

ENGL 4384: Senior Seminar  
Student Anthology

---

---

Spring 2014  
Dr. Laura Miller, Professor  
Department of English & Philosophy

---

---



Printed on campus by UWG Publications and Printing.



# Humans and Animals



Introduction	5
Dr. Laura Miller	

## **I. Challenging Taxonomies**

The Obscene Animal Enclosure: The Search for the Body Without Organs and Animal Colonialism in Peter Greenaway's <i>A Zed &amp; Two Noughts</i>	11
Lucas Chance	

Misrepresentations of Animal Characteristics in Human Sports: The Linguistic Categories of James Wright's 'Autumn Begins in Martins Ferry, Ohio'	25
Robert Davis	

Animals and Humans: Communal Violence	43
Debra Kelley Richardson	

## **II. Reevaluating Children's Entertainment**

The Secret Dark Side in Children's Movies: Portraying Imperialism in <i>Ratatouille</i>	63
Megan Moody	

Garfield: A Cat Stuck in the Uncanny Valley	79
Laura Gordon	

Animals in Fairy Tales	93
Jordan Moss	

### **III. From Gilgamesh to the Geth: Human-Animal Intersubjectivity Across The Centuries**

- Humanimality: Peace With the Inner Beast 109  
James Weeks
- Identifying the Beast Within the Beauty: Articulating Animalistic Connections with the Marginalized Other in Order to Achieve Power in two of Angela Carter's Short Stories in *The Bloody Chamber* and J.M. Coetzee's *Disgrace* 123  
Kelsey Brown
- Finding Utopia with Robots – the Domesticated Animals of the Future – in BioWare's *Mass Effect* Trilogy 137  
Stephanie Williams

### **IV. Revisiting Canonical Texts through Animal Studies**

- Frankenstein* and *The Metamorphosis*: Functioning of the Man within the Animal Societal and Familial 153  
Kyleen Oldham
- Victorian Anxieties: Deconstructing Masculine Predators and Feminine Prey in Hardy's *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* and Stoker's *Dracula* 171  
Trevor Pace

# Humans and Animals

## Introduction

by Dr. Laura Miller



To many students, the senior seminar represents a chance to finish their undergraduate education with a meaningful capstone project, the culmination of four years' education in research and writing. To a few students, this project represents a beginning—a gateway to the kind of academic writing accomplished in graduate school. And to me, a professor, the senior seminar is a chance to let students in to what I do: academic research and writing that are done with the intent to publish. Our class has thus culminated in an edited volume of essays, written by the seminar's students, that relate in some way to the seminar topic of humans and animals. This anthology is very special to me and I hope it feels special to you as well.

Students in this class participated in an advanced research and writing workshop. They learned practical skills, including the ability to improve essay writing. They worked on factoring in counterarguments, timing arguments, and making clear and concise points about the works under discussion. Students learned to take risks in their academic writing, experiment with ways to engage an audience, and understand and improve their own voices and writing styles. The result of this work is the following engaging set of papers on the topic of human and animal studies.

I chose the topic of humans and animals because I wanted to take advantage of an upswing in current scholarship. In recent years, many scholars have explored the relationship between literature and the environment. I chose one subset of this relationship—the connections between humans and animals in literature and culture—as the focus of this course. Because human-animal interactions range from domestication to observation to protection and stewardship, the literary scholar-

ship on humans and animals can vary likewise and the essays in this volume are correspondingly diverse. From ecocriticism to postcolonial criticism to Marxist criticism, there are many ways to theorize humans and animals in literary research.

The first three essays in this volume address the topic of categorization in religion, in sports, and in human research. Lucas Chance's essay offers a hybrid approach to Peter Greenaway's film *A Zed and Two Noughts*, using animal studies in conjunction with Deleuze and Guattari's concept of the Body Without Organs to analyze the twins' quest for understanding in the film. Robert Davis looks at the interrelatedness of language, animal characteristics, and human sports, using James Wright's 'Autumn Begins in Martins Ferry, Ohio' as a springboard to theorizing the synthesis of animal and sport. Finally, Debra Kelley Richardson investigates the way human communities use animal sacrifices for self-definition, including an analysis of representations of animal sacrifice in the Old Testament and how those representations help readers more profoundly understand human community and animal sacrifice in JM Coetzee's novel *Disgrace*.

The second section of this volume reevaluates children's entertainment using academic analysis. Megan Moody's persuasive discussion of the colonial implications of *Ratatouille* changes the way viewers understand the kind of identities, tastes, and cuisines that Disney is privileging. Laura Gordon looks at the connection between the popular character Garfield and the Uncanny Valley, in which too much realism can be a drawback to the success of an entertainment franchise. Jordan Moss's analysis of fairy tales shows how earlier children's entertainment can also benefit from an animal studies perspective.

The third section of the anthology includes three essays that look at the relationship between humans, bestial qualities, and the idea of domestication. The essays span centuries, beginning with James Weeks's comparison of Enkidu in *Gilgamesh* to the character Wolverine. Then, Kelsey Brown's essay looks at past versus present in her evaluation of Angela Carter's retelling of fairy tale stories in *The Bloody Chamber* as well as Coetzee's use of bestial motifs in *Disgrace*. Finally, Stephanie Williams's essay casts its eye forward with a look at the dystopic future presented in the video game series *Mass Effect*, in particular addressing the ontological status of the Geth, a race of human-engineered robot slaves.

Although many of the students in this class explored non-traditional and non-canonical texts, the last two essays in this anthology show how human-animal studies can enhance our understanding of canonical works. Kyle Oldham's essay on *Frankenstein* and *The Metamorphosis*, two works

published a century apart, looks at the social contexts of both of these works through a human-animal studies lens. Lastly, Trevor Pace's essay on *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* and *Dracula* looks at the connections between hunting, the landed gentry, and Victorian narratives of seduction.

Together, these essays represent diverse and exciting inquiries into the nature of human and animal, and by extension into the nature of humanistic inquiry itself, a foundational concept in English studies. With that, I encourage you to read and enjoy *Humans and Animals*.

Laura Miller, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor, Department of English and Philosophy  
University of West Georgia





---

# I. Challenging Taxonomies





# The Obscene Animal Enclosure: The Search for the Body Without Organs and Animal Colonialism in Peter Greenaway's *A Zed & Two Noughts*

by Lucas Chance



*“He watches absentmindedly as a boy and a girl, both aged around ten, struggle to drag a very prominently marked, black and white Dalmatian dog into the zoo. The dog resists, barking and whining” (Greenaway 11).*

This image of a Dalmatian opens both the film and the screenplay of Peter Greenaway's *A Zed & Two Noughts* (1985). It symbolizes man's desire to tame the natural for study and categorization, though the natural defies such burdens. Oliver and Oswald Deuce are twin zoologists who both lose their wives in a car crash outside of the zoo where they work. The accident is caused when a swan walks across the street and the car collides with the animal. This “act of God”—as Greenaway drolly puts in the introduction to his screenplay—destabilizes the two brothers and sends them on a journey towards their own destruction while they attempt to explain why this random event seemingly “had” to happen. The Deuce brothers try to understand life and death. The concept of mortality however, like the dragged Dalmatian, resists their every attempt at domestication.

In *Anti-Oedipus*, Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari discuss a concept known as the “body without organs” (BWO). The BWO as a concept is one that acts outside the physical realm. The BWO acts as a concept of the physical. The example that Deleuze and Guattari give in their text is the capitalist to capital. Capital is a concept that supersedes actual, physical currency. The BWO aligns itself with the concept and the construction of capital in general rather than being a physical manifestation of that (Deleuze and Guattari 10-11). What the Deuces are search-

ing for in *Zed* is the BWO of mortality, and they do this through their own version of research which includes their research in the physical world (i.e. their various sexual encounters with Venus and Alba), and their research through the medium of film.

The search for meaning through art is not an unheard of concept in Greenaway's filmography. His film previous to *Zed*, *The Draughtman's Contract*, features an artist who decodes a murder mystery through his own landscape drawings he contracted to do of a noble estate in rural England. *The Belly of an Architect*, Greenaway's film following *Zed* (which is also briefly mentioned in *Zed* via a newspaper article), follows an American architect in Rome whose obsession with the works of Boulée and the life of Caesar Augustus leads to his own destruction. And in *Prospero's Books*, his adaptation of *The Tempest*, Prospero writes, narrates, and voices all the characters while the film progresses. *Zed* distinguishes itself from the other films in Greenaway's oeuvre because it is one of the few that deals directly with filmmaking as a medium. The Deuces attempt to learn about the interaction of life and death by watching David Attenborough's documentary *Life on Earth*, and, eventually, by recording their own films of decaying animals (ranging from prawns and an angelfish to a zebra and the Deuces themselves) for research.

Greenaway portrays the binary of Empire/colonized other with the Deuces and the characters that they research. For example, the brothers are twins (literal and living binaries) and over the course of the film, the two are reduced to one, co-dependent being. Greenaway shows that the binary between the Empire/colonized—just like the relationship between the Deuces and their subjects—is actually one functioning construction and not two independent subjects who act with their own autonomy. As Deleuze and Guattari state, “man and nature are not like two opposite terms confronting each other...rather, they are one and the same essential reality, the producer-product” (Deleuze and Guattari 4-5). The Deuce brothers devolve into this state, or they finally realize their state as animals in the natural world. Greenaway exploits the co-dependent relationship that Deleuze and Guattari speak, and portrays it through the brothers living off of one another, the people and animals that they study throughout the film, and the Deuce brothers' dependence on these subjects for their experiments.

As mentioned earlier, thematic elements cross over multiple films in Peter Greenaway's filmography. Obsession, concepts such as life and death, and the artificiality of cinema as an art form come up often within his body of work. While there are similarities between the films of Greenaway, his body of work differs greatly from the idea of “classi-

cal cinema.” Indeed, when the British Academy of Film and Television Arts (BAFTA) awarded Greenaway for his Outstanding British Contribution to British Cinema in 2014, it came as a surprise to both British audiences and to Greenaway himself. In the clip from the post-award interview, he characterizes his films as “the cinema of the outsider” and goes on to decry BAFTA as traditionally being seen as “the cinema of the conformist.” This fight against what audiences perceive as traditional narrative and “good” filmmaking has long been the standards that Greenaway subverts through his films.

The way Greenaway stages his films as attempts to “recreate” or works of art from the Dutch tradition of painting, and his style of filmmaking as a whole owes much to Dutch masters such as Goltzius, Rembrandt, and Bosch (each of whom Greenaway has made a film about or plans to in the near future). Greenaway’s previous feature length effort (*The Draughtman’s Contract*) is set in 1694, and Greenaway returns to 1600s in other efforts as well (*The Baby of Macon*, *Prospero’s Books*, and, more recently, *Goltzius and the Pelican Company*). Greenaway builds his films using art forms of the past and presents them in the newer context of film itself. His technique acts as a very conscious and self-aware style of filmmaking where the cultural references and influences present themselves on screen in a completely different context than their origins. This act of “recreation” actually sets about grounding his films that are period pieces. The art Greenaway uses of art fit the common cultural presentation of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, and act to make what could be seen as far-fetched plotlines (i.e. the artificial passion play that interacts with the audience in lurid and violent ways in *The Baby of Macon* and the very specific and hand drawn murder mystery in *The Draughtman’s Contract*) into the realm of plausibility for matinee audiences. This explains why his earlier period pieces tend to be more popular and more heavily screened than his later-fare.

What distinguishes *A Zed and Two Noughts* from Greenaway’s other early work is that it’s his first film set in the present (the early to mid-1980s). *A Zed and Two Noughts* features characters living in the present, and it remains as Greenaway’s most contemporary –minded film. Everything from the setting (contemporary London), its modern mise-en-scène featuring neon signs and advertisements, and its use of film as a means of expression have this film as a reflection of times closer to own compared to Greenaway’s other films. While he has returned to the present in his later films, *Zed* has his characters act without the world of history (particularly the history of art) on their shoulders, unlike some of Greenaway’s other characters. Other critics and casual viewers of

Greenaway may point out that Greenaway's most financially successful film—*The Cook, the Thief, His Wife, and Her Lover*—has a contemporary setting, and while that is true, they would be missing what Greenaway does in *Cook*. It features contemporary characters, yes, but Albert Spica and his men dress themselves in 17<sup>th</sup> century garb while eating and gallivanting, and Michael specializes in studying French history. The characters in *Cook* rely on and face the past just as much as Kracklite looks upon Augustus and Boullée in *Belly*, Nagiko recreates East Asian calligraphy and body painting in *The Pillow Book*, and as much as the multiple Cissie Culpitts need their own family history to justify their actions in *Drowning By Numbers*. The Deuce brothers stand as the first and remain as the only characters in a Greenaway film to fully live and function in the contemporary.

