a garish and monstrous way.
Bello presents himself in an extravagant and peacock-like fashion
similar to the way Mrs. Breen was described when she was donning
more masculine traits—although Bello takes on more monstrous
characteristics with his hooves and gills. Since Bello has more
monstrous features, Joyce most likely uses them to show how he
dominates Bloom rather than using them to indicate a sex change—
these features do not necessarily connote masculine or feminine
traits. As Krouse says, "readers understand who holds power at any
given moment…by interpreting particular changes in costume and
physical form" (131). The costume changes emphasize the gender
dynamic and serves as a more direct method of understanding the
performative nature of this chapter.

Joyce, also in this passage, associates Bello with a jockey given the
breeches and mountaineer coat. He describes Bello with "horseman's
knees" and says that Bello, "horserides cockhorse, leaping in the

saddle" (Joyce 534). This gives a more clear connection with primal sexuality and crass expression. Bello has shed the feminine dominant persona and become the male dominant sexual actor. The image of a jockey complicates this idea, however. Of the two, a horse and jockey, the horse seems the more domineering physically and yet ultimately the jockey is the dominant one. Since jockeys tend to be smaller and less physically imposing—generally thought of as more traditionally feminine trait. This then suggests the inversion of a female dominant over a male—rather than the male dominant over a female. There are also many performance aspects to horse-riding and dressage in particular. A jockey dresses himself and his horse for an audience much like one dresses in order to exhibit gender.

Although there is a clear association with Bello and the jockey, Bloom, however, is not directly associated with the horse. Following this jockey comparison, Bloom insists, "(A sweat breaking out over him.) (He sniffs.) Woman" (Joyce 535). One interpretation of this passage is that Bloom insists on his now female donned identity. However, as the subject of this statement remains unclear—Bloom could be referring to Bello/Bella. Bloom could be reminding himself and trying to come to terms with the female dominant persona rather than insisting on his own female identity and the subsequent male identity of Bello. As Brivic states, "Bloom subjects himself to a power of women that has to be defined as masculine" (177). The power that Bloom subjects himself to is dominant and therefore traditionally masculine. However, the complication of Bella/Bello and Leopold/Ruby as neither truly feminine nor masculine suggests that the dominant persona could be feminine itself and thus suggest this 'power of women'.

This concept is further supported in the following description of Bloom as, "A charming soubrette with dauby cheeks, mustard hair and large male hands and nose, leering mouth" (Joyce 536). Bloom still inhabits the female role and the role aspect is emphasized through the use of 'soubrette' here as a minor female role. However, the inclusion of Bloom's large male hands and leering mouth unsettles the reader. These attributes mar the 'charming soubrette' image. Directly after this description Bloom says, "I tried her things on only once, a small prank, in Holles street. When we were hardup I washed them to save the laundry bill. My own shirts I turned. It was the purest thrift" (Joyce 536). Here Bloom appears to be back in his male role and describing a previous experience and the 'thing's appear to be Molly's underclothes. The subject of the passage is vague, however, and it remains impossible to tell what actually he describes here. The

fact that Bloom is a 'soubrette' could also mean that he continues to take on the persona of a poor female side character trying on her master's or the main character's clothes. This passage clearly illustrates how Bloom tries on different aspects of gender identity through the use of changing costume and mixes both feminine and masculine traits.

In modern *Ulysses* discourse, Bella's fan is often described as an object through which Bloom expresses his own thoughts. As Palusci asserts, the fan "becomes a fetish for Bloom. It functions…as a detachable part of Bella in which is displaced and concentrated all of the phallic power which Bloom attributes to her" (156-157). Although, the fan acts within the narrative and dialogue it does not have a distinct identity. However, this view depends on the assumption that the episode exists completely within the confines of what Bloom is capable of analyzing as his reality. This view disregards the autonomy of Bella as a character and the way in which she performs her own identity.

The fan acts and speaks on its own which allows for arguments that view it as an accessory of Bella as well as a separate part of her identity speaking for itself. In keeping with the concept that the accessories and costuming within *Ulysses* act as fluid identifiers, the fan is a great example of how gender is performative in "Circe" and therefore the book as a whole. The fan is part of Bella/Bello Cohen's costume. Joyce uses the fan to show how Bella presents her gender as well as how she expresses her thoughts. On the other hand, if one views the words of the fan as Bloom's ventriloquism, it reduces the performative aspect of how Bella expresses herself. Although impossible for a fan to talk, it is not impossible for the fan to act as an expressive object for Bella and so can best be examined as an extension of Bella rather than just an extension of Bloom's thoughts. Joyce includes little description of the fan itself. The little description he gives is that it is, "a black horn fan like Minnie Hauck in Carmen" and "her large fan winnows wind towards her heated face, neck and embonpoint" (Joyce 527). The large aspect of the fan reflects Bella herself—a "massive whoremistress" (Joyce 527). This passage above also emphasizes how the fan is personified and acts rather than being acted upon by Bella or Bloom. The fan is the one that winnows wind toward Bella rather than Bella acting on the fan. The fan also works in emphasizing Bella's femininity—it calls attention to her "face, neck and embonpoint" showing how flushed all three are. However, the line directly following says Bella's, "falcon eyes glitter" (Joyce 527). Although the fan shows off her sexualized femininity it also calls to attention her more

masculine and predatory 'falcon' eyes.

The idea of personification becomes more obvious when the fan enters into the dialogue. The fan addresses Bloom, "(Flirting quickly, then slowly.) Married, I see." (Joyce 527). The way in which one might imagine the fan 'flirting' here is complex. The line itself suggests flirtation and at the same time that it acts as an accusation—it mirrors Mrs. Breen's earlier flirtation and simultaneous accusation. The fan seems to be relishing in discovering Bloom's secret and the appeal of the scandalous nature of infidelity—simultaneously emphasizing a feminine quality in Bella.

When Bloom tries to redirect the conversation with the fan, it continues, "And the missus is master. Petticoat government" (Joyce 527). Here, the fan asserts that Bloom's wife acts as the dominant one in their relationship. The words can also be referring to Bella as well. The idea that the 'missus is master' as well as 'petticoat government' reflects upon Bella simultaneously as it implies Molly. One might assume that Bella's fan would address Bella as 'master' and that the brothel itself works as a 'petticoat government' given that Bella runs it. When Bloom submits to this statement, saying "that is so" the fan reasserts its connection to Bella (Joyce 527). The fan is described as "folding together" and it "rests against her eardrop" (Joyce 527). The fan although still acting by itself, shows that it is subject to Bella and 'rests against her eardrop'. Not only does the fan compel the reader to consider Bella again but it also expresses its own submission to Bella. The fan submits to Bella and proves the 'petticoat government' at the same time that it is an extension of Bella's femininity. It serves as an indicator of Bella's femininity and as well as an indicator of dominance—it is both separate from Bella through its personification and part of her self-expression and performance of gender.

Ulysses scholars also often view the fan as a representation of the 'other' through which Bloom can speak as an outsider and objective observer. Brivic describes this ventriloquism for the fan as, "the power of the Other to speak for the Real by disintegrating language and identity, decomposing the discrete boundary of the signifying unit" (Brivic 188). The 'other' object is a more trustworthy 'speaker' than Bloom because of its vague identity. The fan acts as an expression of identity while it also expresses gender concepts through its own words. It shows the separate and multiple aspects of identity. The concept that the fan serves as a way of addressing identity becomes clearer in the coming dialogue. Again, the fan reasserts the femininity of Bella, described as, "folded akimbo against her waist" and then the fan says the line, "Is me her was you dreamed before? Was then she him you

us since knew? Am all the and the same now we?" (Joyce 528). Here, the fan seems to question the nature of identity and the universal assumption of gender. Although the description of the fan suggests femininity by emphasizing Bella's waist, the lines said question the very nature of gender identification. The lines blur the differences and similarities between feminine and masculine—man and woman. The pronouns are not specified and are not differentiated from each other. The confusing syntax of the sentence appears to equate the 'me' her' 'you' 'him' and 'us' into one vague entity—blurring the differences between the specified genders and what these indicate about identity—questioning "am all them and the same now we?" (Joyce 528). The fan shows the perceived femininity of Bella but also questions the very meaning of that femininity given to the object. Herr explains this breaking down of identity by describing how Joyce, "decomposes each and every one into his several selves, breaks the real into fragments and calls on the multiplicity of entire pieces to speak" (Herr 270). The fan shows the way in which entire pieces of identity are given their own voice and how the multiplicity of identity and in turn gender is portrayed within "Circe."

Bloom outwardly shows submission towards this dominant female expression but also ambivalence towards these questions the fan poses—he does not answer them directly. He merely says, "Powerful being. In my eyes read that slumber which women love" (Joyce 528). Bloom shows how he associates the outwardly feminine as a 'powerful being'—without acknowledging the more ambiguously gendered aspects of the fan. The fan, then becomes more demanding and domineering, it says, "Be mine. Now," and insists that Bloom "must" be its possession (Joyce 529). Bloom replies with "desire, with reluctance" and claims that he "knelt once before today" (Joyce 529). Bloom appears enthralled by the dominant and feminine at the same time that he is 'reluctant' to come fully to this concept and tries to convince the reader that he has only been submissive 'once before today'. However, it seems more likely that this submissive act has been played out before. The dialogue parallels the scene in which Bella/Bello dominates Bloom through the playing out of his sexual fantasy as it also parallels the gender and costume changes happening throughout the scene.

Impossible and surreal costume changes serve to exaggerate the performative nature of the gender traits that Mrs. Breen, Bella/Bello and Bloom exhibit throughout the episode. These characters are able to exhibit both masculine and feminine traits and can change between both multiples times. The costume changes are a way of showing the

gender and gender dynamic these characters are exhibiting at a given moment. The objects and costumes that suggest gender take on part of these character's identities and serve to show the performative gender that each of these characters inhabit. The costumes change relative to each other in the conversations between Mrs. Breen and Bloom—Mrs. Breen's costume changes in accordance with her dialogue. Bella's costume initially emphasizes the mixing of masculine with her feminine outward appearance. When Bella becomes Bello his masculine appearance incorporates more feminine aspects through the jockey comparison. Bella's fan serves to further complicate this dynamic by both indicating her feminine aspects as well as insisting upon her dominance. The gender dynamic throughout "Circe" becomes clearer through close reading and examination of their outward gender performance. The association of gender traits relies on costume and accessory within this episode and therefore supports the idea of the performative nature of gender within Ulysses.

Works Cited

Bullough, Vern L. *Cross Dressing, Sex, and Gender.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993. Print.

Brivic, Sheldon. "Dealing In Shame: Power/Gender In 'Circe'." *Masculinities in Joyce: Postcolonial Constructions.* 177-194. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Rodopi, 2001. *MLA International Bibliography.* Print.

Crowley, Ronan. "Dressing up Bloom for 'Circe'" *James Joyce Broadsheet* 87 (2010): 3. Web.

Herr, Cheryl. "'One Good Turn Deserves Another': Theatrical Cross-Dressing in Joyce's 'Circe' Episode." *Journal of Modern Literature* 11.2 (1984): 263-76. Web.

Joyce, James. *Ulysses.* New York: Vintage, 1990. Print.

Krouse, Tonya. *The Opposite of Desire: Sex and Pleasure in the Modernist Novel.* Plymouth, United Kingdom: Lexington Books, 2009. Print.

Palusci, Oriana. "Modernist Sex-Change On Paper: Gender Markers In Joyce's 'Circe' And Woolf's Orlando." *Parallaxes: Virginia Woolf Meets James Joyce.* 152-166. Newcastle upon Tyne, England: Cambridge Scholars, 2014. Print.