While *Zed* acts as Greenaway's most contemporary-minded film, it, however, does not make it his most accessible. *Zed* did not nearly make as much money in the box office that his previous effort received, and *Zed* perplexed many critics upon release. The 1984 review in *Variety* points argues that “[despite] its visual pyrotechnics and an impressively woven texture of intellectual allusions, Pete Greenaway's feature fails to engage the audience's sympathies” (*Variety*). Given the film's uncommon and uncanny style, the alienation of a matinee audience was unavoidable. Which begs the question: if there is no attempt on Greenaway's part to market *Zed* towards a contemporary audience, why would he set the film in a present-day setting? Amy Lawrence, in the section of her book-length study of Peter Greenaway—*The Films of Peter Greenaway*—dedicated to the film, argues that Greenaway intentionally disconnects his film from the emotional attachment of viewers and goes on to assert that it betters the film. She does so by comparing *Zed* to David Cronenberg's *Dead Ringers* (which Greenaway himself claims he and *Zed* inspired). As Lawrence points out in her argument, the two films do share a remarkable amount in common: both feature experimental scientists at the top of their field, both features have the both brothers have sex with the same French woman with a medical abnormality (an amputee in *Zed* and a woman with three separate uteri in *Ringers*), and both end with the brothers indistinguishable from one another and dead while lying next to one another. What remains surprising is the reaction to the films. *Dead Ringers* had financial success and a less tepid critical response than *Zed*, yet two of them seem to have come from the same well. Lawrence explains it thus:

*Dead Ringers* is a psychological horror film...[it] attempts to establish a coherent psychological world and explanations for

things that in Greenaway....*Dead Ringers* demands emotional identification....If Cronenberg were to use the symmetrical compositions and long shots of *Zed*, it would be seem merely a primitive method to separate two halves of the screen. (Lawrence 77)

Lawrence points out that the reason Greenaway's film positions itself impenetrable to a mainstream audience lies within Greenaway's refusal to adhere to genre constraints. Greenaway through meticulously setting up shots and refusing any form of close-up shot on the players gives the film an aloof feel. *Dead Ringers* needs that closeness in order to draw spectators into and sympathize with the plight of the brothers in Cronenberg's world and to instill fear in those watching the film, because the film acts within the horror genre, which critics and fans hold Cronenberg as master of that genre. Greenaway uses the alienation technique to bring forth the absurdity of what his characters are doing. While Cronenberg wants viewers to feel and ultimately pity the brothers in his film, Greenaway wants his audience to see the absurdity of his characters' actions. He does this by deconstructing every aspect of the film from shots to the dialog and even to Michael Nyman's minimalist score which features two movements in constant fluctuation. Lawrence argues that such a method on Greenaway's part comes from his attempt to create "dry comedy" (Lawrence 78). Lawrence's argument belittles the film, however. What Greenaway does here with *Zed* with the contemporary setting and the intentional absurdist methods of presentation is show how the Deuce brothers' search for a concrete and objective definition to the abstract concepts of mortality and free will. With this film, Greenaway addresses the futility of filmmaking to address this as well.

Oliver and Oswald begin shooting films due to their dissatisfaction with the films they watch. After their respective wives' shared death, Oliver and Oswald begin to screen the zoo's copy of Sir Richard Attenborough's *Life on Earth*, which details the origins of life ranging from paramecium to large mammals. The brothers watch the films as an attempt to expunge their grief. In the scene where we first find Oliver watching the film, he has a conversation with a zoo employee about why he's watching the film. The screenplay has it as such:

OLIVER: (*aggressively*) The beginnings of life. / FALLAST: (after a pause) Do want to take time off? / OLIVER: (*sharply*) No...it's cathartic. / FALLAST: What is? / OLIVER: Watching how life begins. / FALLAST: Yes? / OLIVER: Yes—because I know how it ends. /FALLAST: How does it end? / OLIVER:

With a swan. /.../ FALLAST: Then I'm sorry that you will find this film inaccurate. / OLIVER: (*politely mocking*) Don't ruin it for me, Fallast...I'm going to take it in stages, it needs absorbing. I'm sure I must have got it wrong before, and I'm on the lookout for clues. (Greenaway 29)

This scene from early on in the film shows Oliver as being disconnected from other people, yet within reason. Oliver is in grief, and his fellow employees only try to help him. But Greenaway preambles Oliver's eventual disintegration of self and disconnect from everyone around him excluding his brother. Oliver fixates on the film and watches it continuously. As he says to Fallast, he watches it to look "for clues." Oliver obsesses over the film to the point that it becomes a text that requires deciphering instead of a simple documentary that the zoo shows to the visiting public. Oliver finds catharsis for his grief via the film. Fallast acts as the voice of reason here, and he acts as the audience surrogate. Oliver wants a specific answer to his grief that film cannot possibly provide which Fallast and audience both know. Earlier in the scene, he offers his condolences which Oliver totally ignores. Oliver becomes more insular with his grief wanting a film that's made to appeal to a broad audience to answer and alleviate his own condition. Fallast's attempt to console Oliver shows someone's attempt to sympathize with another person in grief, but fails to do so. Fallast will always be incapable of connecting to Oliver in this way and that leads to an awkward conversation where neither party comes out fully satisfied and things are left just as unresolved as they were before. This miscommunication between Oliver and the film, and Fallast and himself causes Oliver to become frustrated. This frustration causes Oliver to become more insular, and he does so to the point where the only outside contact that he has which can satisfy his desire for answer comes from people who also experienced the loss and the traumatic incident: namely, Oswald and Alba.

*Zed's* infamous "time lapse" sequences act as our only true view into the mind of the Deuce brothers. In his essay "Zoos and Ooze in *A Zed & Two Noughts*," Douglas Keesey points out that Greenaway does such using editing techniques like POV shots from Oswald when he looks through the focus of a camera while setting up an experiment, and a POV shot from Oliver when he arranges slugs on a glass tray (Keesey 40). This creative camera work from Greenaway and company (specifically cinematographer Sacha Vierney, who went on to become Greenaway's longtime collaborator after *Zed*) forces the audience not to connect with the brothers as Lawrence suggests Cronenberg does with his close-ups



in *Dead Ringers*, but this perspective gives us a voyeurism and a view into how the Deuces perceive their research, thus causing more distance between viewer and the Deuces as characters. This distinguishing of the Deuces at the beginning film is intentional of Greenaway. In an interview with Michel Ciment, Greenaway says that, “Oliver is a ‘hot’ character, Oswald is ‘cold.’ The two brothers represent in a symbolic manner the human condition: the mind and the heart (Greenaway and Ciment 37).”

Greenaway shows the two separate parts of human consciousness (intuition and logic) searching for the same thing: the BWO of mortality. He shows the gradual devolvement (or decay) of the two into one being using both the cinematography and the color palette. The filmmakers do this to show the unification of the two at their eventual death. We get a view point of their separate consciousnesses and see it slowly become a single consciousness by the end of the film.

The first appearance of Oswald in the film comes during the opening credits where we find him focusing his camera on a gorilla that has had its leg amputated. It’s for a type of unknown and unmentioned research that the brothers do at the zoo. Another moment we have alone with Oswald has him setting up what will soon be the research space for the brothers’ “time lapse” experiments, but instead of an animal’s decay, we find Oliver taking a bite out of an apple and taking pictures of the apple’s oxidation. Like his brother, Oswald too watches the *Life on Earth* films. While Oswald films fruit decay, Oliver releases the animals like his wife wanted him to before her death, but he too remains unfulfilled. The brothers search for the BWO of mortality, but they also look for why they are filled with the desire to know. The two brothers both become frustrated with the half measures they seem to be taking in answering the questions and their failure to discover the BWO through the art and research of others. They need one another to come to the conclusion of filming the decay of animals. As a contrast to the *Life on Earth* segments—which shows the development of life, the Deuces’ films show the rapid rot and decomposition. Each film features their subject on a hard floor where a light flashes and the camera takes a series of photos as the subjects slowly decomposes. The “time lapse” in their films comes from them taking these photos and turning them into a montage. Like the *Life on Earth* clips, it is footage taken from a longer period of time turned into something easily digestible and with a short length. *Zed* features the fast-paced music of Michael Nyman and the music acts both on a diegetic—the record that the Deuces play over their final experiment—and nondiegetic. The Deuces do with their film what Greenaway does with his film, and that is create something as an attempt to understand

complicated concepts. But just as Greenaway needs others to fulfill his vision, the Deuces need one another in order to reach theirs. Together they begin their research.

What the Deuces do to animals in *Zed* (that being euthanizing them and filming the steps of the decay for each respective animal) has been seen by critics as means for Greenaway to criticize and subvert the institution of zoos. To return to the negative review from *Variety*, the critic says that “[in] this lurid arena Greenaway is intent on upturning the seamier, humiliating side of animal existence in captivity (including that of homo sapiens)” (*Variety*). The anonymous critic who dismisses *Zed* as nothing but “visual pyrotechnics” does a fine job at pointing out the vein of what makes the Deuces’ research so unsavory: the exploitation of animals both human and otherwise. Alba acts as both the brothers’ first and last subject of research. Their first interaction comes soon after the accident when the brothers question to see how she is doing. The trip starts off as merely as a formality and an attempt by brothers to connect with people who were part of the accident. When they see that one of her legs has been amputated, the brothers’ respective interest peaks and they start visiting her separately. She becomes a means of studying the accident itself since she was the driver of the car when it collided with the swan. The brothers start having sex with her on separate occasions, and she inadvertently spurns on their research: when she reveals that Oswald’s wife had bought prawns on their trip, he starts filming the decay of prawns; and she calls their “homework” film of watching an angelfish decay (which they screen for her and her daughter) as “interesting,” and her taking the brothers to her childhood home gives them idea for the perfect locale for their final experiment.

What seems to be a symbiotic relationship turns out to be parasitic with the Deuces shown to be the inquisitive flukeworms. When Alba’s surgeon, Van Meegren, conducts his experiments on her by amputating parts of her body so that she can pose in his recreations of Vermeer paintings, Alba complains about the process that will eventually kill her to the Deuce brothers. She thinks she has sympathetic ear with the brothers, but the brothers address her concerns with a detached apathy. As Keesey states:

[The Deuces] want to film the decay of Alba’s body after her death, and, though it was Van Meegren who amputated her legs for his painting, the husbands find that this suits their purpose too: her body will now “fit better into the frame.” (Keesey 33)

While it's been hinted at and foreshadowed throughout the film that the Deuce's relationship with Alba contained some dubiousness, Keesey points to the exact moment where their self-serving nature becomes totally apparent. Van Meegren acts as a character whose methods and motivations remain almost entirely unknown to the viewer through the film's runtime. He and his mistress/assistant converse and interact with the other characters, but only have limited conversations with the Deuces. If anything, Van Meegren seems to be a character who has somehow stumbled into *Zed* from the plotline of some previously existing Peter Greenaway film. He functions in this film as a foil of the Deuces. His experiments seem all the more perverse compared to the Deuces because Van Meegren chooses on people instead of on animals, like the Deuces. The reveal that Deuces want Alba's body for research acts as the climax to the film and the final barrier that the Deuces cross over. The figure of Van Meegren acts as counter to that argument, and it argues that the Deuce brothers have been just as lascivious and pernicious with their art as Van Meegren has been with his.

The only other adult female character in the film, Venus di Milo, also experiences this form of commoditization by the hands of the Deuces. Unlike Alba however, Venus remains outside of the Deuces' control at the end of the film. And throughout the film, Venus remains the most independent of all the characters. The first time she appears on screen, Venus di Milo dresses herself in black and white and has a discussion with the zoo's proprietor, Van Hoyten. Venus, a prostitute, has a tête-à-tête with Van Hoyten on what he will give her if she sleeps with him. He goes on to joke about locking her in a cage with the zebra so that she and the animal could make "a centaur" (Greenaway 27-28). While Alba seems to be totally out of her depth when dealing with the Deuces and the men around her, Venus remains threatening to the men. The Deuce brothers acquire her services before they begin their shared affair with Alba. The purchasing of her only lasts one session for each, as she refuses to be studied and be passive towards the Deuces' advances. Her interaction with Oliver sends him into a personal dilemma:

OLIVER: (*interrupting, irritated and a little sanctimonious*) God, Milo. This is another wingeing story about money and I disapprove of circuses.../ MILO: I disapprove of zoos./ OLIVER: Shut up and get out. / MILO: But I haven't got to the erotic bits yet.../ .../ MILO: What kind of stories does your brother Oswald like? / .../ MILO: And leave those little snails alone, you dirty old man. (Greenaway 37)

Milo tries her services out as an erotic storyteller for both brothers before they reject her and send her out of the room. She maintains her self and originality despite the dominating presences of the brothers. While Alba conceded to the wills of Oliver and Oswald, Venus does not. Earlier in the scene, Oliver tells her to not tell him any nursery stories, but she continues on with one anyway. And as she leaves Oliver's apartment while remaining naked from their sexual encounter, she sings "The Teddy Bear Picnic" as an attempt to spite him. When Oliver brushes off her story, she brushes off his profession and place of work. She condemns his research into snails (which he favors as "uncomplicated" since they are totally asexual) as being the sexual desire that Oliver refuses to acknowledge it as. Milo performs as the one character that remains totally aware to the supposedly secret actions of the men around her. And her influence does have an affect on both of the Deuce brothers. They play "The Teddy Bear Picnic" as they undress themselves to prepare for their final experiment. Milo has dominance in her that Alba does not have, and it's for this reason that the brothers reject Milo in favor of Alba, whom they can control. As Keesey writes about Milo's fate,

Although the [Deuces] reject both Van Meegeren's and Van Hoyten's offers to kill Milo and sell her body to them for use in the decomposition studies, Oswald and Oliver have bought slaughtered animals from Van Hoyten in the past. (Keesey 33)

Keesey focuses on what he perceives as the hypocrisy committed by the Deuce brothers. He fails to acknowledge that while this is an act of hypocrisy, this also functions as a total rejection for Milo for her refusal to be commoditized. While she did make her living as a prostitute, she did so within her own conscience. She remains unforced into being a prostitute and she took on what clients that she wanted. It harkens back to a previous image in the film and screenplay; Venus performs in the same way that the Dalmatian does at the beginning of the film. While the two children try to force the dog to be classified and enter the simulated space of the zoo, the Dalmatian refuses it and fights against its would-be captors. Milo functions much in the same way. While the researchers of the film (the Deuces, Van Meegren; Van Hoyten) all need subjects matters in order to continue their research, Milo does not need the research in order to continue on her way. Her death in the film does not come from another character murdering her, such as Alba, but it comes from her own desire to die. She takes off her shoes herself and walks out into the field where the stallion is sure to kill her. By doing

that, she refuses to die in the same way that Alba dies, and Milo also refuses to be forced to participate in the Deuces' experiment at all. Milo refuses to be a slaughtered animal.

The likening of women to animals happens throughout the film, and it's mostly because we are limited to the perceptions of the Deuce brothers. In the Deuce brothers' mindset, everything that isn't male becomes reduced to subjects ready for study. The Deuces eroticize and exoticize the unfamiliar. While they become more and more insular, the outside world becomes reduced. But while they seem to be aloof from their subjects, they also require their study subjects in order to function. The Deuce brothers need women and animals so that their search for the BWO can continue. They rejected Venus di Milo because she did not need or require them in order to function. Milo acted on the animal instinct that the Deuce brothers could not understand or tame. Alba, however, needed the connection that the Deuce brothers seemingly had with her. Because of this need, Alba became a tool and means of production for the experiments and proclivities of the men around her. Even after she dies, her will is not her own. She donated her body to the Deuces, but when the twins come to collect her, the family intervenes. Even in that moment post death, Alba's body remains a commodity and her wishes are not her own. This throws a kink into the plans of the Deuces because they no longer have a human subject. At this moment, the Deuces realize their codependence with their subjects. As Deleuze and Guattari write about in *Anti-Oedipus* about the producer-produced binary:

Hence everything is production: *production of productions*, of action and of passions; *productions of recording processes*, of distributions and of co-ordinates that serve as points of reference; *productions of consumptions*, of sensual pleasures, of anxiety, and of pain. Everything is production, since the recording processes are immediately consumed...and these consumptions directly reproduced. (Deleuze and Guattari 13)

Since the Deuces literally record their subjects' decay with a camera, as soon as the final product is completed and watched, the Deuces need to move onto another subject so that their research can continue. As a way to move past and externalize their grief, the Deuces became consumers and producers with their filmmaking. They became producers of productions and producers of consumptions with their sexual and intellectual pursuits. They produce their recording process via the films. While they do create the films, it creates the longing within them that they have to

move on up the evolutionary later until they finally come to humanity. The largest flaw to their plan was that the BWO performs without origins or context. The Deuces' failed because they tried to achieve the abstract by going through material means. According to Deleuze and Guattari, the material lasts for a finite amount of time, and only does so until the recording process is complete. In order to reach and understand the BWO, the Deuces would have to create something that would last on an infinite scale. They tried to do this via their films just like Van Meeren tried to do so with his art recreations and Van Hoyten tried to do so via the institution of his zoo. All three groups of men failed because each created something that could easily be consumed and come nowhere near the BWO. Their need for outside subjects halts itself when Alba's family refuses to turn over her body to the Deuces. When that happens, the Deuces rely on the one aspect that has driven them this far and has helped them collect their research: each other.

Oliver and Oswald's gradual devolvement into a single person signifies their internal drive to return to a simpler form of life. The film progresses as their experiments do: from the most basic forms of life to the more complex. The film ends and reaches its zenith when the Deuces place themselves up for their own experimentation. But while the film shows a forward momentum with the *Life on Earth* segments and the increasing complexity of the Deuces' experiments, the film also features a move backwards in the characters in the Deuces. Greenaway first shows the twins as living separate lives and featuring different personality traits. Oliver has deeper connection with nature. His apartment features plant life, snails, and warm lighting. He lets out the butterflies and other insects just as his deceased wife wanted him to do before she died in the traffic accident. Greenaway gives Oliver blonde hair and a warmer connection towards children. He speaks to Beta, Alba's daughter, more often than his brother. When Milo visits Oliver, he wants to hear her story (although he doesn't care for any of the stories she tells), and he acts the most irrational out of the two brothers. Meanwhile, Oswald has a colder demeanor. His apartment has cold gray colors and a modern layout. He has a television, but it seems to only play static of *Life on Earth*. He has a dry sense of humor, while Oliver has a naïve demeanor. For example, when the two watch the zebra decay at L'escargot, Oliver asks "Do you think Adam was a Siamese twin?" to which Oswald replies, "What happened to his brother?". When Milo visits him, Oswald acts and remains aloof towards her. He keeps their interactions formal and commands her to do things. Greenaway highlights this differentiation with his symmetrical filmmaking. The brothers tend to be separate from

another at all times early on in the film. Just as Lawrence said when comparing *Zed to Ringers*, Greenaway highlights the differences between the two in order to highlight their eventual transformation.

The culmination of their research comes in the final shot of the film. The two brothers lay side by side on a floor, they start the music accompaniment and the camera, and they inject each other with an unidentified serum. The Deuces lay dead while the camera rolls over their decaying bodies. In that moment when they put themselves up for their own study, the Deuce brothers realize that they are animals too. By placing themselves in the same situation as their previous filmed subjects (which have all been animals from the zoo they work at), they acknowledge their connection to those subjects. They Deuces learned about this through the process of filmmaking (which includes the exploitation of women and animals), and their own devolvement and dependence on one another. Through these means, the Deuce brothers realize that their research is all for naught.

While they start the film separate, they become one functioning unit when the film ends. They try their best to recreate the conditions when they were children and were conjoined at the hip by creating a shared suit and inhabiting it together. As they insulate themselves against the outside world, the two of them rely on themselves is much that they become synonymous with one another. This functions as a miniature form of the producer-produced binary. While the brothers do somewhat maintain an individual identity, they rely one another to function. Just like Alba relied on men to function, they rely on the other brother in order to continue their existence. The moment when they set themselves up for the experiment is where the brothers realize like they are just like the subjects they have placed upon the same table. This death scene is the closest that the two get to knowing and understanding the BWO of mortality and binaries that the empire has created. But even in that moment, the recording becomes damage when snails attach themselves to the record played and all the electrical equipment that the brothers have set up in *L'escargot*. Even when they are the closest to understanding, it still eludes the brothers because nature remains outside of the brothers' control.

In conclusion, Greenaway concludes that searching for answers via art and science and the creation of art is a failure act. Greenaway also shows that the division of and classification of concepts is also a failed act.

The film has the closest thing to a happy ending that Greenaway has ever done. While the main characters and two of the supporting characters do end up dying, the brothers have their own version of an

epiphany. As explained before, the two setting their selves up for study has them acknowledging their equality with their subject matter. The BWO remains elusive for both Greenaway and his characters, but the film does have a sense of movement even if it is one that shows it is all for naught. When the snails cover the filmmaking apparatuses and Greenaway has a lingering shot over the early morning, the film itself is made useless. The BWO remains unattained, and the Deuces remain dead. But Greenaway shows that nature remains ambivalent to both of these things and will always be.

### Works Cited

- Dead Ringers*. Dir. David Cronenberg. Perf. Jeremy Irons. 20th Century Fox, 1988. DVD.
- A Zed & Two Noughts*. Dir. Peter Greenaway. Perf. Eric Deacon and Brian Deacon. Artificial Eye, 1985. DVD.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1983. Print.
- Greenaway, Peter. "Interview with Peter Greenaway: *Zed and Two Noughts* (Z.O.O.)." Ed. Vernon W. Gras and Marguerite Gras. *Peter Greenaway: Interviews*. Comp. Michel Ciment. Jackson: University of Mississippi, 2000. 21-27. Print.
- Greenaway, Peter. *A Zed & Two Noughts*. London: Faber and Faber, 1986. Print.
- Keeseey, Douglas. "Zoos and Ooze in *A Zed & Two Noughts*." *The Films of Peter Greenaway: Sex, Death, and Provocation*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2006. 24-41. Print.
- Lawrence, Amy. "*A Zed and Two Noughts*." *The Films of Peter Greenaway*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. 71-97. Print.



# Misrepresentations of Animal Characteristics in Human Sports: The Linguistic Categories of James Wright's "Autumn Begins in Martins Ferry, Ohio"

by Robert Davis



Current investigations in Animal Studies regarding animal participation in human sports primarily focus on physical relationships between humans and animals in Australian Jumps Racing, other equestrian models, dogfighting, cock-fighting, hunting, etc. Generally, these conversations debate the ethical nature of the developed relationship, therefore assuming that human language is fit to categorize an animal's habits and define them according to human ethical values and thus creating a conscious power hierarchy favoring the human form. Reduction is prevalent in attempts to define the animal subject based on categorical sciences, such as taxonomy, which ultimately perpetuate the conscious divide. Thomas Nagel argues that investigations into what it's like to *be* an animal ultimately "produces a euphoria...of mental phenomena and mental concepts designed to explain the possibility of some variety of materialism, psychophysical identification, or reduction." (435). The language humans use to understand animal participation ultimately reduces the natural ability of the animal subject into categorical projections of humanness in terms such as competition, winning, and violence; thus trapping the animal world in metaphoric representation similar to the worldview of human consciousness. This representation has led many theorists to debate the categorical existence of animal sentience, yet others like Fredrik Karlsson argue that "a peculiar fact about the way we speak about animals is that we often have specific terms for their feet, but not for their happiness or anger." (1). Considering the linguistic relationship between humans with animals will allow the animal to appear in metaphor for the majority of my argument because this present-absentness of animals "not only says something about [the] art[ist], but also perform another kind of cultural work, namely modeling ways

of thinking outside of literary forms.” (OSLAS. 2). Interrogating the phenomenal existence of intimacy and art in human consciousness will illuminate misrepresentations of violence and competition in sports as well as in animal nature in that intimacy, art, and violence necessitate meta/physical relationships are present in unison in order to create sensation for the perceiver.

James Wright’s poem, “Autumn Begins in Martins Ferry, Ohio”, will serve as a linguistic grounding for my argument in that it is an artistic representation of sports that contains bestial language surrounding a sports theme. Portraying sports like Wright does appeals to the dualism of mind/body present in contemporary biological taxonomy which has its fallacious ties in Cartesian philosophy. I will deconstruct the mind/body dualism Descartes presents in *Meditations*, and thus projects onto the animal kingdom, in order to shed light on the linguistic barriers that currently divide human/animal consciousness by interrogating characteristics of human competition in sports such as bareknuckle boxing which transcend human nature, and the linguistic differences which render competition as another act altogether in animal species. After doing so, I will argue that competition, as a transcendent relationship between subjective “characters of experience” (Bats. 435), lies hidden behind the linguistic guise that American capitalism has placed on sports and thus unites human/animal consciousness unlike other characteristics of human nature. Understanding sports in such a way will move the current conversation away from human ethics into more posthuman grounds that eliminate the empathetic impulse many humans feel towards animals, while also allowing the conversation to consider the conscious existence of the animal subject. This is not to say that humans should not feel emotional connections to animals, rather that sports provide a glimpse of human oneness with the animal kingdom which is rarely seen inside contemporary society.

We will first focus on how categorical understanding is used to delineate intelligent life from bestial creatures and thus reduce what is “human” and “animal” into a problem of language instead of biology. Frederik Karlsson cites a Peter Singer argument where Singer suggests that if there were a “state in which I remember exactly what it’s like to be a horse, and exactly what it’s like to be a human being...nevertheless, I think I can make some sense of the idea of choosing from this position...that the more highly developed the conscious life of the being...the more one would prefer that kind of life...” (713). Singer implies that the “greater degree of self-awareness, and rationality” (713) are categorical keys to his decision in that he believes the horse does

not possess them in their consciousness. Singer presupposes what is “animal”— followed by what is “human—first before any considerations of mindfulness are made by citing these reasons in his argument. Categorizing his consciousness as “elevated” in comparison to a horse’s exemplifies how “speech acts decide what is alien—and, by that, what is familiar” (708). In this sense, the horse is completely alien to Singer because he has no words to describe the horse’s sensational experience in the world. The language Singer uses ultimately attempts to fill the conscious void between humans and animals and thus reduces itself through what Karlsson calls “embodied anthropomorphism”. Human language itself embodies anthropomorphic values because it attempts to define animal characteristics in reductive categories that are used to formulate human understanding—not objective truth.

Singer’s argument exemplifies the philosophic trend to misdirect empathy towards animals because we fail to acknowledge the otherness of the animal. Examining the relationship between humans/animals as one based on categorical reductions ultimately leads philosophers, psychologists, and other metaphysical enthusiasts to attempt to categorize conscious divisions between the two. Singer bases his argument on his experience of human consciousness, which he perceives as superior to the horse’s as such. Since Singer cannot define what it’s like to *be* a horse without using terms such as “consciousness”, he forfeits the ability to accurately answer this question without anthropomorphizing his answer through categorical reductions. Singer’s argument is reminiscent of Aristotle’s categories, which are described as, “things said to be named ‘equivocally’ when, though they have a common name, the definition corresponding with the name differs for each.” (1). The defined thing must be univocal with what is defining the object, or else the definition “will be appropriate to that case only.” (1), meaning that the definer will value the object accordingly with their definition of it rather than by its inherent value. This assumes that the perceived object is completely definable by the language of the perceiver, and thus able to fit into the categorical breakdown of definition. The only way which Aristotle believes one may perceive difference between objects is by analyzing the categorical definitions of each object. In the case of singer’s horse, the animal is represented in its own category, since one can obviously see the physical differences which separate horses from many other animals. This category ultimately defines what it’s like to be a horse for all horses, however, not just for this subjective horse Singer is interrogating.

Examining the problems of Aristotle’s Categories is easily understood through artistic mediums like poetry because there is a necessary use

of metaphor to enact meaning. This allows categorical definitions to become subjective in that metaphors distort the original meanings of words in order to make new meaning when considered in juxtaposition with the overall metaphor. James Wright's poem, "Autumn Begins", exemplifies this in the opening lines, "I think of Polacks nursing tall beers in Tiltonsville/ And the gray faces of the Negroes in the blast furnace at Bentwood/ And the ruptured night watchman of Wheeling Steel/ Dreaming of heroes." (2-4). Each person named has a common name in that they are "sports-fans", by "dreaming of heroes", or the football players, whom they watch "in Shrieve High Football Stadium" (1). The spectators are univocal with the narrator since he feels the need to categorize them as "Negro" and "Pollack", thus exemplifying how a human understanding of language predetermines what is a categorically acceptable definition. Wright categorizes the spectators this way to make a point about the different social classes which are represented in the crowd, yet in the case of animal studies, such titles rarely yield any truths about the animal subject. Titles such as "Negro" and "Pollack" carry connotative presentations of the object which they describe in that their existence is tied to socially constructed concepts like racism. This suggests that animals have no sense of what a "Negro" is, yet this category ultimately shapes the way animals are defined in human language, by presenting the other as a complete other to the perceiver. Categorical thinking denotes that if one is to perceive the other, one must assume the connoted presence of the other to be accurate, which interrogation of aesthetic truths will deem fallible in due time. Although one cannot discredit the influences of both Aristotle and James Wright on contemporary art, both of their works embody a categorical philosophy which has sedimented itself into modern thinking and thus muddies the foundation of sports in competition as humans understand it in animal biology. If we interrogate the existence of these categories in modern examples, we may conclude findings outside of human language which may unite the two natures.