Adventures in Media Consumption:
The Walking Dead

Cheyenne Cooley

Parasocial relationships are defined as uneven relationships that usually involve a celebrity and a viewer or fan. The celebrity is unaware of the fan's existence, but the fan is virtually obsessed with interacting with them (Bennett, et al). This is a general definition, which envelops three different parasocial exchanges: parasocial interaction (PSI), parasocial relationship (PSR), and parasocial breakup (PSB). To evaluate the relationships that media consumers have with personae, a television show, *The Walking Dead*, will be utilized to create examples of this commonplace illusion. In addition to analyzing these interactions, the parasocial relationships between television viewers and characters from the television series, *The Walking Dead*, and to which degree the audience understands the relationship will also be explored. This will explain how media literacy can be the difference between thinking that murder truly just occurred on a television screen and understanding that special effects are in play.

According to Mu Hu, parasocial interaction is "the subjective invention of audience members," but it is defined more specifically as, "the simulacrum of conversational give and take between audience members and media figures and characters" (217). It stands to reason that while the consumers of media have created this construct, they have not made the distinction that the persona(e) they are viewing

can't hear them, and don't even know the former exists. However, the relationship that is created between the viewer and the characters in a program is conversational and comfortable, as if the viewers have known the persona their entire life. This relationship type is also considered temporary; it begins when the consumer starts to view the persona, and ends when the viewing ends, but it could also grow into a parasocial relationship, which is a long-term "cross-situational" exchange.

On October 31, 2010, our country—as well as over one hundred others—was greeted with the pilot episode of *The Walking Dead.* The television series tells the story of the beginning of the zombie apocalypse, and from the moment that the main character, Rick Grimes, wakes up from a coma in the hospital, viewers are thrown into this post-apocalyptic world with him. From his awakening in the hospital, he comes to find that his wife and son are gone, though he's not sure if they were dead or not. Within the first season alone we are introduced to some of the most long lasting characters, Glenn Rhee and Carol Peletier, who are members of the original group of survivors that Rick meets when he find his family. Glenn was a former pizza delivery boy who first met Rick in Atlanta and saved his life in the second episode, and Carol was just a mother with an abusive husband. In later seasons we meet Abraham Ford who was a Sergeant in the U.S. Army. Glenn and Abraham grew to two of Rick's most trusted friends, and Carol is significant to the series as she has the most character development throughout the seasons. For those audience members who didn't read the comics, every scene would have come as a surprise, and they would be experiencing fear, anger, and confusion along with Andrew Lincoln's portrayal of Rick. This is an example of parasocial interaction because from that point, "parasocially active audience members are not passive viewers, but active participants during their viewing processes" (Levy 1979). The show had a new episode every Sunday night, allowing a routine to be developed, and viewers would have a scheduled "meet up" session each week with their persona of choice, which is how a lot of members came to fall in love—so to speak—with the personae portrayed by various actors. According to Mu Hu's research, "Through repeated PSI over time, audience members perceive certain personae to be more predictable and reliable and thus become more loyal to them" (219).

This is where a lot of the confusion comes from between PSI and PSR. While they are different concepts, they also share connections. As stated above, the repeated interactions cause audience members to become more loyal to their chosen persona(e). Loyalty is a staple

of relationships, so this is where the overlap begins: "On the other hand, people's PSR with personae indicates an accumulation of shared past experiences and gives additional meanings to people's perception of the personae in PSI" (Hu 219). The conclusion that Mu Hu comes to in her research is that the correlation between PSR and PSI is a positive one, because everything that constitutes a relationship is strengthened through interaction. The repetitive sight of the characters in *The Walking Dead*, combined with the paralleled story formats in each episode, allows audience members to not only have a weekly catch-up session with their persona but also to become emotionally invested in them due to the stressful, and sometimes scary, situations in which they find themselves. You wouldn't want your best friend to die; that's how media consumers view their favorite television characters and personalities.

Brunick defines a parasocial breakup as, "the reason the parasocial relationship ends" (186). PSB can be caused by a number of things: a viewer outgrows the personae, real-life scandal causes a discontinuation of a parasocial relationship with older viewers, or something tragic or otherwise debilitating happening to the character or actor themselves. Hu notes that, "Most current PSB research explores involuntary PSB, while audience members' voluntary PSB is seldom examined" (217). Now, the difference between voluntary and involuntary breakups can be boiled down to the real celebrity and the fictional character. If the real celebrity is involved in some sort of scandal, if it goes against a viewer's values, they will *voluntarily* cease to care as much for that persona as they did before. Also, if a character's morals suddenly change in the program, the viewer could voluntarily break up with them due to that as well. For instance, when Carol, from *The Walking Dead*, got a little more hardened and started taking things into her own hands by putting people out of their misery, some viewers voluntarily "broke up" with her persona, because of the lack of morals that might have been involved with those decisions.

"Most PSB research focuses on hypothetical or real situations when personae are taken off the air" (Hu 219). At the beginning of its most recent season, fans were shocked, to say the very least, when fan favorites Glenn (Steven Yeun), and Abraham (Michael Cudlitz) were revealed to be on the receiving end of the barbed wire-wrapped bat, Lucille. This caused an uproar from the fan base in the following days. People were horrified at what had happened to their favorite characters. *The Talking Dead*, a show that airs right after *The Walking Dead* to get more information and viewpoints from the actors, aired that night and provided two goodbye compilation clips so that

everyone could bid farewell to the two casualties of the premiere.

Glenn's death was taken the hardest, having been a main character since the beginning of the show back in 2010. This brings back an earlier point about not wanting your best friend to die. Media consumers had been fans of Glenn, or at least followed Glenn with the original group, since the second episode when they first heard his sarcastic instructions to a trapped Rick inside a tank at Atlanta. These viewers have had a six-year long relationship with Steven Yeun's character in *The Walking Dead*. According to Hu's research, "…the PSB literature has shown that those with stronger PSR will experience higher levels of PSB if their favorite personae are no longer on the air" (220). This quote supports how awful the involuntary breakup with Glenn's character would be for viewers who have had strong parasocial interactions and relationships with him since he was welcomed into their homes via television screens nearly every Sunday.

While his gruesome death was heart wrenching enough to many fans, it was his final words that really drove the tragedy home. With the last bit of brain activity Glenn had, he said, "Maggie, I will find you." These famous last words, in addition to the gore and the "gnarly" way his eye bulged out, were the final straw for many viewers as they took to Twitter to proclaim that they would never watch *The Walking Dead* again. Many people use television as an escape from the real world, but there's only so much escapism within a dystopian, post-apocalyptic world like *The Walking Dead*. Countless fans have echoed the thought that since our world seems to always be one step away from dystopia, they are tired of not getting the usual ray of hope that this show provided in previous seasons. The director, Greg Nicotero, took the breakup in stride, saying online, "I would say that that means we have done something to affect these people in a way that they don't necessarily know how to process." Parasocial breakups parallel breakups that people encounter in real life. Usually when it occurs, the other person doesn't know how to deal with that information and the fact that they will be missing a piece of their lives for a while, which leads to a healing period in which they cut off any contact with anything that would remind them of their old relationship.

Due to the new villain, Negan, and his jaw-dropping debut, the actor, Jeffrey Dean Morgan, has been receiving mixed reactions to his new character. Some see him and want him to sign their baseball bats. Others are less than enthused to see him in public. This goes along with Hu's article where she points out, "If the audience members are pleased with their parasocial interaction with certain personae, they may be involved in a variety of activities after viewing, such as

imitating the personae's behavior, discussing the personae with other people, imagining interactions with the personae, or even attempting to contact the personae" (218). While, usually, this means that there would be a positive interaction when the persona was contacted, there are scenarios supported by Hu's information that could be negative. For instance, on *The Talking Dead,* Jeffrey Dean Morgan recounts a time when he had coffee with co-star Norman Reedus (YouTube). They were sitting outside the establishment, enjoying their coffee, when this old woman approached. She called him a bad name, and looked at him, "hate in her eyes," and told him that she wanted to know where he lives. This is a clear indication that she had a negative parasocial interaction with his alter ego from the show, Negan. In the moment, she does not seem to notice the fact that Morgan is an actor with a role he gets paid to play. In a way, the woman was pleased with her interaction with the character because when she did see him out in public, she felt the need to let him know that she did not like what he had done when he was in character and on set.

 The Talking Dead, as mentioned before, is an interview and discussion segment that airs each week after the episode of *The Walking Dead* airs. When the premiere aired for season seven in October of 2016, the whole cast joined the host on *The Talking Dead* to discuss what the ramifications could possibly be for future seasons, as well as how each actor felt about what had transpired. In these interviews, it seemed that each actor also experienced some kind of parasocial interaction and/or relationship with their co-star's characters. An example in *The Talking Dead* is the fact that the whole cast was quite emotional and sad about losing Glenn and Abraham in the premiere. The host mentioned during a segment of the interview that "it is nice for the audience to know that it means as much to [the cast] as it means to them," when Lauren Cohan (Maggie) was talking about what the last words that Glenn spoke to Maggie in the premiere meant. Another example of the actors having parasocial relationships with the characters that their co-stars portray is when Andrew Lincoln (Rick Grimes) mentions that both of those characters (Glenn and Abraham) are strong men in the show, and also bring a humorous factor to many of the episodes, so it is going to be strange that they are gone.

 In closing, parasocial relationships are prevalent in today's media consumers. It is not exactly a lack of knowledge of what is real, and what's not. Rather, personae in entertainment programs are created to be relatable, or something to attain to be a better person. Consumers grow close with these characters, and while there are a few here and

there that don't understand that the actors are just playing a role, most viewers are entirely aware that they have some kind of less than interactive relationship with a fictional character. The awareness of these relations is how consumers can become media literate, or remain literate.

Works Cited

Bennett, N., et al. "Parasocial Relationships: The Nature of Celebrity Fascinations." *Find a Psychologist,* 23 Jan. 2014, www.findapsychologist.org/parasocial-relationships-the-nature-of-celebrity-fascinations/. Accessed 16 Nov. 2016.

Brunick, K. L., et al. "Children's future parasocial relationships with media characters: the age of intelligent characters." *Journal of Children & Media,* vol. 10, no. 2, 2016, pp. 181. doi:10.1080/17482798.2015.1127839

"SuperKID The Talking Dead Season 7 Episode 1." *YouTube,* uploaded by KID Super, 26 Oct. 2016, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Pj2xO3FqRow.

Hu, M. "The influence of a scandal on parasocial relationship, parasocial interaction, and parasocial breakup." *Psychology of Popular Media Culture,* vol. 5, no. 3, 2016, pp. 217-231. doi:10.1037/ppm0000068

"Talking Dead- Jeffrey Dean Morgan (Negan) on fan incident." *YouTube,* uploaded by kmouts, 7 Nov. 2016, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sbOSERHJu64.

Levy, M. R. "Watching TV news as parasocial interaction." *Journal of Broadcasting,* vol. 23, 1979, pp. 69–80. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08838157909363919

Moore, C. (2016). "'He will blame himself': The Walking Dead's Steven Yeun says fans should not blame Daryl for Glenn's death in 'disgusting' season premiere." *Daily Mail.* Associated Newspapers Ltd, 28 Oct. 2016, http://www.dailymail.co.uk/tvshowbiz/article-3882140/He-blame-Walking-Dead-s-Steven-Yeun-says-fans-not-blame-Daryl-Glenn-s-death-disgusting-season-premiere.html. Accessed 4 Dec. 2016.

"Talking Dead." *Internet Movie Database,* www.imdb.com/title/tt2089467/. Accessed 7 Dec. 2016.

A Feminist Critique of *Othello*

Elizabeth Massie

In the play *Othello* by William Shakespeare, we encounter many forward thinking actions and characters for the Venetian era but we also see the opposite viewpoints as well. While looking at this play through a feminist viewpoint, we are given the tools to analyze different social values and statuses of the women in this play. *Othello* is an example that demonstrates the expectations of the Venetian patriarchal society, the practice of privileges in patriarchal marriages, and the suppression and restriction of femininity. There are only three women in *Othello:* Desdemona, Emilia and Bianca. Throughout the play, the Venetian patriarchal society portrays women as possessions, submissives, and temptresses.

In the beginning of the play, we meet Desdemona. Normally, she would come across as a very strong female character. She has eloped with "the moor", Othello, against her father's wishes. After hearing Brabantio's complaint and Othello's defense, the Duke eventually grants permission for Desdemona to accompany Othello to Cyprus. Othello speaks to Iago, ironically describing him as a man of 'honesty and trust', informing the Duke that "To his conveyance I assign my wife" (1.3.324). Desdemona, as Othello's wife, is treated as his possession: he implies that she is a commodity to be guarded and transported. The Senator ends the conversation with Othello by hoping that he will "use Desdemona well" (1.3. 332). The word 'use'

seems to run parallel to the phrase 'look after', but also supports the Venetian expectation of women. They are expected to bow to the wills of their husbands who may utilize them as they wish. The function of women within marriage is also supported by Othello's 'loving' words to Desdemona in Act II: "Come, my dear love/The purchase made, the fruits are to ensue" (2.3.9-11). Marriage is portrayed as an act of purchase, a woman is bought by her husband, and is expected to fulfil his sexual desires in return for the privilege.

Iago's desire for revenge on Othello is dictated by his view of women as possessions. He believes that 'it is thought abroad that "twixt my sheets/Has done my office" (1.3.430-431), suggesting that Othello has slept with his wife Emilia. It is the thought of Othello using his wife, "the lusty Moor/hath leaped into my seat" (2.1.317-318) which drives him mad, the thought that Othello has used a possession that belongs to him. Fueling this theory is the fact that Iago refers to his wife metaphorically in these two instances: she is his 'office' and his 'seat'; she is objectified and deprived of her humanity. Iago wishes to be "evened with him, wife for wife" (2.1.321). By sleeping with Desdemona, Iago believes that he and Othello will then be equal. The feelings of Desdemona and Emilia are not even considered in his plotting. The women are pawns to be used in order to further his own desires. Iago demonstrates through his thinking that women in Venetian society are perceived as possessions, secondary to the plans and desires of men.

Some modern feminist critics, such as Ruth Vanita, see Desdemona as a hideous embodiment of the downtrodden woman. Desdemona herself declares that "I am obedient" (3.3.99), continuing to obey Othello's orders from the early honeymoon phase of their relationship through to the later stages of his jealous actions. Even when he orders Desdemona to go to her bed towards the end of Act IV, she still replies with the submissive "I will, my lord" (4.3.10). In her final breath, she still remains true to her husband, saying "Commend me to my kind lord" (5.2.153) and provides Othello with an alibi that he does not use. She appears to have completely accepted her role as subordinate and obedient wife.

Arguably, a much stronger character, Emilia, also indicates that she is aware of her 'proper' role in society. When revealing Iago's plotting at the end of the play, she states that "Tis proper I obey him, but not now" (5.2.233). Although going on to betray her husband, she still feels the need to explain why she is going against the patriarchal rules. Bianca expresses a similar sentiment, consoling herself when Cassio rejects her by arguing "I must be circumstanced" (3.4.231): she feels

compelled by the laws of society to be 'circumstanced' - to 'put up with it' - implying that she has no other choice.

Society weighs heavily on the shoulders of these women; they feel that they must support the men they are married to, even if the actions of the men are questionable. Brabantio's opinions of women appear to represent Venetian ideology. Speaking of Desdemona, he describes her as 'perfection', 'Of spirit still and quiet' and 'A maiden never bold' (1.3.112).

By expressing the qualities of these women in the patriarchal society of the Venetian senate, Brabantio compounds and develops the traditional expectations of women. When Desdemona marries Othello, going against his wishes and the ideal mold of woman, he describes her as erring "Against all rules of nature" (1.3.119). Venetian society presents its own social beliefs as immutable laws of nature. It is 'natural' for fwomen to be feminine and to do as their husbands and fathers tell them. It is 'unnatural' for them to do anything else. This Venetian concept was also an Elizabethan and pre-Elizabethan belief, and was widely understood by Shakespeare's audiences. (Nachit 98)

Today, feminists argue that it is not 'natural' for women to be 'feminine', that history has tried to camouflage its social expectations of women as part of the laws of nature. The women of Othello, however, are pre-Feminism in a Venetian society, and seem to only compound the ideological expectations of what it is to be a woman through their own behavior and surroundings.

Othello, when talking of his wife, often seems pre-occupied with matters of the flesh. Regretting the fact that he did not know earlier of his wife's supposed infidelity, Othello argues that he would have been happier "if the general camp/Pioneers and all, had tasted her sweet body,/So I had nothing known" (3.3.397-399). He appears to be obsessed with Desdemona's sexuality. On his way to murder his wife, he states that "Thy bed, lust-stained, shall with lust's blood be spotted" (5.1.40). The repetition of the word 'lust', combined with the sexual associations of Desdemona's bed and the violent word choice of this line, reflects and draws attention to Othello's preoccupation with sensual matters.

This preoccupation is driven by the fact that Desdemona has so much sexual power over him. Cassio jokes about Desdemona as "our great Captain's Captain" (2.1.82), implying that she is the only individual capable of controlling and taming Othello. Desdemona uses this when attempting to persuade Othello to reinstate Cassio: she tells Cassio that 'My lord shall never rest' (3.3.24) until she has changed his mind, an indication of how powerful she is. Attempting

to change his mind, Desdemona is not frightened to use her position and sexuality:

> "Tell me, Othello. I wonder in my soul
> What you would ask me that I should deny
> Or stand so mammering on?" (3.3.76-78)

In this scene, she refers to her own unquestioning desire to please Othello, implying that he cannot love her as she loves him if he is able to refuse her what she wants. Othello responds with the interesting term of endearment "Excellent wretch" (3.3.100), suggesting that he is aware that her manipulation of him is fairly 'wretched', yet finds it 'excellently' compelling.

Later in the play, however, Othello ceases to find Desdemona's sexual power so entertaining. Speaking to Iago about his planned murder of Desdemona, Othello is adamant that he will "not expostulate with her, lest her body and beauty unprovide my mind again" (4.1.223-25). As far is Othello is concerned, if he is tempted into conversation and interaction with his wife, then her overpowering sexuality will distract him from the right course of action. He considers her to be a sexual hazard.

Othello's fear of Desdemona's sexuality erupts into emotional abuse on a number of occasions. He refers to her as 'whore' (3.3.389), a 'subtle whore' (4.2.23) and a 'cunning whore' (4.2.104), in addition to multiple references to her as a 'strumpet'. Bianca is described by Iago as a 'housewife' (4.1.111) and 'strumpet' (4.1.114), although there is no evidence to suggest that she actually is a prostitute. When she reveals his part in the horrific events of Act V, Iago vents his fury upon Emilia, labelling her a 'villainous whore' (5.2.273).

Admonishing his wife for being a nag in Act II, Iago goes on to add to this stereotype by suggesting that all women are not as they appear. He seems to believe that all women are, essentially, 'wild-cats' (2.1.123) and 'housewives' (2.1.125). All three women of the play are accused of prostitution and inappropriate sexual conduct, yet it appears that none of them are guilty. As male society falls apart in Cyprus, its members vent their anger by labelling all of the female characters 'whore'. When things go wrong, it is acceptable for men to blame the women in 16th century Venice.

The patriarchal Venetian society presented in *Othello* seems to put women 'firmly' in their place. Men consider women to be possessions, who ought to remain submissive and meek at all times. The only power that women do seem to have – their sexuality- is considered

to be an 'evil' which must be resisted by the men in society. Men are free to refer to women as 'whores' and get away with it. The language that Shakespeare gives to his female characters suggests that they have internalized society's expectations of them.

There is some hope in the play. The women do begin to question the validity of unchecked male authority. Emilia shows her feminist opinions throughout, but it is Desdemona, who in conversation with Emilia, indicates that the tide may be finally turning: 'Nay, we must think men are not gods' (3.4.169). This line suggests that Desdemona has certainly perceived men to be god-like figures in the past, but indicates that her experiences with Othello have taught her a lesson. It is clear that the actions and language of Shakespeare's three female characters, although seemingly subservient, signify a tentative step towards an egalitarian society.

Works Cited

Nachit, Mohssine. "Shakespeare's Othello and the Challenges of Multiculturalism." *SSRN Electronic Journal*, doi:10.2139/ssrn.2872975.

Shakespeare, William. *Othello.* New York, NY, Washington Square Press, 1993.

Vanita, Ruth. "'Proper' Men and 'Fallen' Women: The Unprotectedness of Wives in Othello." *Studies in English Literature*, 1500-1900, vol. 34, no. 2, 1994, p. 341. JSTOR, doi:10.2307/450905.

Power Dynamics in *Land of the Dead,* *American Psycho,* and *Funny Games*

Molly Hartig

When most people think of horror movies, the first things that come to mind are the classic horror monsters, like Dracula or Frankenstein, or the supernaturally-human monsters of the 1970s and 80s, like Michael Myers, or Freddy and Jason. Usually, it is not until after they cover these bases that people think of the other kinds of horror villains, the less exotic ones: the ones they can find in real life just as easily as in a horror movie. There are classic villains of this type, too, like *Psycho's* Norman Bates, or *The Silence of the Lambs'* Hannibal Lecter. However, the films in this paper involve villains more common than a crossdressing schizophrenic or a charming cannibal; they all have villains who are men in power. Films such as *Land of the Dead* (2005), *American Psycho* (2000), and *Funny Games* (1997) show that we fear authority and power just as much or more than we fear many of the traditional horror monsters.

Land of the Dead (2005), directed by George A. Romero, tells the story of what has happened in Pittsburgh after zombies have already killed a large portion of the population. However, the zombies are not the main antagonist in this story, differentiating this film from other zombie films. Instead, the big bad of this film is the man with the most power in the city, its de facto president, Paul Kaufman. Kaufman lords his power from the penthouse of the tallest and safest building

in the whole city, a mall-like paradise known as Fiddler's Green. This is a place where only the richest are welcome to live and pretend that the lower-class people right outside aren't struggling to find food and shelter. Kaufman also creates and runs an underground dungeon of vice, a place designed to get the lower classes to spend what money they do have on things like alcohol and gambling. He turns prisoners over to this place where they are forced to fight to the death against captive, starving zombies. He talks about this place as if it is good, a place where the lower class can take a load off and really relax. He fails to mention that people die there every night. When he turns on one of our main characters, the lower class Cholo who he is tricked into trusting him and doing his bidding, he also displays some definite racial prejudices. It is not a coincidence that the only person of color we see living in Fiddler's Green is Kaufman's personal butler.