A contemporary link to this thinking can be found in *Psychology Today* where Andrea Mathews cites that "...some issue has been pushed into the unconscious. But that issue has energy and is constantly looking for release from its prison in the unconscious. So, it projects it through the lenses of the eye" (2). The issue which has been pushed to the unconscious is the language which surrounds human understanding of animals. By placing language in the unconscious, humans lose the ability to render animals as a complete other and thus subject animal nature to the constraints of human language. Attempts to separate humanness from

animal-likeness can be found in studies by UCLA psychologist Marc Houser, who argues that there are four categories which separate the animal psyche from the human, “generative computation, promiscuous combination, symbols, and abstract thought” (45). Generative computation allows the human brain to recall a limitless variety of words and use them in recursive and combinatorial ways as needed; Promiscuous combination is the process which allows recursive and combinatorial computation to occur; and Symbols are understood as the basis for the sensory perceptions which fuel the language used to describe the symbol through abstract thought, or the conceptions of objects which are outside the human senses. Understanding human consciousness to possess such functions ultimately places categorical restrictions on consciousness itself by limiting its function to perceiving fallible aesthetic truths, and therefore unable to interpret the “dog’s ability to perforate the human” (DTS 103). Since animals are widely accepted to lack the ability of linguistic communication, Frederik Karlsson argues that “this linguistic circumstance has probably fueled the notion that animals lack genuine sentience and the associated experiences and emotional life. In a sense, animals would never know the sadness of being an “ashamed father too proud to go home./ Their women cluck like starved pullets/ Dying for love.”, as Wright depicts (5-7) because, according to Houser’s argument, animal’s do not possess the ability to generate abstract thought in such a way that creates an emotional response. Assuming that animals lack emotions inevitably presupposes that intimacy plays no part of animal relations, and thus becomes problematic to those who attempt to define animal characteristics by insisting that animals indeed are sentient, and can interpret the world according to emotional senses, [using] a terminology that makes their case open to charges about anthropomorphism.” (“C.A.&A.E.”. 708). Karlsson suggests that because human sciences have not been able to interpret the languages of the animal kingdom, therefore, animals must lack a similar sentient nature which humans claim to possess.

Attempting to describe animal behavior through scientific investigation invariably highlights the phenomenological problem of human language in that it cannot describe the other’s presence fully, only the physical representation as such. Levinas’ posthumanist theory of alterity “breaks with a certain traditional humanism...[which] would seem to remove the obstacles that have barred animals from ethical subjectivity” (DTS. 103) becomes relative to this point because of the infinite characteristics which separate dog from cat, bird from lamb, alligator from moth, etc. We assume that a Tiger will act as such because the animal

belongs to the Carnivora order, but if it belonged to the Primate order, we would expect the animal to act in a much different way. By favoring the taxonomical categories for the tiger, the spectator ultimately adheres to “formalist aesthetics [which] outline different reasons for prizing the same figure, namely through attention to the linguistic values for expression...” (OSLAS. 2). Considering the Tiger as such ultimately presupposes that a tiger will fit all categorical qualifications to be labeled as such and thus become subject to connotation, which ties the perceiver’s humanism to the “obstacles which have barred animals from ethical subjectivity”. Aesthetics are the source of this linguistic problems in that descriptions necessary to understand animal subjects are bound to the spectator’s subjective interpretation. By acknowledging the “values of expression”, formalist aesthetics would remain as subjective in their interpretation as the language used to describe them. These expressions provide subjective considerations of the world’s effect on the subject emotions, which then may be interpreted by the other in order to formulate an understanding of the conscious being.

Descartes writes about the linguistics of aesthetics in *Meditations II* when he says, “What did I perceive which any animal might not have perceived? But when I distinguish the Oval from its exterior forms...I consider it quite naked... I cannot, nevertheless, thus apprehend it without possessing a human mind.” (14). Descartes is describing the linguistic barrier between humans and animals in that an animal knows nothing of an ‘Oval’, and that when it is considered outside of Descartes’s humanness, the object becomes void of meaning. Therefore, the oval may only be understood through a human mind in that the oval represents an amalgamation of human qualities, such as geometrics and mathematics, which have created a linguistic medium that allows the oval to be considered as such only through categorical comparison. Aesthetics and language exist in a correlative relationship which, when considered in unison, inevitably create reality by using symbols to differentiate physical objects from one another. If we can deconstruct the ways which aesthetics presents these symbols as relative to one another, then we may interrogate the metaphoric problems separating human/animal natures.

When one considers how symbols play with one another, it may be deducted that connoted presentation becomes key, since the presence of the object relies greatly on the symbols of the language used to describe it. Symbols formulate the basis of linguistic understanding in that they encode sensory perceptions about objects which in turn generates new “abstract thoughts”, as presents in Houser’s argument, about the world in itself for the perceiver. These bases are generally formed within the body

of the perceiver, since it is from here that all investigations about one's world are made. This is where the idea of competition as is understood to be present in animal species begins to schism from competition as humans understand ourselves to possess. Sexual intercourse seems fit to analyze these differences in that sex requires multiple participants, or "symbols", use sensory percepts of the other in order to create arousal, as well as a competitive playing-field in order to find a partner; yet, this assertion ultimately reduces sex to a bodily desire accented by language. Wright presents this point by describing the football players as "growing suicidally beautiful/ as the beginning of October." (10-11). The athletes are totally encompassed by their titles as "football players", which may be understood as a bodily desire in itself. Although Wright is commenting on the religiosity of high school sports, his categorization presents how the connotation of being a high school athlete accents the connoted definitions of "male" and "female". The phrase "growing suicidally beautiful" represents the process of bodily change which many athletes endure, thus accenting the athletic body presentation as one which is "suicidally beautiful". This categorization renders sex as goal-oriented by asserting physical participation links human/ animal natures while not accounting for the conscious presence of the human during sex.

Descartes' famous dualism of mind/body is present here in that sexual intercourse is being portrayed as an act of the body which requires very little mental involvement. Descartes attempts to separate man from animal in order to claim that consciousness is the key component which separates the two when he writes, "But what is a man? Shall I say a rational animal? Assuredly not; for it would be necessary forthwith to inquire into what is meant by animal and what by rational..." (6). Without rationality, it seems that the animal would be subject to the volition of its body because the animal cannot perceive judgments such as value, or desire, thus proving Descartes's mind/body dualism to be true; but biologists Ivana Schoepf and Carsten Schradin propose that "reproductive competition has been invoked as the main factor promoting dispersal and solitary-living in [such] groups" (650). Schoepf and Schradin suggest that the dominance is a key part of reproduction for the breeder-mice, but only a select few will gain this dominance and thus be allowed to procreate. They write, "Young adult individuals that delay dispersal and remain as philopatric subordinates in their natal group may incur costs: (i) by delaying onset of own reproduction; and (ii) by having to 'pay to stay'" (650), which implies that the mice who cannot attain dominance within their group have a less likely chance of producing offspring of their own because of the competition. In essence, the



mice that do not get to procreate become the worker mice of the colony and begin to take on tasks outside of nurturing young, thus beginning their “solitary-life”, until they can compete again for reproduction. This suggests that the mice are consciously aware of times when competition is necessary, as well as physically capable of performing such tasks in order to reproduce. Psychologist Liubov Borusiak speaks to this point when she writes “reproduction has ceased to be the primary function of intercourse” (11). This can be seen in contemporary culture if one considers the choices of viewing pleasures on American cable networks. To say that sex is a physical act is to overlook the fact that humans do not participate in intercourse strictly for the sake of reproduction, unlike some animal species. Therefore, sex ultimately reduces the value of intimacy to a bestial, physical pleasure which limits the ways humans can interpret animal behavior as well as our own.

Outside the physical participation of the body, sex provides what Nagel refers to as “psychophysical identification” by establishing power hierarchy of mental and physical states in order to find the mice that are most fit to reproduce. However valuable to competition this presentation may be, it designates that one party will hold dominance over the other and therefore denies sex value in examining links between human/animal natures. Dominance is the foundational concept for misrepresentations of violence in the animal kingdom in that it requires a functional understanding of the other in order to make an accurate judgment. Sports do not necessitate that one party is necessarily dominant in competition over the other in the same manner that sex necessitates a dominant initiation. This is not to say that sex requires a forceful inquisition, or even a physical nicking; it is to suggest that one party must first conceive of the idea before then passing it on to the other, thus trying to impose their will upon the other. Some may still argue that sports portray dominance in this same fashion, but the dominance perceived in sports is generally physically situational, whereas sexual dominance is both physical and mental in unison. Hyland speaks to this point when he writes, “as I move towards the basket, see my teammate cut, and throw him a pass; or as I see the curve of the baseball and adjust my swing accordingly. . . am I thinking or physically acting? (96). Hyland suggests that the athlete’s movements are in many ways constructed in their training, so much so in fact, that one may argue that they are merely acting rather than participating. In many ways, athletes’ training intersect with one another and thus create instances where dominance may seem to be on display, but in reality it is another act of the sport.



Dominance also presupposes that there is a goal to be attained from playing sports like “getting-off” is the goal of sex when pursued for pleasure’s sake. Scheopf and Chadrin present sex as a valuable tool of group dynamics in order to point out how reproductive competition “increase[s] the overall benefits of philopatry...where young adults have a better chance of survival by benefitting, for example, from group augmentation, as well as a place where they can acquire new skills, such as parental care.” (650). Analyzing this aspect of the study will provide examples of how competition itself is valuable in the human condition other than to simply entertain, as many critics cite. Shoepf and Chandrin note that reproductive competition is a way of learning about the environment for these mice because the group decides as a whole when it is ready for new members to arrive and which members are most fit to produce the offspring. This kind of competition “reflects uncertainty of truthfulness rather than a factual or categorical law” (OSLAS 709) in that the mice who are able to reproduce are categorized as “dominant” when in reality there may be extenuating factors which allowed those mice to gain an upper hand. Sex may thus be understood as more than a bodily impulse for the striped mouse, which deems competition itself a necessary object of investigation in attributing a sense of oneness to the human/animal binary. If we can understand this kind of competition to be a natural trait common between humans/animals, then we may investigate the nature of competition as it may provide further links between the two natures.

Prizefighting, or bareknuckle boxing as it is known as today, is the perfect sport to analyze how competition in human sports is relative to the reproductive competition in the African striped mouse we discussed earlier because of the foundational conditions of the sport: one subject must face another in an intimate gathering, interpret the movements of the other, and counter-attack accordingly. Intimacy plays a large role in the relationship between these competitors in that each one is interpreting both meta/physical aspects of the other by way of their subjective sensations. Intimacy differentiates the human understanding of competition from animalistic traits which may be attributed because it is a sensory response which cannot be interpreted by anyone other than the subject. Elliot J. Gorn, professor of Urban American History at Yale University, writes about two fighters competing for the Prizefighting Championship, Tom Crib: Champion of England, and Tom Molineaux: Champion from America. They met in front of “twenty-thousand Englishmen at Thistleton Gap, outside London, on September 28, 1811” (19) for a rematch from a previous one which

“crowd interference kept the Championship from Molineaux’s grasp.” (20). Each man understands his self to be the best fighter, given that they are both titled “champions”, yet neither one could ever factually know of the skills the other possesses without experiencing them as the Other. Emmanuel Levinas maintains this thought in *Ethics and The Face* when he writes, “the Other remains infinitely transcendent, infinitely foreign; his face in which his epiphany is produced... breaks with the world that can be common to us, whose virtualities are inscribed in our *nature* and developed by our existence.” (519). The Other is focal point of the competition, then, and is always perceived without any regard for the true infinity behind the Other’s face. This fact is the same in the case of the African mouse as it is for the fighters. Molineaux remains infinitely transcendent to his opponent in that Crib can never fully comprehend Molineaux’s skills as Montrileaux does, only as what Crib perceives. When Crib is confronted by a consciousness in such a way that he must interpret the Other’s movement, he can no longer accurately perceive this Other based solely on physicality, which his reason designates.

Transcendence, then, becomes the essence of the competition because of the impossibility of deducing any Truths about the other’s ability from physical expression itself. The epiphany which Levinas refers to is facial expression, and these expressions break the world which is common to Molineaux and thus becomes the only way each once can perceive any truths about the other. As we discussed earlier, the aesthetics at play with the fighter’s expressions ultimately render these truths subjective in interpretation and thus further break the common-world. Language would act as a common ground which both fighters could use to comprehend the meaning of the other’s glare, but without it, the perceiver is left to create the meaning for themselves. Levinas’ last line, “whose virtualities are inscribed in our nature...” is key in understanding this relationship between transcendence and competition as experienced by each fighter. Competition is a virtue of human nature in this sense because it provides a glimpse of what each participant does not know about 1) their environment, 2) his/her self, and, 3) the others involved in competition. This virtue has been inscribed in us in that humans generally seek the higher meaning to the reality they perceive, yet this reality depends on the *uncertainty of truthfulness* in order to become reducible into translatable linguistic mediums. These mediums generally anthropomorphize concepts of violence which are then projected onto sports under similar logic. The competition between Montrileaux and Crib demonstrates how vio-

lence is a term which captures humanness within its definition which cannot categorize animal traits accordingly. By analyzing this story in comparison with Schoepf and Chadrin's study, I will deconstruct the linguistic barriers which project labels such as "violence" and "winning" onto contemporary conceptions of sports.