When Kaufman is killed at the hands of a zombie, someone we know by the color of his skin and the uniform he wears would be welcome at Fiddler's Green even if he was alive, the audience cheers. Kaufman represents corruption and oppression in the United States government that can still be seen today, and people are vindicated when they watch the film and see the person representing those who oppressed them in real life getting punished for oppressing the people that represent them. On the other hand, representations such as this one show that people are fully aware of how much corruption there is among those in power, but realize they are not likely to be punished for it any time soon unless it is on screen. In other words, the money that has given those in power the power they have is stopping them from facing any sort of any retribution in real life. Thus, we turn to film.

American Psycho (2000), directed by Mary Harron, is less about government corruption and more about the evils of corporations and the individual businessmen that run them. Patrick Bateman fits in with his coworkers and subordinates at work. They can all get together in the middle of the day when they are supposed to be working, talk about how they are all cheating on their significant others, and do cocaine in the bathroom. The only discernible difference between Bateman and the others is that in his spare time, Bateman likes to murder the homeless, prostitutes, and even coworkers who dare to have a more professional looking business card than his. Interestingly, however, Bateman displays very "progressive" opinions about the goings on in Africa at the time the film takes place, which would appear to make him aggressively not racist, something you wouldn't really expect of a rich white businessman in the 80s. According to

Jarcho (2012), the fact that Bateman uses Africa often as an alibi is what reveals him as racist. Bateman is a sociopath on the brink of schizophrenia and total insanity, and the conclusion of the film leaves the audience wondering what is the truth and what has been fabricated in Bateman's mind. One thing is definite even if nothing was as it appeared, Bateman is a psychopath who managed to rise undetected to an incredible position of power and wealth, and the other businessmen he interacts with in the film could be the same, and no one would have noticed.

Bateman is deeply classist and misogynistic, and his hatred of women is the most obvious of his prejudices shown throughout the film. The scene in which he runs almost naked down his apartment hallway covered in blood in order to drop a chainsaw on an escaping prostitute from the top of the stairs is one of the most famous from the film. It seems like something like that could never happen in real life, that surely someone would notice and inform the police that something terrible was happening. However, the scene calls to mind the real-life case of Kitty Genovese, who was raped and murdered while nearly forty people either watched or listened to it happen without calling police. Things like this really do happen, and rich white men are the most likely to get away with these crimes.

Another famous scene is the murder of Bateman's coworker, Paul Allen, while Bateman discusses music in a carefully practiced way, masking the fact that he knows absolutely nothing about people and the way they interact with each other. Bateman chops off heads and stores bodies in suit storage bags in a spare closet, admitting to eating the flesh of at least some of his victims. The fact that he can get away with all this with no one noticing that anything is amiss is the most terrifying of all. It is not until his behavior becomes extremely erratic and he actually confesses to his crimes that anyone notices that something is wrong with the man who calls himself Patrick Bateman. Misogyny and drugs are the norm among businessmen anyway. In the end, Bateman gets away with everything he may or may not have done, and life goes on for the men on Wall Street.

Funny Games (1997), directed by Michael Haneke, shows a different kind of power. While Kaufman from *Land of the Dead* was an older man, and Patrick Bateman is a younger, still very well established adult, the antagonists in *Funny Games* are younger still than even Bateman. Paul and Peter are bursting with life and charm when they first appear, and it is not really surprising that the family falls victim to them. Theirs is the power of youth. One of them, Paul, also has another kind of power, one that is more specially ordained. When

Peter, his accomplice, is shot by the mother of the family, Paul is actually able to pick up the family's remote control and literally rewind the events that have just unfolded. This obviously lends itself to the feeling that the family has never had a chance of survival, that they were never going to get away from these two young, strong, and able-bodied men. They are utterly powerless, and Paul and Peter are infinitely powerful. Also, while we have come to expect the corruption of the rich and those in power, such violence coming from two attractive and charming young white men is seen much less often on screen. They're the kind of young men that people would probably describe as "seeming like such good boys" if it ever came to light that they were involved in such violent crimes.

So why would these privileged individuals partake in such violence in the first place? The viewer is never given a definitive reason. All we know is that they seem to enjoy the killing, even breaking the fourth wall to make bets with and wink at the viewer. They play sadistic games with the family, and once the remote scene happens, the audience knows that Peter and Paul have nothing to lose. When the father of the family escapes next door and finds that their neighbors have already been murdered, the audience knows that Paul and Peter have won this game before. They have the invincibility of youth and things are hopeless for any person they choose to play with next. If the audience is paying attention, they wouldn't dare bet against them. Even though they don't have socially established power beyond what the privileges they were born with, being young, strong, white men affords them enough power to do what they want to do and kill whom they want to kill. *Funny Games* is not an easy film to watch, because watching almost feels like rooting for Peter and Paul to win and for them to kill all the members of the family, which they do. According to the article by Herling (2012), this is a purposeful effect. Michael Haneke made *Funny Games* not as entertainment, but to make people think about all the violence they watch as entertainment. The difference between his film and the others like it is that *Funny Games* gives no hope for a future hero to take down these antagonists.

It is no coincidence that all the antagonists in this paper are upper-class white men. Oppression at the hands of men like these is something almost every person has experienced, even other upper-class white men. This makes these antagonists extremely relatable to the viewer. However, a lot of people are in denial that this kind of oppression happens purposefully, even if they've experienced it themselves. Plus, people who are more marginalized, like people of color and women, can't always talk about their experiences with those

in power without being retaliated against or discredited due to their identity. Thus, films like *Land of the Dead, American Psycho,* and *Funny Games* make it easier for people to discuss these issues in a sort of code. Horror films are excellent at bringing up social issues in a way that is very obvious but pretends not to be. While *Land of the Dead* kind of pokes fun at the issues within it while still taking itself very seriously, *American Psycho* and *Funny Games* both portray terrifying stories that could happen, and probably actually have.

Works Cited

American Psycho. Directed by Mary Harron, performances by Christian Bale and Jared Leto, LionsGate, 2000.

Ebert, Roger. "American Psycho Movie Review & Film Summary (2000)." *RogerEbert.com,* 14 Apr. 2000, www.rogerebert.com/reviews/american-psycho-2000. Accessed 28 Apr. 2015.

Ebert, Roger. "Land of the Dead Movie Review (2005)."*RogerEbert.com,* 23 June 2005, www.rogerebert.com/reviews/land-of-the-dead-2005. Accessed 03 May 2015.

Funny Games. Directed by Michael Haneke, performances by Susanne Lothar and Arno Frisch, Wega Film, 1997.

Herling, Bradley. (2012). "The Horror of (a) Playing God: Job's Nightmare and Michael Haneke's Funny Games." *Journal of Religion and Popular Culture,* vol. 24, no. 2, 2012. EBSCOhost, doi:10.3138/jrpc.24.2.230.

Holden, Stephen. "Film Review; Murderer! Fiend! (But Well Dressed)." *The New York Times,* 14 Apr. 2000, www.nytimes.com/movie/review?res=9B05E6DC113EF937A25757C0A9669C8B63. Accessed 28 Apr. 2015.

Holden, Stephen. "Film Review; An Exploration (He Explains) of Reactions to Torture." *The New York Times,* 11 Mar. 1998, www.nytimes.com/movie/review?res=9C0DE6DC1330F932A25750C0A96E958260. Accessed 3 May 2015.

Jarcho, Julia. "Absence Pleasures: Whiteness, Death, and Music in American Psycho." *Americana: the Journal of American Popular Culture (1900-present),* vol. 11, no. 1, 2012. EBSCOhost, proxy1.nku.edu/login?url-http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,cpid,url&custid=s8992667&db=mzh&AN=2015307151&site=eds-live.

Laine, Tarja. "Austrian Film: Michael Haneke's Funny Games." *Kinoeye,*

8 Mar. 2004, www.kinoeye.org/04/01/laine01.php. Accessed 03 May 2015.

Land of the Dead. Directed by George A. Romero, performances by Simon Baker and John Leguizamo, Universal Pictures, 2005.

Thomas, William. "Land of the Dead." *Empire,* www.empireonline.com/movies/land-dead/review/. Accessed 03 May 2015.

"But Like a Man He Died:"
Violence and Masculinity in *Macbeth*

Elizabeth Martin

Macbeth's ambition is traditionally and culturally thought to be the cause of his downfall and ultimately his death. Arthur Kirsch states that Macbeth's "ambition provokes desires in him that he is increasingly incapable of satisfying," and it is this that leads to his demise (272). While Macbeth's ambition and desire for power are two traits that are most often associated with Macbeth's character, they are only contributing factors when it comes to his downfall. A trait that ends up affecting Macbeth's path throughout the plot of the play more than his ambition is his tendency to be so easily persuaded by those who affect or question his masculinity. The societal ideals and expectations of the time regarding masculinity have been imprinted onto Macbeth, making these persuasions possible. Macbeth's correlation between manhood and violence lead to the multiple murders in the play, while his thoughts on manhood and guilt leave him with little remorse. While Macbeth's ambition does play a part, it is the ideologies and social expectations on masculinity that persuade Macbeth to take action and participate in the killing of other characters.

The first instance in which the audience is able to witness how impressionable Macbeth is occurs shortly after Macbeth and Banquo receive the first prophecy from the three witches (1.3.39-81). This

prophecy states that Banquo, Macbeth's friend shall be the father of kings, and that Macbeth shall become king himself. Before this point, there is no evidence to suggest that Macbeth had ever considered the idea of being king in the past. Macbeth's reaction to the three witches' prophecy supports this claim. If Macbeth had a desire for kinghood to be his future, the prophecy "should first fill him with joy" (Cheung 431). There is no sign of joy from Macbeth. Instead, Macbeth seems to be unsettled by the prophecy he is given: he states that the "supernatural soliciting / cannot be ill, cannot be good" (1.3.144). Macbeth appears to make the decision not to take action in order to make his possible kingship a reality, believing that "chance may crown [him] / without [his] stir," (1.3.157-159). However, being king is an idea that he comes back to multiple times in the scenes following in the play. In scene four, Macbeth seems to instinctively see Malcolm, the son of the current king, as an obstacle he "must fall down or else o'erleap," (1.4.56). Macbeth's inability to forget and move on from the ideas of the witches and their prophecy illustrates to the audience how susceptible Macbeth is to persuasion from outside forces. It is this inability to forget that sets up Macbeth's demeanor and trajectory for the remainder of the play. The Macbeth's reaction to the prophecy sets up the next instance in which the audience is able to see how Macbeth is influenced by an outside force on a much bigger level: the patriarchy and the gender roles associated with it.

Through the comments of others, the audience is able to see what Macbeth's character was like before he hears the prophecy. Before the audience can meet Macbeth for themselves, they are introduced to him through the conversations between Duncan and Malcolm. According to Duncan, Macbeth is a "worthy gentlemen" (1.2.26). Shortly beforehand, Malcolm describes Macbeth as a "good and hardy soldier," (1.2.5). Macbeth is referred to by Lady Macbeth as being "too full o' th' milk of human kindness," (1.5.17). By most of the characters' standards, Macbeth is a respectable, and even kind, person. By being exposed to Macbeth in this manner, the audience comes to understand that Macbeth is an impressive, respected, socially acceptable man (Favila 5). This then begs the question: how does a respected person like Macbeth end up turning into a murderous usurper? The answer simply being: gender roles and the societal expectations of men. These expectations play a large part in the development of Macbeth's character as well as his downfall.

Macbeth has a very specific view about what it is to be a man and to be successful. Macbeth was a soldier and was greatly respected because of his actions during conflict; he received praise from a king that

he respects, as well as titles such as the Thane of Cawdor rewarding him for his service. While acting as a soldier, Macbeth is noted to be a violent person as his Captain recalls he "doubly redoubled strokes upon the foe. / Except they meant to bathe in reeking wounds" (1.2.42-43). Macbeth has grown accustomed to having violence be a key factor in determining whether he is a successful and societally appropriate man or not. Macbeth's association of masculinity with violence is further supported during the scene in which Macbeth is discussing killing Banquo with the murderers. When the two murderers show some hesitation in their plans to kill Banquo, Macbeth immediately begins to question their manhood stating that "in the catalogue [they] go for men" (3.1.103) and asking if they "are not i' th' worst rank of manhood" (3.1.115). From Macbeth's perspective, the two men that are hesitating to kill Banquo are less manly because of their refusal of violence. According to Howell, Macbeth "suggests the murderers are essentially an inferior specimen of the male species because unlike real men, they lack an innate killer instinct" (20). Because this type of thinking appears in the beginning of the play, the audience can assume that Macbeth thought this way before he heard the prophecy from the witches. Although Macbeth is, per some of the characters in the play, uncommonly kind and "without / the illness" (1.5.19-20) to commit such violent acts, his association between socially acceptable men and violence makes him particularly vulnerable to the persuasion of Lady Macbeth.

The discussion Macbeth and Lady Macbeth have after Macbeth and Banquo have received the prophecy from the three witches is a pivotal moment in regards to not only the plot of the play, but also to Macbeth's character development and downfall. During their discussion, Lady Macbeth questions Macbeth's ability to be an acceptable father figure for a child in an attempt to convince Macbeth that he should kill Duncan and take the kingship for himself. Lady Macbeth states that "he that's coming / must be provided for; and [Macbeth] shall put / this night's great business into [her] dispatch," (1.5.78-80). By questioning Macbeth's ability to provide for a child, Lady Macbeth is directly questioning his masculinity. As it was stated before, Macbeth does not seem to have any innate desire to become king. However, Lady Macbeth's questioning of Macbeth's manhood convinces Macbeth to take the crown and prove himself a man. Howell states that Macbeth is "compelled to authenticate his masculine virtue" and do as Lady Macbeth wishes him to do (19). Since Macbeth's definition of masculinity largely consists of what he has learned from his time as a soldier, Macbeth tries to counter

Lady Macbeth's allegations in the only way that he knows how. When Macbeth's manliness is questioned, he turns to acts of violence to regain his masculinity.

Lady Macbeth's questioning and doubt in regards to Macbeth's manhood continues throughout the play and is often used on her part as a motivational tool used to get Macbeth to do as she desires. Shortly after Duncan has arrived at the Macbeth estate, Macbeth can be seen second guessing the plans to murder the king. Macbeth states that Duncan is in "double trust" (1.7.12) and that he is obliged to act as Duncan's subject and "his host / who should against his murderer shut the door / not bear the knife [himself]" (1.7.14-16). In this moment, the audience gets to see the true character of Macbeth, a man who is loyal and does not wish to do any harm upon his king. Macbeth even decides not to go through with the plan, telling Lady Macbeth that they "will proceed no further in this business" (1.7.34). According to Clark, "this deliberation results from Macbeth's question of manliness and valor and the relationship of those questions to acts of violence" (36). Macbeth's questioning of the need for violence exhibits the fact that for Macbeth, being violent does not come naturally, but is instead something that he has learned to participate in to prove his masculinity and get approval from society.

Once Macbeth has decided against any acts of violence, Lady Macbeth begins to attack Macbeth's masculinity once again. Lady Macbeth accuses Macbeth of changing his mind because he does not meet the society's standards of masculinity stating that "when [he] durst do it, then [he was] a man," (1.7.56). Lady Macbeth goes on to further insult Macbeth's manhood, by claiming that she, a woman, would kill her own child if she had sworn to do it (1.7.64-67). This threat to Macbeth's masculinity puts him on the defense. In order to prove Lady Macbeth incorrect, and sustain his masculinity, Macbeth chooses to do the only masculine thing that he has been taught: follow orders and commit a violent act. Macbeth agrees with Lady Macbeth, stating "I am settled and bend up / each corporal agent to this terrible feat," (1.7.92-93). Macbeth – in an attempt to preserve his masculinity, not to gain the kingship – follows the orders given to him by Lady Macbeth and decides to kill Duncan.

Macbeth's guilt regarding the acts of violence that he participates in gradually declines as the plot of the play moves forward. This lack of guilt is another example of how Macbeth's understanding of masculinity affects how he acts and presents himself. After his first act of violence (Duncan's murder) Macbeth's reaction reveals many things about his character to the audience. First, the audience once

again sees that Macbeth is not a naturally violent person as he is genuinely shaken by what has just occurred. When asked to return the daggers to the men's bodies, Macbeth states that he will "go no more / [he is] afraid to think what [he has] done," (2.2.65-66). The audience also witnesses the guilt Macbeth feels in regards to Duncan's death. While Lady Macbeth works to keep things orderly, Macbeth is overcome with guilt as he ponders whether or not he will ever "wash this blood / clean from [his] hand," (2.2.78-79). The scene ends with Macbeth claiming that if he could "wake Duncan with thy knocking" (2.2.94), he would. Macbeth's regret illustrates to the audience that Macbeth does not take acts of violence lightly. It also shows that Macbeth is still not interested in being king, as he shows no joy at what the future holds for him. Macbeth defends his masculinity with violence and is met with extreme guilt afterwards.

The guilt Macbeth feels after acts of violence appears to dissapate as the plot of the play transpires. Macbeth needs no convincing from Lady Macbeth to murder Banquo. However, the guilt he feels afterwards is substantially worse than the guilt he felt after the Duncan's death – especially when considering the fact that Macbeth played no physical part in the murder of Banquo, but instead arranged for others to do it for him. Because of his guilt, Macbeth hallucinates of Banquo while at a dinner at his estate. In response to this, Lady Macbeth ask Macbeth "Are you a man?" (3.4.70). When Macbeth responds that he is a man, Lady Macbeth counters stating that the image of Banquo is "the very painting of [Macbeth's] fear" (3.4.74) and that Macbeth's guilt is causing him to be "quite unmanned in folly" (3.4.88). Macbeth, because of her comment, seems to acquire the belief that men do not fear and they do not feel guilt. The audience is able to immediately see this belief applied, as when the image of Banquo disappears, Macbeth states that "being gone / [he is] a man again," as he is no longer frightened and the guilt that caused the image to appear is gone (3.4.130-131).

The new belief that in order to be masculine, one must not only participate in violent acts but also feel no guilt or fear after committing them helps to explain Macbeth's lack of reaction when Macduff's family has been killed. At this point in the plot, ambition no longer plays any role in Macbeth's character or motivation. Macbeth does not appear to make plans to gain other titles or land and he does not fixate on the idea of having heirs to take the throne after himself. Macbeth instead has only taken on tasks that will maintain his status and masculinity in the eyes of both society and Lady Macbeth. To maintain this status, Macbeth decides that Macduff must be killed.

Macbeth is no longer thinking about the acts of violence that he is participating in, and instead sees them only as a way of maintaining his masculinity. Due to the same reasons, he shows no remorse or guilt after participating in the acts, as we see none when Macduff's family has been killed, on Macbeth's orders. According to Calderwood, "murder has become almost a reflex action for Macbeth" (75), as he no longer thinks of what he is doing, just that "what must be done must be done" in order to preserve his masculinity and that "what has been done cannot be undone" explaining the lack of guilt from Macbeth about events that no long beforehand cause him so much pain (Low 826). After the dinner, Macbeth believes that not showing guilt or remorse is a sign of masculinity, and does not do so for the remainder of his life.

In the events leading to Macbeth's death, Macbeth begins to lose the characteristics that he believes make him a masculine person. No traces of ambition can be seen in this Macbeth, as he ponders the meaninglessness of life. After hearing a cry of a woman from within his living quarters, Macbeth's response is "I have almost forgot the taste of fears" (5.5.11). This suggests that Macbeth has started to fail in repressing emotions such as fear and guilt as this line implies that he has yet again felt fear. Lady Macbeth's death has removed the one person who consistently questioned Macbeth's masculinity and pushed him to be violent and unfeeling. Because of this, when finding out that Macduff was "from his mother's womb / untimely ripped" (5.8.19-20), Macbeth's reaction is fear. Macbeth himself states that this news, and possibly the fear that resulted from it, "hath cowed [his] better part of man," (5.8.22). Immediately following this, Macbeth attempts to give up the remaining trait that he believes to make him masculine: he refuses to participate in the act of violence, telling Macduff "I'll not fight with thee" (5.8.26). Though Macbeth is forced to fight, all aspects of his masculinity have left him. Without these aspects and without a need to prove himself, Macbeth is killed at the hands of Macduff.

Macbeth's ambition is widely thought to be the cause of his downfall and death. However, it is Macbeth's beliefs that masculinity is defined by a willingness to participate in acts of violence, and an ability to repress the fear and guilt associated with these acts, that ultimately lead to his downfall. These beliefs come from the culture Macbeth resides in, as well as his experience within the army. Because of the societal pressures and expectations that require men to be violent, Macbeth, a previously kind person becomes and murderer and usurper.

Works Cited

Calderwood, James L. "'More Than What You Were': Augmentation and Increase in 'Macbeth'" *English Literary Renaissance*, vol. 14, no. 1, 1984, pp. 70-82. www.jstor.org/stable/43447118.

Cheung, King-Kok. "Shakespeare and Kierkegaard: 'Dread' in Macbeth." *Shakespeare Quarterly,* vol. 35, no. 4, 1984, pp. 430-439. www.jstor.org/stable/2870162.

Clark, Seth. "'Confusion Hath Made His Masterpiece': (Re) Considering the Maddening of Macbeth." *Journal of the Wooden O Symposium* 13. (2013): 34-45. *Academic Search Complete.* Web. 11 Dec. 2016.

Favila, Marina. "'Mortal Thoughts' and Magical Thinking in 'Macbeth.'" *Modern Philology,*   vol. 99, no. 1, 2001, pp. 1-25. www.jstor.org/stable/439153.

Howell, Maria L. "Concepts of Manhood and Masculine Identity." *Manhood and Masculine Identity in William Shakespeare's The Tragedy of Macbeth* University Press of America, 2008, 19-34.

Kirsch, Arthur. "Macbeth's Suicide." *ELH,* vol. 51, no. 2, 1984, pp. 269-296. www.jstor.org/stable/2872946.

Low, Lisa. "Ridding Ourselves of Macbeth." *The Massachusetts Review,* vol. 24, no. 4, 1983, pp. 826-837. www.jstor.org/stable/25089505.

Miranda, Lin-Manuel, Anthony Ramos, Phillipa Soo, and Renee Elise Goldsberry. By Li-Manuel Miranda. *Take A Break.* Hamilton (Original Broadway Cast Recording). Alex Lacamoire, Lin-Manuel Miranda, Bill Sherman, Ahmir Thompson and Tariq Trotter, 2015. MP3.

"Prophecy in Macbeth and Harry Potter." *Shakespotter. Wordpress,* 17 July 2015, shakespotter.wordpress.com/2015/06/17/prophecy-in-macbeth-and-harry-potter/.

Shakespeare, William. *Macbeth.* Edited by Barbara Mowat and Paul Werstine, The Folger Shakespeare Library, 2013, New York.