Though Schoepf and Chadrin's study examines the effects of ecological constraints on sexual competition on solitary-living in the African striped mouse, it offers some relevant insight into the meaning of violence in sports via animalized representations of competition. Reducing animal competition to a genetic code also reduces the human understanding of competition as a whole in that what is competitive ultimately must maintain a sense of ethical value which terms such as "violence" relinquish. Schoepf and Chadrin note infanticide and other removal tactics in their studies with the mouse populations, which, if analyzed through a human lens, read as acts of violence, yet in truth, they are a tool of survival for the mice. Understanding that the mice can consciously decide the killing of an infant and thus will enact some sort of emotional or visceral harm onto another mouse is fallacious in that it presupposes too many human qualities in the mouse's consciousness, and given Descartes' understanding of animals, this seems impossible. In the case of Montrileaux and Crib, their participation in the prizefighting championship is itself violent in that each one is willing to inflict harm upon the other in order to gain the title as "Champion", yet the violence is categorized, and in some aspects forgiven, under the idea of human competition. Gorn notes how each fighter "gallop[s] terribly against [the] other's [body]" ("Autumn" 12) to portray the inherent violence which prizefighting incorporates Wright's description of sports as a "gallop" against one's body adds another metaphoric layer to the human/animal relationship in that it shows how humans appropriate animal characteristics to describe our own actions. This suggests that humans assume that our virtues concerning our way of life are univocal with animal ways of life, and our definitions for "violence" and "competition" ring out objectively true. Schoepf and Chadrin's study suggests that "several removal experiments in the field have shown the removal of ecological constraints, such as high population density, can lead to dispersal" (651), which implies that the group of mice decides for itself when it is too large to accept new members in, or when the land will not allow resources to be divided amongst all members. The study does not suggest any considerations were made as to which one of the offspring was killed; only that it occurred, and was noted as a part of the group dynamics. Understanding this scenario as violence is a misnomer in that

the act of infanticide is not being used maliciously, it is a tool used to ensure the survival of the group as a whole.

Violence, then, seems to necessitate an established viewership of the subject whose actions are in question. The voyeuristic nature of violence requires that the subject under watch produces a situational response which goes beyond what conventional ethical codes posit. This play between the spectator and the spectacle becomes the true source of violence within sports, since this is where the greatest sense of alienation is felt. In this sense, violence begins the division of human/animal as well as the linguistic complication between competitions as it is seen in both natures. Capitalism, then, appropriates the term “violence” as “champion” or “winner” in order to re-present the most violent subject as the most desirable product.

To see exactly how capitalism begins to shape the contemporary view of American sports, we will first investigate how alienation becomes necessary to the metaphysical relationship of competitors by presenting a physical absence of the other in the world of the spectator. These absent-presentations are generally perceived as metaphor, such as a “Run-Batted-In”, so the physical nature rests in how each subject interprets their differentiation. American capitalism has no problem regarding the uncertainty of aesthetic truths as well because it focuses on the metaphoric production of the subject from the view of the spectator. Drew Hyland cites French Marxist Jean Marie Brohm’s argument that “sport contains all the values of traditional, repressive morality... the cult of duty for one’s own sake, the sense of sacrifice for the community, the ideology of the super-ego, obedience, discipline, etc.” (6) in order to bring to light many of the characteristics which capitalism brings to sport. Hyland argues that it is not the “competition, or anything *inherent* in sports that is undercutting its value.” (6), but rather, American society as a whole undercuts the value of sports by misrepresenting animals metaphoric presence. The repressed morality, sense of community, duty for one’s own sake etc. stems from the categorical representation of “winner” versus “loser”. The “Champion” is understood as the pinnacle athlete of the sports world, but this title is also the single largest alienating factor because symbolizes the countless hours of hard work, dedication, sacrifice, and strain that the athletes subjected themselves to in order to attain this goal. As presented before, it may be understood that these athletes subject themselves willingly out of sheer enjoyment of the sport, however, when the ideas of winning and violence are construed under the careful guide of a capitalistic system, the “Champion” becomes another byproduct of sport in society. The crowd, or “fancy”, which generally

attended the prizefighting event mentioned earlier included all walks of life from “professional gamblers, tavern keepers, and young dandies out for a good time; prostitutes, costermongers, pugilists, and pickpockets; wealthy “Corinthians” who patronized lower-class recreations; cockfighters, dog trainers, butchers, weavers, and chimney sweeps; high and low; rich and poor” (*Prizefighting*: 19). By labeling the spectators under such categorical titles as “gambler”, “Corinthian”, or “pugilist”, Gorn inevitably conceptualizes how taxonomy permeates biological understandings of animals and invests itself into human conceptions of reality. The labels attributed to each spectator are founded in each one’s subjective social class, therefore delineating value based on material accumulation. Over time, these labels develop connotations based on the expanding amount of people whom are reduced into each category, and thereby change the definition of the title as meant by its inception.

Connotation, then, may be argued to divulge the true value of alienation to a capitalistic relationship in that each party must doubt the conscientious existence of the other in order to maintain the voyeuristic attributes of the spectator/spectacle binary. We will investigate this premise by analyzing Descartes’ mind-body dualism as presented in *Meditations II* where he argues that “body, extension, motion, and place are merely fictions of my mind” (2). Descartes doubts all that he sees because he believes there is no certainty other than the thoughts which pass through one’s head, an idea which he uses to explain the existence of God. He doubts these extensions simply because he cannot accurately perceive that any object before him possesses a consciousness like what he is using to perceive those objects. This doubt is prevalent in the spectator/spectacle binary in that the spectator can never fully grasp the reality of the spectacle, only interpret it. Here, capitalism takes advantage of this conscious divide by unifying the two under the premise of incentive-gain where either the spectacle will act in such a way which deems a reward from the spectator, or the opposite. By portraying sport as a victim to capitalism’s values, Marx successfully creates an enveloped existence for sports, where capitalistic virtues onto the innocent playing-field which James Wright notes as “the Shrieve High Football stadium” (1). Portraying sports in such a way enables the metaphoric presentation of the stadium to seem dominant over the game, since the field is surrounded by the grand-stands. Yet, this representation may be argued as inhabitable by capitalism, not strictly inherent to capitalism.

If we can prove that capitalism itself is forged outside the bounds of the athletic arena, then we may investigate the bounds of this relationship as it pertains to the linguistic divide between humans and animals.

The ideas of “winning”: and “violence” in sports are clear examples of capitalism’s passive influence on contemporary thinking. Comparing the symbolic presentation of capitalism and the sense of alienation which follows will allow us to see how humans and animals have found oneness in industrial production that cannot move past the humanistic ethical debate surrounding this relationship. This characteristic only severs the divide between human/animal natures because industrialization is a characteristic which can only be comprehended through a human mind, just as Descartes contends that an oval faces the same truth. Marx would argue that the metaphor of “Shrieve High Football Stadium” becomes an alienating factor for the athletes based on the players productive output within its confines. This representation is an example of how capitalism may inhabit the football stadium without the sport ever adhering to its values since the game itself is merely contained, not defined, by the stadium. The foundations of capitalism’s ties to sports may be traced back to the Cartesian dualism of the mind and body, in that the value of the mind outreaches the will of the body to perform for its own sake. To suggest this is to contend that the human mind ultimately controls the volition of the body, and that by changing the perception of the game in the mind of the athlete, the system is therefore changed in entirety. This assertion only accounts for the production of the athletes and not the subjective valuation of the game which each one possesses. By suggesting that athletes are subjects to these factors to deny the athlete any right to be a subjective participant in the sport, in that, the athlete will always fulfill the same need of the sporting organization—as a product of value. According to [www.baseball-reference.com](http://www.baseball-reference.com), of the thirty teams in Major League Baseball, all thirty teams currently have a manager who played in the MLB (“Current List of MLB Managers”), so to say that the athlete will always remain the product of a team is fallible. The manager cannot be considered a product of the sport in that there is no physical production from the manager in a game-to-game basis outside of organization. Most managers set lineups, make strategic in-game decisions, and deal with the “front-office” on occasion when their opinion is needed. These duties do not aid in the team’s overall success as much as one may think either.

Assuming that the organizational aspects of sports will guarantee victory is to forget the subjective nature of competition as a whole. This argument also assumes that managers can be sold as commodities of sports in the same ways that their players are, but we will return to this point in due time. Stephen Toulmin remarks that this logic is the curse of modern philosophy in *Cosmopolis* when he writes, “age-old traditions are sometimes conjured into existence long after the event, and

the circumstances of their creation throw as much light on the times in which they were invented and accepted as they do on the times which they ostensibly refer.” (11). Toulmin suggests that by rendering Marx’s critique as valid in today’s era is to forget the circumstances and characteristics of today’s sports which differ from those of historical standing. Marx’s critique of sports is powerful in that it is mindful of the societal repercussions of capitalistic virtues, yet the argument is dated because one can never remove a philosophical ideal from its historical context. Marx was writing at the height of the industrial revolution and many of his works were in direct response to this movement. This same logic may be applied to the use of Descartes’ mind-body dualism to describe the nature of humankind. Descartes’ dualism helped to explain the existence of God to 16<sup>th</sup> century theologians, not the influence of society on the subject as it has been posited to do so today. If we compare the metaphoric representations of both humans and animals in industrialized business practices, then we may conclude the existence of oneness outside the humanistic ethical debate which we currently seek to overcome.

Although most of my argument examines how human/animal nature can be connected through prizefighting, it is easier to understand the capitalistic influence on sports by interrogating the MLB—Major League Baseball—because Marx’s critique focuses on sports that generate large amounts of money. Considering posthuman aspects of this investigation will account for the conscientious divide that exists between humans and animals while also allowing two seemingly unrelated subjects like the New York Yankees and Industrialized farming to become relative. Elliot Gorn begins this example by describing Tom Molineaux as, “an American and a black man... [who] had astonished Englishmen over the year with spectacular displays of power and craft.” (19). Montrileaux man was seen as an adversary to a nation, not just because of his intimidating physique, but because he presented a chance at England losing the Championship, “a symbol of national virility” (19). Here, the play between the physicality of Montrileaux and his title as “champion” are clearly stated. His dominating physical qualities seem to dwarf England’s symbol of virility, Tom Crib. During this time period, Molineaux would have been as animalistic simply because he is a black American, but his sport has forces his opponent to see him as a competitive equal outside the bounds of race or culture. Anyone who will climb into the ring to face Montrileaux is surrendering a human presentation of themselves in the ring for the sake of competition and to defend England’s masculine honor. This is where Marx’s critique begins to hold weight, though he makes the fatal mistake of totalizing the influence of capitalism on sports



as a whole. Jonathan Safran-Foer notes in *Eating Animals* that “it’s often said in nature that red in claw and tooth is violence” (53), which then applies to the case of Montrileaux and Crib in that each one is inherently violent for their participation in prizefighting. The oneness achieved between humans and animals stems from the spectator/spectacle binary in that capitalistic incentive is present for each party involved. The spectator has the incentive of pleasure, whereas the spectacle has the incentive of compensation for completing their tasks. The attendance of the “fancy” at the prizefighting championship is a prime example of how capitalism offers entertainment via sports if one considers the vast array of social classes that were mentioned. The spectators also find union in that they may each be witnesses to some momentous event together, thus creating a sense of semblance with the fighters. The crowd is the incentive for the fighters, however. If more people show up, they may be compensated more accordingly, or the notoriety of the fight may spread faster; both of which are byproducts of capitalism creating commodities out of each party. Safran-Foer remarks about this point when he writes, “by 1926, Steele had 10,000 birds, and by 1935, 25,000. (the average flock size in America was still only 23).” (105), which compare relatively easy to today’s factory-farming statistics. Safran-Foer is writing about how a single housewife, Celia Steele, revolutionized factory-farming during the great depression, but the statistical comparisons to the New York Yankees seem too valuable to my point not to explore.

Forbes magazine recently ranked the Yankees as the most valuable baseball organization in the world with a net worth of nearly \$2.5 Billion. According to the Yankees Valuation Breakdown, nearly 50% of their total value comes from their market at \$1.2 billion per year. Their market has nothing to do with the \$51 dollars the Yankees make off of every ticket-holder that walks through the gate; it’s more about the products and souvenirs like jerseys, hats, cards, mugs, bats, etc. This suggests that the Yankees organization is heavily dependent on their fan base to support their \$225 Million a season player expenses. (Forbes: The New York Yankees. March 2014). This valuation breakdown ultimately exemplifies how both product and producer are commodities under capitalism as it is applied to sports in similar fashions to what is found in factory farming of animals. Both the Yankees and factory farms must build a stable relationship with their respective markets in order for the business to run appropriately. Without regards for the community, neither party could expect to benefit from sports since there is no incentive for the community to attend, by creating this incentive, capitalism ultimately creates the false-need for the patron to attend the



game, as well as the false incentive of the player to perform better for the sake of compensation. The system does not care whether or not any single player is actually playing the game, only that there is another one waiting to replace the first, and perpetuate the current state of the game. The same may be said about current factory farming techniques, that they ascribe to a certain set of values which favor profitable gains rather than providing the best quality product for the consumer.

Both the athlete and the factory farm animal become equals in that neither party retains any agency in deciding how they are represented in the public light, yet this singularity is only found through a human understanding of nature. Understanding that animals are, in fact, the complete essence of a transcendent other brings the conversation out of the humanistic realm and into a posthuman state where the conscious divide may remain intact while other truths concerning the nature of human/animal binary may be deduced. The competitive aspects of sports ground the natural existence of competition within human and animal natures, which thus enlightens a new oneness which exists between the two species. Finding a central oneness is key to going beyond the humanistic constraints of ethical investigations in that one must feel a sense of conscious connection to regard the differences of the other in their completeness. Connecting outside the mediums of the physical world provides the pedestal from which we can see the distinctions between capitalism and sport which have muddied the contemporary understanding of the human/animal natures. Reaching outside ethical bounds will also alleviate the “false sense of empathy” which Karlsson argues is projected onto animals by way of ethical investigations. Empathy creates alienation between perceiver and object in that the perceiver must feel there are similarities existing between the two which one can then understand via their subjective emotional responses. Feeling empathy towards animals not only presents a false sense of singularity, it also perpetuates a hierarchy of consciousness which categorical thinkers like Aristotle believed to hold reality’s key. By interrogating the problem of human/animal division under a posthuman lens, one can ultimately conclude that the problem is not one of physicality, but one of metaphysics—of language, in a word.

### Works Cited

- Levinas, Emmanuel. “Ethics and The Face”. *Phenomenology Reader*. Ed. Dermot Norman. Timothy Mooney. New York: Routledge. 2010
- Gorn, Elliot J. *The Manly Art: Bareknuckle Prizefighting in America*. New York: Cornell Press. 2010

- Borusiak, Liubov. "Love, Sex and Partnership". *Russian Social Science Review*. 2013. MasterFILE Elite. Web. 1 Apr. 2014.
- Hyland, Drew A. *Philosophy of Sports*. New York. Paragon House. 1990.
- Wright, James. "Autumn Begins in Martins Ferry, Ohio". *The Branch Will Not Break*. Wesleyan University Press. 1961. Print.
- "Current List of MLB Managers". [http://www.baseball-reference.com/bullpen/List\\_of\\_current\\_Major\\_League\\_Baseball\\_managers](http://www.baseball-reference.com/bullpen/List_of_current_Major_League_Baseball_managers). 8 April 2014. Web.
- Toulmin, Stephen. *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity*. Chicago. University of Chicago Press. 1990. Print.
- "The New York Yankees Statistical Breakdown". <http://www.forbes.com/teams/new-york-yankees/>. 8 April 2014. Web.
- Schoepf, Ivana, and Carsten Schradin. "Better Off Alone! Reproductive Competition And Ecological Constraints Determine Sociality In The African Striped Mouse (*Rhabdomys Pumilio*)."  
*Journal Of Animal Ecology* 81.3 (2012): 649-656. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 4 Apr. 2014.
- "Categories by Aristotle". Trans Edgehill. E.M. 8 April 2014 <http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/categories.1.1.html/>. Web.
- Descartes. Rene. "Meditations II: Of the Nature of the Human Mind; And That It Is More Easily Understood Than The Body". <http://oregonstate.edu/instruct/phl302/texts/descartes/meditations/Meditation2.html>. 8 April. 2014. Web.
- Debrot. Anik, et al. "Deeds Matter: Daily Enacted Desponsiveness And Intimacy in Couple;s Daily Lives". *Journal of Family Psychology. PsychArticles*. Web. 8 April. 2014.
- Nagel. Thomas. "What is it like to be a Bat?". *The Philosophical Review*. No.4. Cornell University Press. 1974. Web. <http://cutonthebias-workshop.files.wordpress.com/2011/05/nagel-1974-what-is-it-like-to-be-a-bat.pdf>
- Karlsson. Frekerik. "Critical Anthropomorphism and Animal Ethics". *Springer Science & Business Media*. Uppsala: Uppsala University Press. 2011. 8 April 2014. Web.
- McHugh. Susann. "One or Several Literary Animal Studies?" Ruminations 3. H-Animal Discussion Network 17 Jul. 2006. <[http://www.h-net.org/~animal/ruminations\\_mchugh.html](http://www.h-net.org/~animal/ruminations_mchugh.html)>
- Safron-Foer. Jonathan. *Eating Animals*. New York. Bay Back Books. 2009.

# Animals and Humans: Communal Violence

by Debra Kelley Richardson



Animal sacrifice, for thousands of years, represents a way humans show devotion or faith in religious rituals. Whether it is in seeking God's favor by placing sins on the back of a sinless animal, realizing that the meat you are about to consume must come from another form, or the performance of a sacred act which is inspired by Biblical direction, the killing of blameless animals has brought justification for humans. According to the Judeo-Christian account of the beginning of time, found in the Book of Genesis, God may not have originally intended for animals to become the stand in for the sins of humans because He knew the killing of innocent animals would provoke the violent nature humans would adopt. A close reading of Genesis 1:29-30 states "And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which [is] upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which [is] the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat. And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein [there is] life, [I have given] every green herb for meat: and it was so" (Holy Bible). However, after the fall of Adam and Eve, God used the skins of animals to cover their bodies as He removed them from the Garden of Eden thus indicating the first sacrifice for human sin. As Adam and Eve begin life outside the Garden of Eden, producing two sons, Cain and Abel, sacrifice is mentioned again in the form of an offering to God by the two brothers of their harvest. Cain offered the fruit of the ground as a farmer and Abel offered the firstlings of his flock as a herder of sheep. God did not accept Cain's offering because he had not offered his best. With hatred in his heart, Cain killed Abel and the association of sacrifices and violence began.

Not only does the first book of the Bible offer the link of sacrifice and violence but also foreshadows using humans as the sacrifice for transgressions and obedience to God. Genesis 22 relates the story of Abraham and Isaac where Biblical scholars note the similarities of the coming sacrifice of Jesus in the New Testament. In his article written in *Horizons in Biblical Theology*, Leroy Andrew Huizenga notes “The parallelism of persons is intriguing; the angel, Joseph, Mary and Jesus in the Gospel stand in parallel to God, Abraham, Sarah and Isaac in Genesis. The passage invites the reader to consider the situation of the Virgin Mary in light of the situation of barren Sarah: both Sarah and Mary, women outside the normal bounds of childbearing status, conceive the promised children Isaac and Jesus through extraordinary, divine means, a comparison later made explicit by several patristic writers.” (Huizenga) Thus Abraham and Isaac set the stage for the coming of the sacrificial lamb (Jesus) that creates a communal view of sacrifice and violence leading from God’s first human creations and progressing this act toward today. Modern day history does not forsake this concept as the need for humans to offer each other in violent, sacrificial deeds in order to obtain their desires grows common in each communal setting around the globe.

J. M. Coetzee’s novel, *Disgrace*, also reveals the story of animal and human sacrifice in the new world of a post-apartheid South Africa. David Lurie, former university professor and main character of *Disgrace*, leaves his city life amid a sexual scandal to find peace and solitude at his daughter’s farm in the rural province of Eastern Cape. Lurie finds himself amidst a different and developing scenario involving the care and sacrifice of animals. A selfish man, Lurie has never explored the world of animals and the first few chapters of the novel explain his self indulgence of women, sex, and his own desires. However, life on his daughter’s farm begins to reveal a deeper side to Lurie that ends in a quest to determine the significance of animal sacrifice, human sacrifice and the violence that undermines each experience of his life changing development. J. M. Coetzee portrays animal sacrifice in *Disgrace* that allows the reader to follow the foreshadowed events leading to the communal violence that offers Lurie’s daughter Lucy and her unborn child as the ultimate human sacrifice for peace amid the violence. Noam Gal noted this association in his article written in *African Identities* by saying “It seems that the animal as a common medium for the ritual of sacrifice reappears in other sacrificial practices, such as the cultural figuration of victims of colonial conquests in postcolonial art – in literature, for instance. *Disgrace* could serve as an interesting exponent of this since it presents a range of various victims of the postcolonial condition in

South Africa: the black man without land; the white woman raped by black men; her father who is injured in the attack; abandoned and sick animals in the black townships, as well as other characters in the text” (Gal). Gal exemplifies each sacrificial incident that I intend to relate to the age old sacrifices of the Old Testament and link the beginning of humans in place of animals, ultimately leading to the human sacrifice that existed then in relation to J. M. Coetzee’s *Disgrace*. Animal sacrifice, while an essential and necessary ritual of the Old Testament appears to have changed the surface of society’s interconnection of sin, desire, and guilt placed on blameless animals to using humans as the sacrifice for their coveting nature as seen in Petrus’s manipulation of Lucy in *Disgrace*.

The steps leading to the changing view of sacrifice can be found within the stories of the Bible by documentation of communal rituals that lead from God’s explicit instructions to the hands of humans. The Old Testament describes images of sacrifice but all do not include animals. In the beginning, the word sacrifice was not used for humans to offer God gifts of their animals and harvest. Understanding the sequence of Biblical text in a historical approach is a key factor in perceiving the development of offerings, animal sacrifice, and human sacrifice. Another key factor in acknowledging the underlying meanings of sacrifices is that God did not summon sacrifice or offerings for the sake of man’s sin only but also to show man’s obedience to God.

Cain and Abel brought offerings to God in the form of animals and harvest from the ground. The word sacrifice was not used in this story from Genesis chapter 4; however, an important detail noted in the scripture was the value of the offering. The scripture says “<sup>1</sup> And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the LORD. <sup>2</sup> And she again bares his brother Abel. And Abel was a keeper of sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the ground. <sup>3</sup> And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the LORD. <sup>4</sup> And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And the LORD had respect unto Abel and to his offering: <sup>5</sup> But unto Cain and to his offering he had not respect. And Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell.” (Holy Bible) In verse three, the scripture notes that Cain brought the fruit of the ground to the Lord as an offering, while verse 4 documents that Abel brought the first of his flock and the fat. Cain brought a sample of his harvest while Abel brought an offering of the best of his flock, the first and fattest. The offering made by Abel signified his obedience to God by bringing his best. God respected Abel’s offering.<sup>1</sup> The offering was not a sacrifice nor marked with ritual, uniformity, or directive procedures. It was truly an act of offering

God a portion of what had been given as a gift.<sup>2</sup> Abel acted with a pure heart by presenting an offering of his best animals and Cain's response was violence. The scripture omits wordage that would indicate Cain's offering was his best. In my opinion, Cain's wrath, became jealousy and the Bible's first recorded murder began with violence in association with an offering. Another underlying factor in this story is Cain's sacrifice of Abel because of his inability to please God. Cain's hatred of Abel promoted him to transfer his emotions to a human counterpart and shed the blood of his brother because of jealousy over his superior offering.

The story of Noah records the first burnt offering of animals but thus far the Bible does not mention sacrifice. Noah's obedience to God led to the building of a great ark to hold two of each animal on the earth as flood waters destroyed all mankind because of evil ways. After the flood waters had receded, Noah and his family exited the ark and built an altar. Genesis 8:20 records "And Noah builded an altar unto the Lord; and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar" (Holy Bible). Noah was attempting to thank God for bringing him through the flood by offering the best of the animals signified as "clean". He was not atoning for sin but making a gift to God for allowing Noah and his family to survive the flood. Verse 21 states that God found favor in Noah's offering because He "smelled a sweet savour" and made a promise to not curse the ground again.<sup>3</sup> However, Noah's sons were jealous of each other and while violence did not become evident from the scripture, sin again creeps into mankind after the flood because of human's inherently sinful nature.

Further into Genesis the word "sacrifice" is mentioned as Jacob made an offering on the mount after the treaty between him and Laban distinguishing territory. However, the sacrifice is not explained in detail. The succession of events, in the Bible, does not mention sacrifice again until Moses speaks with the Egyptian Pharaoh in the book of Exodus. He uses the terms offerings and sacrifices as he makes demands for the Hebrew people in captivity.<sup>4</sup> However, further into Exodus, God instructs Moses on how His people should present offerings to Him. Exodus 20:24 states "<sup>24</sup>An altar of earth thou shalt make unto me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings, and thy peace offerings, thy sheep, and thine oxen: in all places where I record my name I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee" (Holy Bible). Deep into the second book of the Bible, God finally gives basic instructions regarding animal sacrifices along with the Ten Commandments and direction concerning the building of alters.<sup>5</sup> However, Moses only touched the surface of commandments to the new Hebrew nation in regards to sacrifices.

The third book of the Bible, Leviticus, conveys the details of animal sacrifice. Moses, the author of Leviticus, illustrates proper rituals, living creatures, and specific sins that animal sacrifice should sanction for the people. In my opinion, God wanted the Hebrew nation to understand that sin separated His chosen people from Him. By shedding the blood of an innocent animal, humans may atone for their sin but a living being must die for this atonement. In the book *An Introduction to the Old Testament* the authors clarify the true purpose behind the extensive information regarding animal sacrifices found in the book of Leviticus. "When an Israelite worshiper laid his hand on the animal victim, he identified himself with the animal as his substitute . . . this accomplished a symbolic transfer of his sin and a legal transfer of his guilt to the animal victim. God then accepted the slaughter of the animal . . . as a ransom payment for the particular sin which occasioned it" (Dillard and Longman). Because the worshiper identified himself with the animal in a symbolic transfer of sin, atonement was granted from God and although an animal was lost, the violation was behind the sinner and he could go forth and seek a holier life. Although Leviticus opened the door for humans to conceive the idea of identifying with the sacrificed animals, we must return to Genesis to actually gather the significance of substitution on the altar.

Genesis 22 relates the story of Abraham and his obedience to God as he prepared to sacrifice his son in accordance to God's instructions. Abraham was told to take his beloved son, Isaac, to a designated place and offer him as a human sacrifice to God. Because Abraham was obedient, he followed God's instructions and prepared to offer the human sacrifice of his son on an altar. God recognized the obedience of Abraham and stopped the sacrifice, providing a ram to culminate the ritual. Modernistic approaches to this story speculate on a father that would kill his son and a God that would ask such a huge request. The cruelty and willingness to shed the blood of one's son in the form of a sacrifice appears to represent a violent nature among humans. However, the point of the story is obedience to God and although Abraham did not have to follow through with killing his son, God did make this ultimate sacrifice with His own Son, Jesus.