When Reality Becomes Fiction:
The Authority of Stephen in *Ulysses*

Elizabeth Gauck

Characters can be written so vividly that they feel real, but they are not. Instead, they're just realistic figures created by an author who has the keen ability to create multi-dimensional and dynamic characters. However, sometimes the lines are blurred between life and fiction. This is the case for 'Scylla and Charybdis' in James Joyce's Ulysses, where Stephen Dedalus is presenting his theories on Shakespeare and *Hamlet* to four real-world literary scholars. In this paper, I argue that the real people infused in this episode are merely shadows of the real-life figures and are merely characters in and of themselves, who only manage to decrease Stephen's authority.

There is a theory—Possible Worlds Semantics—which discusses what it means when characters are represented in both the real world and the fictional world. An argument has been made that they cannot exist in both, that "where A is a fictional character, there is no possible world which A exists; a *fortiori*, A cannot exist in the actual world, and so A cannot be both fictional and actual" (Proudfoot 13). This means that characters cannot exist in the real world because they are fictitious, which leads to the idea that a character and a real person cannot be the same. The two are different, even if they share similar qualities because one is fabricated while the other is real. However, it is plausible to view a real-world person or character as being a catalyst

for fiction and its truth to be come out (Proudfoot 16).

In 'Scylla and Charybdis,' Stephen presents his opinions on both *Hamlet* and Shakespeare to four characters who exist in real life as an actual person, but also as a character in *Ulysses:* Thomas William Lyster, John Eglington, Richard Irvine Best, and George Russell (AE). According to Possible Worlds Semantics, these men are not the actual Lyster, Eglington, Best and Russell—all of whom in some way have authority in literary criticism—but are instead Joyce's fictionalized versions of them. This could also present the idea that the real men were starting points for Joyce's fictionalized versions. By not changing their names, Joyce is still leaving authority with these men. Despite their being fictionalized, these men manage to retain their accomplishments just as they retain their name. Their presence makes Stephen's fictional character more sympathetic, but simultaneously fails to give Stephen more authority as a literary figure. There's an allusion that some of the men in the Library in 'Scylla and Charybdis' has heard the theory as well before when "Eglington's later comments suggest that even before the scene opens, Stephen has already stated his thesis to the company in the Librarian's office," (Norris 4). Eglington even downplays Stephen's theory by simply calling it a "ghost story" (Joyce 153). This implies that he does not regard Stephen's theory as being more than fiction; if he viewed it as being more than a ghost story, he might have called it a theory, but because he didn't, he lowers the integrity of Stephen's theory by continuing to think of it as a ghost story. Because Stephen has most likely told his theory to these authoritative men, there's some inquiries to be made as to why Stephen would try it again. It seems that the stakes would be raised, because Stephen has already failed before with them and must try especially hard to impress them the second time around. This means that before Stephen even presents at the library, he's already aware of how the men view his theory. By presenting despite this, Stephen's inexperience as a critic is magnified. Without the proper evidence to persuade these men, he automatically has no authority to theorize with them. However, by trying to anyway, Stephen is only proving his disadvantages, because he is going into a losing battle, knowingly. His persistence only brings out his flaws as a literary critic, rather than increasing his integrity and credibility.

Often when presenting an idea that's meant to persuade, credibility is important. People are more likely to listen to someone who is credible because it means that they have studied their topic in-depth. But Stephen does not hold enough necessary credibility; these men hold more than he does. They are well educated, while

Stephen is not—or at least he hasn't proved himself to be to them. If he had, these men would find at least some part of his theory true or reasonable, instead of only mocking him. Even as characters, their disregard for Stephen's theories makes him appear increasingly unqualified and lacking of authority. This is shown in the way that they disregard both Stephen and his ideas throughout Ulysses, but also through the way Stephen is characterized. It is easier to believe that a man who is essentially wandering through life, without the money to have a home or buy a beer, would be in the position that Stephen is in in the library. It would be hard to think of him having a more nomadic, difficult life but at the same time being wildly successful in the literary criticism world. Stephen does not present himself as successful, therefore his lifestyle does not permit him to appear successful either. This means that he cannot gain authority from those more successful than him, including those who are in the library with him.

This forms a rhetorical situation, in which Stephen, the rhetorician, is attempting to persuade the men, who form his audience. In the face of an audience, Stephen must convey his opinions efficiently enough to make the men believe him. This doesn't mean that his opinions need to be entirely true, but they must be persuasive. To do this, Stephen has to know how to perform for his audience. He must change his persuasive techniques to allow him to better reach his goals, even if it is just on the mental level. For example, "following Stephen's thoughts…we see him mentally relating the present discourse with the older men to his failed relationships with his own peers" (Norris 5). Stephen appears to very aware of the conversation that he is orchestrating and of his own performance, because his stories are "notably self-conscious, critical of their own methods and motives, at some plains to transform real experience into an account of that experience" (Benstock 711). This awareness means that Stephen is more than aware of his argument, but he's also aware of his audience. His performance is based on how they react, because if they can see his point by the end, Stephen will be accepted by them. However, it must also mean that Stephen is aware when his audience isn't persuaded. By performing to an audience, he must once again be aware of the audience's possible rejection of him. If they do reject him, Stephen will return to being an isolated figure. The continuation of his performance means that Stephen is accepting this possible rejection, but his awareness makes his isolation self-perpetuated. If Stephen were performing without taking his audience into mind, he might still be rejected, but he wouldn't have been intentionally

working toward that rejection. When Stephen is aware, he is also fully aware that a consequence could be his isolation, but it is his need to be accepted that fuels him to continue with his performance. By not stopping, Stephen is allowing the isolation to be a consequence which he is aware of. When he doesn't stop his performance, even when it is clear that the audience is rejecting his theories, he is furthering his isolation. Additionally, this isolation is decreasing his authority. While he is persevering, his dedication is not improving the men's opinion of him or his work. His performance as a character is just causing the others to become more discouraged by him than they already were. If Stephen should choose to present to them again, then it will be even more difficult for him to sway them and that difficultly will only increase the more he tries, only to fail. The more he persists, the more his authority with these men will drain.

When asked if he believes his own theory on Shakespeare, Stephen replies, "No" (Joyce 175). This means that Stephen is attempting to persuade the men in the library to believe an argument that Stephen himself does not believe. This "no," can mean that Stephen's theory is a "work in progress" (Gordon 502). After all, Stephen might not just believe his own theory yet, but maybe once he's built it up enough, he will. At this point however, he doesn't believe it, so his audience can't be expected to believe it either. Here it seems that Stephen is just a mouthpiece created by Joyce to talk about literary criticism. Literary criticism is about creating original ideas about works of literature. This is exactly what Stephen has done, but the scholars do not see it that way. To them, Stephen has only formulated a far-fetched origin for Shakespeare. Perhaps James Joyce is trying to point out that all criticisms are far-fetched at first, until they have the evidence to back them. The question he might be posing here is: *what makes one literary critic's ideas more important than another, or is there ever even a critic's theory that's correct?* After all, theories are just theories—waiting to proven, but unable to be anything more as long as the writer is not here to relay his exact meaning. This makes the scholars at the library seem less scholarly. Their fame and authority seem to dwindle at this, which makes them seem less real themselves. This is just another way in which these men become less of historical figures and more characters of Joyce's making. Since he is removing their authority, their touchstone to real life is fragmented. They become characters themselves, which makes the contrast between them and Stephen disappear. Without this contrast, there's little question whether Stephen is made more real amongst his peers. The reality becomes that he is just a character amongst other characters. Because these

men are made into characters, it becomes difficult to judge their authority other than what is on the page. Without their authority, Stephen's authority cannot be elevated either. In addition, Stephen is failing to give authority to his own self. It is just as important for others to believe in him as it is for him to believe in himself because that is where confidence is bred. With confidence, Stephen wouldn't necessarily gain authority, but he would become more persuasive, which would in turn increase his authority. Even with self-made authority, Stephen might have a point to build from, but without it he is unable to convince the men of what he thinks. He cannot expect to be convincing for an argument that he does not believe in.

The authority of William Shakespeare is also being evoked in 'Scylla and Charybdis.' While a lot is known about the works he produced during his lifetime, little is known about the man himself, because "apart from the poems and plays themselves, the surviving traces of Shakespeare are abundant and thin" (Greenblatt 50). The fact is, Stephen is postulating a theory about the autobiographical nature of Shakespeare's writing, when there isn't enough about Shakespeare's history (especially in the modernist era) for Stephen to theorize about. In this sense, Shakespeare himself is just another constructed character. Much like how a character is created, Stephen's Shakespeare has been given traits, qualities, and a background, which Stephen has conceived to support his theory. According to Stephen, Shakespeare is a man who was being cuckolder by his wife and was using his writing as an outlet for his broken heart. He is conjuring up a Shakespeare of his own making who is not the real person, but a fictitious character who only makes Stephen even more fictitious. If Stephen were to only present the generalities of Shakespeare's work and perhaps some accepted theories, then one might only see Shakespeare as the writer. However, Stephen turns him into someone foreign to both the reader, his audience, and maybe even Stephen himself since even he does not entirely believe his theory. It is said that "with *Hamlet*, Shakespeare found that if he refused to provide himself or his audience with the familiar, comforting rationale that seems to make it all make sense, he could get to something immeasurably deeper" (Greenblatt 324). This could also be said for Stephen, especially because he is choosing to provide rationale about *Hamlet* that is neither familiar nor comforting. However, Stephen is unable to get his own audience to find anything deeper. This could perhaps be because the Shakespeare that Stephen is creating is not the same Shakespeare that wrote *Hamlet*. This would be because Stephen's Shakespeare is nothing more than a character he has created, as "it is

Stephen, not Shakespeare, who is building art out of his own ordeal" (McBride 87). If he were to evoke the real Shakespeare, he would be able to go deeper into the criticism he is forming about both *Hamlet* and Shakespeare. Because he is unable to do that, Stephen is leaving his audience unimpressed and confused. The Shakespeare that they know—and the criticisms that go along with him—is not who Stephen is theorizing about. Instead, Stephen is drawing from his own ideas about who Shakespeare was and what that means for Shakespeare's writings. This ultimately means that Stephen's Shakespeare isn't real, but a character Stephen created which fits
his theories.

In fact, Stephen might also be drawing "his Shakespeare out of highly personal experiences." Stephen's character of Hamlet might just reflect who Stephen is—someone who he aligns himself with and who he hopes to someday be. He feels the relation to him through artistic creation, but he also recognizes "the Shakespearean interplay between father and son, between the elder, ghostly Hamlet and the younger, dispossessed one, for his own purposes. The relationship between father and son becomes the core of Stephen's newfound terminology for conceptualizing the desired experience of successful artistic creation" (Caraher 204-205). Stephen feels connected to Shakespeare, so therefore he feels that he can theorize about him because he knows him—or at least feels akin to him. However, even Stephen's Shakespeare holds a lot of authority because while Stephen might have created his backstory, he did not change his literary accomplishments. It is fair to say that Stephen respects Shakespeare and that he would someday like to have similar accomplishments. However, when Stephen channels Shakespeare, it only mars Stephen's integrity. He seems to hold himself to higher esteem than what he occupies because he sees himself on a similar level as Shakespeare, even though he is not. In a setting where Stephen is unable to impress the scholars of his time, it is clear that Stephen cannot compare himself to Shakespeare. This is especially true because Shakespeare *created* his own work, whereas Stephen is only *theorizing* about Shakespeare's work. This decreases Stephen's authority because Stephen is both creating a theory that scholars do not believe, but mainly because he is comparing himself to someone who he barely even matches the credentials of. The juxtaposition of Shakespeare as a character and Stephen, makes the latter appear to have little to no authority. This is not solely due to the integrity of the work that Shakespeare has created, but instead the amount that was created in regards to Stephen. Stephen's character is more about thinking and

ruminating, which only creates art in the mind. Until Stephen can physically create it, he will not be able to hold the same authority of Shakespeare or even come close.