The sacrifice of Jesus is foreshadowed in the story of Abraham and Isaac and the violence associated with the death and crucifixion was more than holding up a knife.<sup>6</sup> Jesus' death, as documented in the four Gospels of the New Testament, was carried out through beatings, whippings, and the ultimate carnage of being nailed to a cross of wooden planks suspended in the ground. His death was the perfect sacrifice for the sin of man. As discussed, the sacrificial rituals involving animals



throughout the Old Testament discussed perfected directions on how, what, where, and when a human could receive sanctification for sins by placing that burden on the animal and, through identifying with the sacrifice, receive forgiveness. The death of Jesus followed no ritual save that of the Roman government. Although many aspects of Jesus' death were prophesized in the Old Testament, the act was brought forth by His own people. People that through the years have learned, participated, and accepted the violence of transgressing sins to blameless animals. At this point in history, the crowd calling for the innocent blood of Jesus did not hesitate to offer Him as a human sacrifice in an event steeped with violence, power hungry politicians, and common people motivated by the most aggressive emotion of fear.

J. M. Coetzee used the same motivating factors in his novel *Disgrace*. The story Coetzee weaves has many identifiable relationships found in Biblical texts which lead to a comparative reading of the novel to narrative found in the books of the Bible. He writes metaphorically of animal sacrifices and intertwines sexual content with the conditions of a violent, post-apartheid South Africa. The ways and means of original South Africans that used violence to bring back power is compared to the human state of the government that sacrificed Jesus. In Jesus' time, the Jews were under the command of a strict and unrelenting Roman government. Native South Africans were struggling with an oppressive European government that refused to impart power to the natural inhabitants of the country.<sup>7</sup> Power and fear promoted violence leading to human sacrifice regardless of whether it was seen in death or birth.

Rules and rituals of sacrifice are lost in identifying the price paid by David and Lucy Lurie, the major and minor protagonist of J. M. Coetzee's novel *Disgrace*. The word sacrifice had no meaning for David Lurie because he is a man that believed in taking what he wanted without remorse, repentance, or thoughts of atonement for his actions. He entered daughter Lucy's simple, country domain as an outcast from his professorship at a Cape Town, South African university. His fall from grace as a professor indulging in unwanted sexual advances on a student is comparable to Adam and Eve's fall from grace in the Garden of Eden. In complete denial of his aging status, Lurie takes of the forbidden fruit from one of his young and impressionable students. In an ironic setting of the old college gardens, Lurie meets the young student, Melanie Isaacs. Coetzee remarks "Wine, music: a ritual that men and women play out with each other. Nothing wrong with rituals, they were invented to ease the awkward passage" (Coetzee). While Lurie is the antagonist of this part of the story and Melanie becomes the victim, they both fall as



a result of their actions. Lurie is dismissed from his professorship and Melanie falls into a depression that has serious consequences on her life. In the Biblical story of Adam and Eve, she is the antagonist that brings Adam into the awkward passage from the Garden of Eden to the real world. Sin enters the picture and violence is destined through their children. Lurie seeks solitude with his daughter in the country setting of Salem located on the Eastern Cape of South Africa. Although Lurie feels he can hide his sins among the solitude of rural, country living, violence finds him through his daughter.

Lurie also takes on the role of the tempter as he manipulates Melanie into a one-sided sexual affair. He stalks different areas of her private life and refuses to acknowledge the negative signs she delivers. The satanic snake that meticulously works his way into convincing Eve to take the fruit from the forbidden tree also uses similar tactics. Confrontation was inevitable as Melanie's father confronts Lurie and gives him a chance to explain. Lurie did not respond but acknowledged his role through his thoughts: "Now is his chance indeed: let him who would speak, speak. But he stands tongue-tied, the blood thudding in his ears. A viper: how can he deny it?" (Coetzee 38). God also confronted Adam and Eve are banished them from the garden and Lurie is banished from the university. His journey to seek redemption leads him to daughter Lucy's domain although he is unaware of the need for reformation.

Lucy Lurie appears to have a comfortable life in the small village of Salam. She has a small farm, a hired South African man that helps around the farm, and makes a comfortable living by kenneling dogs supplemented by raising and selling vegetables. As David settles at the farm, Lucy encourages him to use his time constructively by helping with the dogs or in the animal clinic operated by her friend, Bev Shaw. David ponders on this idea but feels volunteer work with the animals will give the impression he seeks salvation for his past deeds. "I'm dubious, Lucy. It sounds suspiciously like community service. It sounds like someone trying to make reparation for past misdeeds" (Coetzee 77). David feels the sins he has committed in the past can be redeemed by working with the dogs, or philosophically, by placing his transgressions on the animals through his volunteer work. He obliges Lucy by meeting and agreeing to help Bev in her animal clinic. His response is a glimpse into his soul: "All right, I'll do it. But only as long as I don't have to become a better person. I am not prepared to be reformed. I want to go on being myself" (Coetzee 77). Coetzee gives us a better understanding of why his character, David Lurie, does not recognize the need for sacrifice to pay for his sin. From an essay written by Coetzee and quoted in

“The Politics of Shame and Redemption in J. M. Coetzee’s “Disgrace” he explains “the self cannot tell the truth of itself to itself and come to rest without the possibility of self-deception. True confession does not come from the sterile monologue of the self or from the dialogue with its own self-doubt, but [. . .] from faith and grace” (Kossev) David does not realize his life is about to change through his volunteer work. The sabbatical journey he begins leads him through several layers of understanding animals, sacrifice, and the association of violence with both. Upon entering the clinic, David reflects on the mission of Bev’s work “Things are beginning to fall into place. He has a first inkling of the task this ugly little woman has set herself. This bleak building is a place not of healing – her doctoring is too amateurish for that – but of last resort” (Coetzee 84). David has received his first introduction to animal sacrifice on behalf of the animals and the work of Bev Shaw.

Bev Shaw, while not a major character in the book, brings the beginning of change for David as he observes her work in the clinic. She is representative of hope as she eases the suffering of sick and dying animals. While the Old Testament clearly defines sacrifices to God as the best of the flock, Bev renders sacrificial death to the weak and sick animals brought to her clinic. However, one can identify Bev’s actions in euthanizing the unwanted animals to the transgression of human sin to the faultless animals. David’s place in working with Bev in the clinic may be interpreted by some readers as an unwarranted desire to search for penance of his past deeds or sins in connection with his affair with Melanie. A possibility of placing his past deeds on the life of the animals by helping to ease their suffering could mark his offering of the sacrificial lamb.

In the critical study “Say the Ram Survived: Altering the Binding of Isaac in Jacques Derrida’s “Rams” and J.M. Coetzee’s *Disgrace*” the author states “Sacrifice is at work in David’s interactions with Driepoot, other animals, and with human beings as well. However, David’s work for dogs is frequently interpreted not as sacrifice, but as an obscure calling to carry and respond to animals at the moment of their greatest alterity, in and beyond the moment of death” (Rother). I believe that Rother’s remarks are correct and David does see the death of the animals at Bev’s clinic as a calling. However, I do not believe, at this point of the novel, David has ascertained the depth of how the animals are actually a sacrifice and only understands this after a violent episode involving his child. Rother backs my assumption by saying:

[I]t would be a misreading of his behavior” with the dogs “to suggest that he is taking on an existence of suffering and service

as expiation for his sin.[...] Instead, Attridge argues, dog-work explodes this debt, transcending its conditions in the passage to another economy defined by disinterested service and bestowals of unearned, unexpected “grace.” Though I agree with Attridge that dog-work does not function as the absolution of a debt, I think it can be understood as sacrificial in a different sense. Dog-work, and especially the killing of the lamb-dog, is not the redemption of David’s crime against the young woman, Melanie Isaacs, but may be an effort to complete it, impossibly, upon an ever-shifting chain of substitutional animals. (Rother)

David’s understanding of the animals as living beings slowly evolves. Just as the Bible discusses offerings that slowly develop into the full sacrifice of animals for human sins under God’s direction, David learns through his apprenticeship with Bev the significance of bringing peace to the forgotten, unloved, and physically deformed animals through their sacrificial death. He is not actively seeking redemption, but progressing toward substitution with his work in the animal clinic. He proves this in his conversation<sup>8</sup> with Lucy as he describes the term scapegoat and links it with religious power. He discusses how sins are loaded on the back of a goat, driven out of town and the result was a clean place because of the ritual of removing sins. However the religious power belonged to gods who died and man had to take over with the real action of watchfulness instead of symbolism or the act of purging. (Coetzee 91). This conversation foreshadows the violence approaching David and Lucy as the discussion took place within minutes of meeting the three men that would bring brutal harm to them.

The defining point of the novel *Disgrace* occurs when the three men David and Lucy met on their morning walk are waiting for them at the farmhouse. The need to use the telephone for an emergency prompted Lucy to cautiously allow one of them in, however, another forced his way in and locked the door. David, in his fear for Lucy’s safety, busts down the door and is promptly knocked over the head, dragged to the bathroom, and eventually set on fire. While he is held prisoner, locked in the bathroom, Lucy is raped by the three men. The men rob the house, retrieve Lucy’s rifle, approach the kennels and murder the caged dogs with sadistic enjoyment. The violent incident takes charge of David and Lucy’s life and forever changes the continuance of their existence.

The story of Abraham and Isaac in the Old Testament is also a crucial turning point in the history of God’s chosen people. Isaac was Abraham’s only son by his wife, Sarah, and his love for him was immeasurable

because he was given to them past the years of child bearing. Genesis chapter 18 relates the news of Isaac's birth was delivered to Abraham and Sarah, by God, in the form of three visitors. Abraham talked with the men and Sarah listened, making a mockery out of their news.<sup>9</sup> The brutal rape of Lucy compares to the events surrounding the news of Isaac. The three men are comparable to the visitors to Abraham although they represented God, not violence. But several issues point to similar accounts of David's comparison to Abraham and Lucy to Sarah. Rother acknowledges this in her essay by quoting "The attack on Lucy's farm accentuates these libidinal undercurrents, giving more room, or greater hospitality, to the suggestion of sexual ravishment, seizure of wealth, and circumvention of conjugal authority in the Biblical narrative" (Rother). I believe this quote is somewhat overstated, however, Sarah did acknowledge pleasure at the old age of herself and Abraham. However, the circumvention of conjugal authority was evident in, first, her eavesdropping of Abraham's conversation and, secondly, in her laughing at the conversation. During their morning walk, David was surprised to hear Lucy laugh as they discussed Bev.<sup>10</sup> Also, David's conjugal authority is undermined as Lucy gives the directives, after the violence, of what will and will not be said. Another comparable is the three men at the Lurie farm asked to use the phone because of someone having a baby while the three visitors to Abraham provided news of a continuous life line through the birth of a baby.

A major revelation of the comparables in the story is the sacrifice. In the story of Abraham and Isaac, it is known that the consummation of the sacrifice of the son did not occur. God provided for the sacrifice in the form of a ram caught in the bushes. While Lucy was raped in the violence at the farm she was not killed. However, a substitute was provided which not only served as the sacrifice, but also awakened a deep emotion in David. A few days after the attack, Petrus, the hired man that worked on Lucy's farm, returned. He had been absent during the violence but arrived back with a load of material to begin working on the land he had acquired through a grant program initiated by South Africa encouraging people to buy property. Along with his supplies, he unloaded two black faced, Persian sheep. He explained the sheep were bought to slaughter and cook for a party to celebrate the land transfer. The sheep were tied to a fence post on a barren patch of land which disturbed David because of their lack of access to water and grass. David moves the sheep to a better location and Petrus moves them back. He ponders about buying the sheep from Petrus but knows that will only force him to substitute other animals. He is grasping with the changing

emotion of caring for the animals by thinking “A bond seems to have come into existence between himself and the two Persians, he does not know how. The bond is not one of affection. It is not even a bond with these two in particular, whom he could not pick out from a mob in a field. Nevertheless, suddenly and without reason, their lot has become important to him” (Coetzee 126). David is not aware of what will take place later in the novel concerning Lucy and her pregnancy from the rape. However, he feels Petrus is an instrumental part of the violent episode.

The fact that Petrus has control over the sheep to be slaughtered, or sacrificed, for the party is the foreshadowing of his manipulation of Lucy and David. In an article in *Perspectives in Political Science*, the author concludes my opinion by saying

Petrus’s motives in the novel actually become clear enough, although this has not yet been brought out in what little has so far been published on *Disgrace* because the critics seem to refuse to face them. As Lurie tells us, “the real truth” is “something anthropological”. By organizing the rape, Petrus asserts his permanence in the land against Lucy’s transience. Petrus arranges the attack to drive her off the land. (Kochin)

Although the two sheep represent the animal sacrifice for Lucy as the ram for Isaac, the outcome is somewhat different. Abraham accepts the ram with joy at the saving of his son and goes on to live a holy and just life because of his obedience to God. In David’s situation, the sacrificing of the sheep leads him to question himself and the need for change. He even asks himself if he must become like Bev and adopt an attitude of service instead of selfish. A discussion with Lucy brings out his inner thoughts when David says he does not want to attend the party where the sheep will be sacrificed “I never imagined I would end up talking this way. God moves in mysterious ways, David. Don’t mock me” (Coetzee 127) Abraham has found obedience and his calling while David is discovering a type of positive humanity while surrounded by the heartlessness found in post apartheid South Africa. He will discover, through his work with animals, that he can change as seen in a quote from *The Politics of Shame and Redemption in J. M. Coetzee’s Disgrace* “Despite David’s resolution not to change, it is the dogs that unleash his emotions—“the more killings he assists in, the more jittery he gets” (142). He cries and “does not understand what is happening to him” as his indifference towards animals dissipates from an “abstract” disapproval of cruelty to a personal commitment to the dogs and, through

them, to “his idea of the world” (Kossew). This release of emotions and acceptance of personal commitments will aid him as he discovers the further sacrifices his daughter must endure because of the violence directed at her through the devious intentions of Petrus.