For Shakespeare to simply be a character of Stephen's design means that it is hard to see what Stephen's real trajectory is in *Ulysses.* He does not seem to grow as an artist, nor as an intellectual, but he also does not have the authority to present his theory. This is a product of his own making, because he continues to persist even when he knows the probable outcome. He knows that his theory does not stand with others, but he keeps trying to present it—even when his friends, like Buck Mulligan, are using it as a source for mockery. Taking his views to an audience like those of real-world scholars creates a juxtaposition of authority—where they have it in plenty and Stephen is lacking. The characters on the pages of *Ulysses* are just characters, yet they still manage to hold some of the authority of their real-life counterparts, just as Stephen's version of Shakespeare does. These real-life characters, made fictitious, only manage to lower Stephen's authority as a scholar.

Work Cited

Benstock, Shari. "The Dynamics of Narrative Performance: Stephen Dedalus as Storyteller." *ELH,* vol. 49, no. 3, 1982, pp. 707-738. *JSTOR.* Web. 12 Dec. 2016.

Caraher, Brian G. "A Question of Genre: Generic Experimentation, Self-Composition, and the Problem of Egoism in *Ulysses.*" *The Johns Hopkins University Press,* vol. 54, no. 1, 1987, pp. 183-214. *ELH.* Web. 9 Dec. 2016.

Gordon, John. "Getting Past No in 'Scylla and Charybdis.'" *James Joyce Quarterly,* vol. 44, no. 3, 2007, pp. 501-522. *JSTOR.* Web. 12 Dec. 2016.

Greenblatt, Stephen. "Shakespeare's Leap: How Did the Son of a Provincial Glovemaker become the Greatest Playwright of All Time? By Plunging into the Streets." *New York Times,* 2004, pp. 50-55. *EBSCO.* Web. 12 Dec. 2016

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Will in the World: How Shakespeare Became Shakespeare.* New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2004. Print.

Joyce, James. *Ulysses.* New York: Random House, Inc., 1986. Print.

McBride, Margaret. *Ulysses and the Metamorphosis of Stephen Dedalus.* London: Associated University Press, Inc., 2001. Print.

Norris, Margot. "The Stakes of Stephen's Gambit in "Scylla and Charybdis." *Joyce Studies Annual*, 2009, pp. 1-33. *Project Muse.* Web. 12 Dec. 2016.

Proudfoot, Diane. "Possible Worlds Semantics and Fiction." *Journal of Philosophical Logic,* vol. 35, no. 1, 2006, pp. 9–40. *JSTOR.* Web. 9 Dec. 2016.

Author-to-Audience Conversations: Behind the Fictional Narratives in *Doctor Faustus* and *King Lear*

Zorada Porter

    The interaction of individuals within the contemporary social hierarchy of Early Modern England is a key theme in both Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* and in the narrative of Shakespeare's *King Lear*. Marlowe targets issues presented by the contemporary class structure through the story's setting and the use of over-dramatized, Christian supernatural elements. Shakespeare's *Lear,* differentially, uses the context of an unfamiliar setting to direct the subtextual, author-to-audience conversation to similar questions regarding the worldly class structure. This essay will discuss how the use of supernatural elements in the narrative structures of William Shakespeare's *The Tragedy of King Lear* and Christopher Marlowe's *The Tragedy of Doctor Faustus* are purposeful, imaginative devices through which the authors are able to ask questions about class structure without the threat of social repercussion. Both Marlowe's *Faustus* and Shakespeare's *Lear* engage in conversations about the appropriate order of the culturally specific, perceived, natural class structure. The use of distinct Christian wording in a pre-Christian setting, as in Shakespeare's *Lear,* and the inclusion of supernatural figures of Christian theology, as in Marlowe's *Faustus,* become guises through which the audience is engaged in an

introspective conversation about the Christian influence on the Early Modern sociopolitical framework.

A narrative, fictional or non-fictional, is "a text in which an agent relates a story in a particular medium, such as language, imagery, sound, buildings, or a combination thereof" (Bal 5). In the tragedies of *King Lear* and *Doctor Faustus*, the linguistic style treating the fictional, supernatural Christian elements in *Faustus* and the fictional, pre-Christian setting of *King Lear* draws the audience's attention. Though written for an audience in the Early Modern Period, Shakespeare's *King Lear* is set in a period that pre-dates its publication. Before the foothold of Christianity stamped English soil, the setting of *King Lear* and the landscape which sparks the tragedy provides subtext essential in decoding the dialogue between author and audience. For those in attendance to a performance of *Lear*, using references to a cruder and outdated sociopolitical structure stands at stark contrast to the intended audience's contemporary, Christian-dominant structure. First introduced by the Duke of Kent in Act 1, Scene 1, where he addresses the silver-tongued sisters Goneril and Regan and the recently, unjustly banished Cordelia: "[*To Cordelia*] The gods to their dear shelter take thee, maid, that justly think'st and hath most rightly said. [*To Goneril and Regan*] And your large speeches may your deeds approve, that good effects may spring from words of love" (Mowat and Werstine 19). Here, Kent is the first verbal medium to confirm that the setting of the play is distinctly non-Christian. The exchange of "God" for "gods" separates the listener's reality from the story which allows the author to safeguard their message within the folds of fiction. On this topic, de Rivera and Sarbin state that "constructed accounts meet a number of important psychological needs. They provide excitement and a distraction from the unbearable complexity of modern existence" (9). However, the audience needs elements within the narrative that reach into their personal experience, without which the author's conversation becomes lost to audience interpretation.

It is not accidental that the first identification of the pre-Christian setting runs concurrently with the abdication of Lear's responsibility and power as a father and as a king. Shakespeare purposefully contradicts the pre-Christian setting with the use of Christian phrasing, further adding to the emphasis that the story is a fictional narrative because the wording stands out against the medieval backdrop. The language of fathers to children and servants to kings features prominently throughout the narrative of *King Lear* while also playing towards the audience's Christian, societal worldview.

In a society heavily influenced by Christian theology, the paternal, familial position in the domestic framework held prominence due to its association with the Almighty. Reference to God as one's heavenly father remains a common colloquialism used in Christian culture. The Lord's Prayer serves as another example; dedicated solely to the veneration of the traditional God figure, it is more widely known as the Our Father. The first lines of the prayer, "Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come, thy will be done, on Earth as it is in Heaven" emphasize that God, as the holy father, is able to carry out his might throughout his "kingdom" due to his position at top of the natural hierarchy.

The fictional, pre-Christian setting of *King Lear* features a subversion of the familial hierarchy as a major plot driver. Cordelia, Lear's youngest daughter, is the source of this subversion when she refuses to address her devotion to Lear publicly. Because Lear has already abdicated his right to the throne, however, he is in a vulnerable position where Cordelia's words directly impact the audience's perception of his importance. The natural hierarchy that a Christian audience would expect is subverted because the child has exerted dominance over the parental figure. At the end of Act I, Scene 1, Goneril reasons for the combined treachery of herself and her sister against Lear, exemplifying further subversion of the Christian familial structure: "If our father carry authority with such disposition as he bears, this last surrender of his will but offend us" (Shakespeare 29).

As Goneril schemes she references Lear's 'disposition,' relating it back to the abdication of his supremacy earlier in the scene. Lear states, "'tis our fast intent to shake all cares and business from our age, conferring them on younger strengths… since now we will divest us both of rule, interest of territory, cares of state" (10-11). He voluntarily moves down the social hierarchy in the story world and disrupts the audience's ideation of inheritance-post-death that their sociopolitical climate normalizes .

Lear's kingship acts as his identifier to other characters. Through the narrative's progression his kingship is frequently referred to in Christian terminology. In Edgar's speech in Act 3, Scene 6, his reference to Lear's title also serves a double meaning to the audience who are assumed to have a comprehensive understanding of Jesus' biblical title: 'King of Kings.' Edgar says, "How light and portable my pain seems now, when that which makes me bend makes the King bow" (157). Another incident of this phenomena occurs later within the dialogue between Cordelia and Lear in Act 5, Scene 3 as they

are marched by Goneril and Regan's soldiers to face their imminent judgement: Cordelia says, "We are not the first who with best meaning have incurred the worst. For thee, oppressed king, I am cast down," referencing to the "oppressed king" and assimilating Lear to the oppressed Jesus, who bore the pains of the world only to bow his head in death on the cross. Due to the biblical connotation associated with the kingly office, the continued use of the word King in reference to Lear in spite of his recent shift down the social ladder shows that the author is attempting to bring attention to the rigidity of the Christian social structure beneath the narrative's fictional camouflage.

The idea of a king in the Christian ideals of the Early Modern period was influenced by the sociopolitical structure built on the Divine Right of Kings. King James I, reigning monarch for a significant portion of the period, delivered a famous speech while addressing a gathering of Lords and Commons: "The state of the monarchy is the supremest thing upon earth: For kings are not only God's lieutenants upon earth, and sit upon God's throne, but even by God himself they are called Gods" (qtd. in Burgess 837). By introducing the idea of birthright in the context of a Christian framework to the sociopolitical structure of Early Modern England, it is made clear that any movement of the predetermined monarch holding the kingly office or those to follow in the same bloodline would, in a heretical sense, defy the will of the Father in heaven. Burgess says that:

> Far from making kings absolute, [the Divine Right of Kings] was actually hostile to the idea that kings had any substantial latitude for the discretionary exercise of sovereign will. It embedded them in a divinely created hierarchy, and this position required them to obey the norms and serve the purposes that God had laid down. (839).

Lear, by abdicating his authority as the fictional representation of kingly office, disrupts the typical social hierarchy where kingship was the penultimate diction of God's authority.

Lear uses the pre-Christian setting to fictionalize the play and therefore provide a guise beneath which Shakespeare questions the sociopolitical boundaries that exist within a Christian-influenced class structure. Similarly, Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* includes Christianized supernatural elements, weaving the fictitious narrative disguise to converse with the audience about the state of the reality of that time. Doctor Faustus, as described in the beginning chorus of the

production, is a man born "base of stock" (Marlowe 1128). Base of stock, in this context, implies that the character lacks a background of affluence and says to the audience that the character of Faustus will act, speak, and perform within the context of his class. However, reality soon parts with Marlowe's fiction by Faustus' opening soliloquy, incorporating intelligent Latin phrases that claim self-grandeur.

A man of lower stock with the intellectual capability to reference material associated with the scholarly elite would not have been a clear indicator of the story's fictional classification due to the expansion of education to more people in lower classes spreading at this time. However, "while the number of grammar schools increased, this did not bring with it a necessary broadening of educational opportunity. The better schools still catered to the elite of the society, whose schools usually afforded them the better teachers" (Jenkins 2). Faustus' disproportionally inflated education serves as a fictional guise, or, the summoning supernatural skills from the Christian Devil to transcend the authority of the rigid social hierarchy as dictated by the Christian God.

Scene nine of *Doctor Faustus* both subverts and reestablishes the expected social norms of the contemporary reality through Faustus' supernatural expression of his grand cosmic powers at court. Chorus 3 explains how Faustus' fame has led to employment by the emperor to perform like an entertainer. While at court he is repeatedly insulted by a knight, recognized in the Early Modern hierarchy as a member of high rank. Faustus, with the aid of his supernatural abilities, has the power to enact divine justice over any mortal man who casts him insult. Yet, the only act of justice taken to correct the perjury of his public image is in placing horns on top of the knight's head to brand him a cuckolded husband; "How now, sir knight? Why, I had thought thou hadst been a bachelor, but now I see thou hast a wife that not only gives thee horns but makes thee wear them!" (Marlowe 1154). The knight responds with, "How dar'st thou thus abuse a gentleman?" (Marlowe 1154). Marlowe makes an important distinction for the audience through both Faustus' rebellious supernatural actions against the social hierarchy and the reaction of the high class courtier. He separates the knight as a gentleman. Thus, by proxy, Marlowe exemplifies that Faustus is not.

Despite Faustus' extensive education and mastery of the four principle disciplines of the time, his God-given background originating by birthright in the lower social classes follows him up to the affluence of court. Similar to Lear, Faustus is trapped by his own class. Movement, either up or down on the class structure, is

deemed impossible by the fictional narratives based on the reality of the contemporary class structure, imbued with the authority of the almighty through the Divine Right of Kings. God, in the ideology of Early Modern Christianity, trickles down the appropriate role of every person within the society by placing the premeditated king on the throne with purpose.

When Faustus attempts to climb the ranks of the Christian social hierarchy, as juxtaposed to Lear's decline, displaces the rest of the hierarchy and subverts God's authority in the sociopolitical climate by rejecting its correctness. The main premise of the play focalizes on Faustus' desire for powers beyond human comprehension. He says:

> Ay, these are those that Faustus most desires. O what a world of profit and delight, of power, of honor, of omnipotence is promised to the studious artisan! All things that move between the quiet poles shall be at my command: emperors and kings are but obeyed in their several provinces, nor can they raise the wind, or rend the clouds; but his dominion that exceeds in this stretcheth as far as doth the mind of man: a sound magician is a mighty god. Here, Faustus, try thy brains to gain a deity. (Marlowe 1130).

Through Faustus' desires and acquirement of metaphysical powers, Marlowe exhibits a subversion of the socially accepted theology on natural hierarchical order and the consequences of that subversion.

Faustus' socially damnable actions literally drag him into hell. His last words before the Devils overpower him are "I'll burn my books-ah, Mephastophilis!" (1163), followed by the epilogue of the play, resonating as the last input into the conversation from Marlowe. He says:

> Cut is the branch that might have grown full straight, and burned is Apollo's laurel bough, that sometime grew within this learned man. Faustus is gone! Regard his hellish fall, whose fiendful fortune may exhort the wise only to wonder at unlawful things: whose deepness doth entice such forward wits to practice more than heavenly power permits. (Marlowe 1163).

Here, Faustus' unrealistic education and blatantly supernatural extension of that education bear blame as the primary source of Faustus' unearthly punishment. However, the audience translation

of the last lines of the epilogue indicate that stepping outside the sociopolitical class boundaries decided by the Almighty leads to the swift enactment of Divine Justice.

Featured prominently in Christian thought, divine justice refers to a heavenly veneration or reimbursement awarded for living wholesomely according to Christian doctrine and a punishment enforced for living defiantly. Because rigid Christian doctrine was so completely intertwined with political and social hierarchical theory and, during this time, "Absence from church, and any deviation from the forms and rubrics of that book, were statutory offenses and attracted the secular penalties of fine and imprisonment" (Collinson 75). The enactment of divine justice logically applied, in an Early Modern context, to those that subverted the hierarchy dictated by the Divine Right of Kings. In both play-texts, the protagonists perish beneath the cruel, adjudicating hand of divine justice.

In *King Lear*, the titular character is punished by the fictional 'gods' for abdicating what the Christian-rooted audience would perceive as the holiest decision of God's social ordainment. Cordelia is punished for her subversion of that divine hierarchy through her display of power over the natural authority figure. Is his punishment just or unjust? Lear himself says "I am a man more sinned against than sinning" (Shakespeare 131). A characteristic central to the creation of an archetypal tragedy, Lear's character moves from an ignorant disposition- blind to his faults- to achieving insight which, unjustly, leads to his own downfall. In Act 4, Scene 7, Lear re-acknowledges Cordelia as his daughter, thus containing the previous subversion interpreted through the intended audience's cultural filter. Lear says, "For, as I am a man, I think this lady to be my child Cordelia" (221). Lear is beginning to re-ascend the social ladder and enact his artificially dormant power as a father figure in the play. The rest of the dialogue in the scene, however, exemplifies that a complete return to the audience's desired Christian power structure is not possible within the confines of the fiction. "If you have poison for me, I will drink it. I know you do not love me, for your sisters have, as I do remember, done me wrong. You have some cause; they have not… Pray you now, forget, and forgive. I am old and foolish" (221-223). In Lear asking for forgiveness rather than taking forgiveness, Cordelia and Lear become equals in the familial hierarchy.

In this sense Cordelia represents, to the audience, the medium through which the divine source of Lear's authority. "He that parts us shall bring a brand from heaven and fire us hence like foxes. Wipe thine eyes. The good years shall devour them, flesh and fell, ere they

shall make us weep. We'll see 'em starved first" (237). In the first lines, Lear indicates that only a force from heaven would be powerful enough to separate Lear and Cordelia. Heaven, a connection through which the audience applies the message of the fictional narrative to their reality beneath the guise of a pre-Christian setting, summons the key ideal behind the Divine Right of Kings: that only the Christian God has the authority to separate the authority of the monarchy from divinity within the existing social framework. Next, the consequence of such separation is explained through the cultural slang of the time. Among Shakespearian scholars "It has been suggested that this should be printed as "goodyears," and that it is a rare plural form of a term used to connote an unnamed evil power" (Shakespeare 236).

In this scenario, the unnamed evil power that separates Cordelia (divinity) from Lear (monarchy) is the swift hand of divine justice, who outran the too-late messenger sent to save Cordelia from her execution. During Act 1, Scene 1, Lear removes himself from the throne in order to "crawl unburdened toward death" (Shakespeare 9). Being an offense to the natural hierarchy of the Early Modern Christian mindset, the most logical enactment of divine justice to contain the subversion of God's divine ordinance here is to ensure that his monarchy burden him to the grave. From the previous connections, Cordelia's power in the familial hierarchy is equal to Lear's. The holy office of the King according to the early modern school of thought has no parallel or equal contender. Lear was born to be a king just as Cordelia was born to rank below him as a child. Because Lear, in the minds of the Early Modern theatergoers, was meant to be a king as dictated by the Divine Right, Shakespeare poses a question: why would the divine be so thoughtlessly cruel to someone who defied the sociopolitical norm in order to do right by someone (i.e. forgiving)? Simply, he ironically portrays divine justice as unjust.

How does Marlowe question divine justice with Faustus' unnatural punishment in considering these events' application to reality? Throughout Scene 13 Scholars implore Faustus to repent to the Christian God. They ensure that "God's mercies are infinite" (Marlowe 1160) However, Marlowe writes Faustus' reply using a metaphor from Christian lore: "But Faustus' offense can ne'er be pardoned! The serpent that tempted Eve may be saved, but not Faustus" (Marlowe 1160). Indeed, Faustus continues to protest with the same excuse: he cannot repent. If God's mercies are infinite, what ensnares Faustus in the cage of his sin? Faustus reminds the audience, as the scene continues, of his education at Wittenberg: "O would I had never seen Wittenberg, never read a book" (Marlowe 1160). By emphasizing the

fictional possibility of the lowborn Doctor's stellar education, Marlowe is also emphasizing, through the guise of the narrative, that the subversion of the lower class moving up the social ladder with the aid of education will lead, ultimately, to undesirable aftereffects. Faustus is unable to repent and save himself because he cannot unlearn what has been learned just as Eve brought the permanent consequence of mortality on the human race by reaping the benefits from the Tree of Knowledge. Further, when Faustus attempts to repent, he reiterates his crime of verbally manifesting his improbable intelligence by inserting Latin into his soliloquy: "let this hour be but a year, a month, a week, a natural day, that Faustus may repent and save his soul. O lente, lente currite noctis equi!" (Marlowe 1161). Within the audience's understanding of this concept based on their Christianized world view, Faustus is unable to correct the subverted, rigid social structure represented in the supernatural conjuring of the definitively Christian antagonists to gain godlike power and disrupt the natural hierarchy of God-above-man.

Faustus' inability to repent reflects the rigidity of the Christian societal structure and the injustice of the predestination featured within said structure. Marlowe, within the same soliloquy, also draw's audience attention to the omnipotence of the Christian God as the designer of the roles; he already knows who will go where and how they will participate within their respective class in the contemporary Early Modern society. "You stars that reigned at my nativity whose influence hath allotted death and hell… cursed be the parents that engendered me!" (Marlowe 1162). Marlowe, here, uses the concept of the "stars" ruling one's fate and predetermining one's life as a delivery mechanism of the author-to-audience conversation about the fairness of divine justice at work in the then-current social framework.

Because the audience is forced to confront the unfair, emotionally taxing effects of the divine justice in the fictional pre-Christian narrative of *King Lear* and the supernatural action driving towards the climatic damnation in *Doctor Faustus*, questions arise. If an omnipotent God determines social hierarchy, how fair is that premeditated social structure that plans for divine justice to punish those whose greatest sin is an ill-fit with the station of their birth but restricts movement?

By diverging with reality through supernatural, Christian elements and under the disguise of a pre-Christian setting, the authors diversely play on the personal experiences of the intended audience and thereby engage in a controversial conversation without fear of repercussions reverberating back onto themselves: "The problem of truth or falsity of imaginings-cum-believings is often rendered

in discourses on reality… It is important to recognize that real is employed as a term to convince one's self or another that the credibility assigned to an imagining is warranted" (Sarbin 24). While it could be argued that both Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* and Shakespeare's *King Lear* hold full responsibility for the results of their actions in the view of today's society, the mindset of the 17th century, dominantly Christian, English population who engendered these tragedies would be called to pause and contemplate the interpersonal conflict between Christianized social theory and the sense of injustice evoked by the results of the fictional narrative. The fictional mediums that act as a safety net from persecution for revolutionary commentary concerning the injustice in the rigid Christian social structure expose how movement from one social class to another, either up or down, is unfairly rigid and unjustly enforced.

Works Cited

Bal, Mieke. *Narratology Introduction to the Theory of Narrative.* 2nd ed. Canada: University of Toronto Press, 1997. Print.

Burgess, Glenn. "The Divine Right of Kings Reconsidered." *The English Historical Review* 107. 425 (1992): 837-861. PDF. 29 April, 2016.

Collison, Patrick. "The Politics of Religion and the Religion of Politics in Elizabethan England." *Historical Research* 82. 215 (2009): 74-92. PDF. 29 April, 2016.

de Rivera, J., and Theodore Sarbin, eds. *Believed-In Imaginings: The Narrative Construction* Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1998. Print.

Jenkins, Gary. Rev. of *Society and Culture in Early Modern England,* by David Cressy. *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 2005. PDF. 29 April, 2016.

Marlowe, Christopher. "The Tragedy of Doctor Faustus." *The Norton Anthology of English Literature.* 9th ed. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc, 2012. 1128-1163. Print.

Sarbin, Theodore R. "Believed-In Imaginings: A Narrative Approach." *Believed-In Imaginings: The Narrative Construction of Reality.* Eds. Joseph de Rivera and Theodore Sarbin. Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1998. 15-31. Print.

Shakespeare, William. "King Lear." *Folger Shakespeare Library.* Eds. Barbara Mowat and Paul Werstine. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1993. Print.