The final Biblical comparison of *Disgrace* is the deliverance of the ultimate sacrifice found in both texts. Lucy Lurie has experienced a life altering event having been raped by a relative of the South African man that now owns land adjacent to her property. The novel teaches the reader about Lucy and her strong countenance and learns that she is faithful, hard working, and strong but can give in to fear. From the first arrival of David, she demands equal treatment as an adult capable of making the correct choices deemed best for her situation and no one should interfere. Lucy knows the exact reasoning behind the attack made against her and David and decides for herself the course of action to be taken in order to protect the life she has chosen to live. In *Postmetaphysical Literature: Reflections on J. M. Coetzee's Disgrace* the author explains Lucy's situation by stating “Coetzee's Lucy, like Richardson's Clarissa, just wants to be let alone, to be left alone by men. Lucy is attractive, yet lost to men, Lurie says to himself. Of course, this independence of male “protection” proves impossible for her to maintain against the wave of male violence that engulfs the Eastern Cape. Lucy says that she will make any sacrifice so as to win peace, and she winds up having to sacrifice a great deal to maintain it” (Kochin). Unfortunately for Lucy, the life she has chosen to live is in a violent and power grabbing time of South Africa's history. The sacrifices she must make are human sacrifices involving herself and her unborn child. However, she stands strong in her decision despite her father's advice against her choices.

During the conversation between Lucy and David, as she reveals her pregnancy from the rape, she states “David, I can't run my life according to whether or not you like what I do. Not any more. You behave as if everything I do is part of the story of your life. You are the main character, I am a minor character who doesn't make an appearance until halfway through. Well, contrary to what you think, people are not divided into major and minor. I am not minor. I have a life of my own, just as important to me as yours is to you, and in my life I am the one who makes the decisions” (Coetzee 198) Lucy's decision involves her acceptance of Petrus's proposal to become his third wife and give him the rights to her land. By agreeing to become his wife, her lifestyle will remain unchanged and she can live on her farm without fear of other males seeking power over her. However, one must recognize the humility Lucy must suffer in order to gain. She even states “Yes, I

agree, it is humiliating. But perhaps that is a good point to start from again. Perhaps that is what I must learn to accept. To start at ground level. With nothing. Not with nothing but. With nothing. No cards, no weapons, no property, no rights, not dignity. Like a dog. Yes, like a dog” (Coetzee 205).

Perhaps Lucy has a hidden agenda for desiring to stay on her farm and raise the child in this environment or perhaps she feels this is her calling. Whatever her justification for making this choice, she is fully aware of the realm of her existence. In my opinion, Lucy has conceded to the world around her as the place she is destined to be. Her plans are to make the best of the situation and possibly instill hope in the next generation of her bearing. She recognizes her place in a land torn apart by oppressed people searching for gain by overthrowing the oppressor, even if they are in the form of a simple woman such as Lucy. A quote from *The Politics of Shame and Redemption in J. M. Coetzee’s Disgrace* concurs with this opinion by stating “She is aware that the African co-worker of her land, Petrus, who, in the past would have been a servant, is “his own master” and that by accepting a marriage of convenience with him, as his third wife, she is acknowledging the power of African rather than Western tradition and law” (Kosew). Lucy acknowledges that Petrus has orchestrated the events to bring about the relinquishment of her lands to him and used the violence brought about from the three men to accomplish his plan. She concedes to the world around her but states “I must have peace around me. I am prepared to do anything, make any sacrifice, for the sake of peace” (Coetzee 208). These words were spoken to her father. She must separate from him in order to find this peace.

Lucy’s sacrifice of herself and her unborn child is comparative to the sacrifice of Jesus in the New Testament of the Bible. The time in which Lucy lived is in accord with the time Jesus spent in ministry. Power had been stripped from the Jews and they were oppressed by a dictatorship of the Roman government. However, the Sadducees and Pharisees still retained a small amount of power that was guarded beyond measure. As Jesus began teaching and preaching to the Jewish people His popularity increased and the high priests of the Jewish council feared the growing number of his followers. In order to stop Jesus, they arranged through Judas, to have Him delivered to the council and present the charge of blasphemy. They manipulated the crowd into supporting their charges and thus Jesus was found guilty<sup>11</sup>. The state of post apartheid South Africa was also dealing with power struggles and corruptions. Jesus became the pawn for the Jewish council



as Lucy became the victim in Petrus's desire to gain more for himself. Jesus knew that it was destined for Him to die a violent death at the hands of the people. His mission on earth was to become the human sacrifice for the sins of mankind thereby paving the way for Him to become the intercessor for humans to God. His human sacrifice erased all the years of animals carrying the sins of man. Lucy, however, had to learn through violence of her place in the world. She had witnessed the lengths humans would sacrifice each other to gain for themselves, as in the senseless shooting of her animals.

While Lucy did not die, she gave her body as a sacrifice to carry an innocent, unborn child created by violence to bring peace to her world. Her fate of carrying a child was not by choice. The desire to stay at the farm, the place she called home, was her choice as well as her desire to be a good person as she states "Love will grow- one can trust Mother Nature for that. I am determined to be a good mother, David. A good mother and a good person. You should try to be a good person too" (Coetzee 216). Hope was evident as she encouraged David to do the same. Jesus' fate was not by choice but of the need to help save mankind by becoming the sacrificial lamb. Through His death, hope was given to an undeserving people. Through birth, Lucy had hope for a new generation.

David and Lucy Lurie experienced a changing world that encompassed their growth as humans through the sacrifice of animals and humans. They followed no directives, rituals, nor sought favor from anyone for their actions. Lucy, and Bev gave comfort to living beings who suffered mistreatment and abandonment from humans. David experienced a coming of grace through working with the dead animals sacrificed for the sins of those that harmed them because there were too many to feed. However, throughout the novel *Disgrace* J. M. Coetzee leads the reader to the ultimate sacrifice of humans as David and Lucy both experience violence and its consequences brought about by Petrus's quest for power as a product of post apartheid South Africa. The Old Testament details the offerings and sacrifices of animals as the only way man could pay a debt of sin through killing an innocent animal. This violent nature in man brought about the practice of sacrificing each other for gain of power, possessions, and territory. Humans have learned exploiting and sacrificing each other to achieve greater wealth is acceptable and thus changed the face of society forever. *Disgrace* acknowledges this concept through Lucy's trials of Petrus's manipulation forcing her to forfeit her possessions to one with greater power. Jesus died on the cross to offer salvation from mankind's violent nature but people turn to greed rather than a communal concept of "love thy neighbor". Humans,



without the benefit of grace or the concept of love, seek to perfect the belief that more is greater regardless of the sacrifice.

### Notes

1. Genesis 4:4 And the Lord had respect unto Abel and his offering.
2. Offering comes from the Hebrew word *minchah* which means offering, gift, tribute or present according to BibleStudyTools.com
3. Genesis 8:21 And the Lord smelled a sweet savour; and the Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake; for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth; neither will I again smite any more everything living, as I have done.
4. Exodus 10: 25: And Moses said, Thou must give us also sacrifices and burnt offerings, that we may sacrifice unto the LORD our God.
5. <sup>25</sup> And if thou wilt make me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone: for if thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it. <sup>26</sup> Neither shalt thou go up by steps unto mine altar, that thy nakedness be not discovered thereon.
6. Genesis 22:10 And Abraham stretched forth his hand and took the knife to slay his son.
7. Short history of pre-apartheid South Africa found at [cs-students.stanford.edu/~cale/cs201/apartheid.hist](http://cs-students.stanford.edu/~cale/cs201/apartheid.hist)
8. The conversation between David and Lucy occurs while they are taking the dogs for their morning walk. As they are walking, they pass three men, strangers to Lucy, headed in the opposite direction. David and Lucy are in a deep conversation regarding David's affair and subsequent dismissal from his position. Thus the word "scapegoat" comes into play.
9. Genesis 18:1-15 relates the story of God's visit. Verses 12-15 states "Therefore Sarah laughed within herself, saying, After I am waxed old shall I have pleasure, my lord being old also? And the Lord said unto Abraham, Wherefore did Sarah laugh, saying, Shall I of a surety bear a child, which am old. Is anything too hard for the Lord? at the time appointed I will return unto thee, according to the time of life, and Sarah shall have a son. Then Sarah denied, saying, I laughed not: for she was afraid. And he said, Nay; but thou didst laugh.
10. Page 91, the very simple sentence "Lucy laughs".
11. The story of Jesus' charge and sentencing for the charge of blasphemy is found in the New Testament Gospels of Mathew, Mark, Luke and John.

## Works Cited

- Coetzee, J. M. *Disgrace*. New York City: Penguin Group, 1999.
- Dillard, Raymond B. and III, Tremper Longman. *An Introduction to the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.
- Gal, Noam. "A Note On The Use Of Animals For Remapping Victimhood In J.M. Coetzee's *Disgrace*." *African Identities* 2008: 241-252.
- Holy Bible*. Belgium: World Bible Publishers, Inc., n.d.
- Huizenga, Leroy Andrew. "Matt 1:1: "Son Of Abraham" As Christological Category." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 2008: 103-113.
- Kochin, Michael S. "Postmetaphysical Literature: Reflections on J. M. Coetzee's *Disgrace*." *Perspectives on Political Science* (2004): 4-9.
- Kosew, Sue. "The Politics Of Shame And Redemption In J. M. Coetzee's *Disgrace*." *Research In African Literatures* (2003): 155.
- Rother, Adeline. "Say the Ram Survived: Altering the Binding of Isaac in Jacques Derrida's "Rams" and J.M. Coetzee's *Disgrace*." *Critical Studies* (2011): 145-167.

April 15, 2014

Dear Reader:

Reflection on accomplishments, mistakes, and goals is always a positive approach to seeking a life of quality. However, one may become lost by trying to define the word quality as it applies to the individual. Who makes the rules and by what standards are our endeavors judged? Unfortunately we, as humans, depend on each other to define that mark of excellence that states to the world we have become successful. In my opinion, that is wrong.

The seminar paper subject I chose to write about included the text that I base my success as a human being entirely within its pages. As a Christian, or more descriptively, a follower of Christ, the Holy Bible defines my standards of a quality life. The path I chose is difficult and I fail daily. However, faith and knowledge based on a personal relationship with a loving God is assurance that I have another chance.

The text I chose to complete my seminar paper was the novel *Disgrace* which spoke to me through a reading compared to Biblical text. I identified with the character Lucy Lurie because she made a choice to follow a path destined to bring pain, joy, and personal accomplishments. The key word in this statement is "choice".

My reflection of the past four years of attending college and recognizing the accomplishments I have thus far achieved, the word “choice” is very important. It constantly amazes me that I have gained the confidence to take the two above mentioned texts and write a, hopefully, scholarly account of my understanding and opinions of two remarkable books. The events that brought me to writing this letter of reflection was achieved because I made a choice to pursue a goal that will enable me to use a talent I feel is a God given gift. Each of us, as unique and wonderfully made humans, has a choice to follow a path promoting the skills bestowed upon us. The first step is to recognize your own abilities, desires, and actions that bring about peace and harmony in our life. The next step is discovering a way to use these talents to bring joy to others thereby achieving a quality of life that meets the standards of success based on our own judgment, not that of the world.

I am thankful for my journey that has led me through valleys and seen my struggle to reach mountain tops. With each valley, I grew and learned and with each mountain top I celebrated. I will continue to find joy and quality in life because my success is based on my ability to bring those attributes to others.

Debra Kelley Richardson



---

## II. Reevaluating Children's Entertainment





# The Secret Dark Side in Children's Movies: Portraying Imperialism in *Ratatouille*

by Megan Moody



Pixar's *Ratatouille* appears as a benign children's movie that focuses on a person's potential to achieve their dreams with a little hard work and luck. Children and parents across the United States adore the movie and its themes of persistence, dedication, and loyalty to one's friends. If one digs a little deeper into the movie, however, one uncovers a radically different world in which Remy and the rats stand in for a marginalized, colonized group that is oppressed throughout the film. *Ratatouille* condones imperialist ideas through its portrayal of the civilizing effects of food, portraying Remy as a barbaric savage who, through his discovery and subsequent love of cooking, learns to fit in with the mainstream culture and becomes brainwashed by said culture. The film ends on an even more negative note by showing that the mainstream culture will never accept Remy because he is from a marginalized and repressed group. I will explore how rats are represented in our society, how their representation relates to that of a colonized society, and how *Ratatouille* ultimately argues in favor of oppression.

## **I. Birth of Modern Ideas about Rats**

"The rat is... linked with filth, poverty, and the spread of such diseases as the plague. In Western civilization, rats are regularly described as sneaky and deliberately destructive, whereas people denounced as 'rats' are lawbreaking traitors, liars, and thieves" (McTavish 516), but where did these ideas come from? How have we come to see animals who have no motives, are capable of little beyond survival and play and definitely not of the human concept of cruelty or intentions, as negative beings associated with the worst of our society? If they appear, rats are nearly always cast the villains in film and literature, especially in narratives with

mice as the main characters. The rats are bigger, tougher, and meaner, as exemplified by Rattigan in *The Great Mouse Detective*. Rats are the stuff of nightmares, and something we must protect ourselves against, as *Lady and the Tramp*'s Lady must protect her owners' child from a rat in the nursery. Winston Smith of *1984* fears rats more than anything, contributing to this negative stereotype. Even when rats side with the protagonists, as with Templeton from *Charlotte's Web*, they still tend to do so in a negative way; Templeton only helps because he wants food, and so his potential acts of compassion become acts of selfishness and greed. Rats are almost never the good guys whom we root for; rats, according to a 1950s Alberta campaign, are the ones that we must kill on site (McTavish).

First of all, where exactly did our modern fear and distaste for rats originate? Lucinda Cole researches rats in the early modern era (roughly 1400s – 1700s) and discovers that people had already developed associations between rats and sickness during this time period. At first, she explains, people believed that “bad air” caused disease, and that rats and mice originated from that same “bad air” (Cole 69). Their original negative ideas of rats stemmed from the fact that rats and humans shared a food staple: grain. “The productive capacity of rats... posed significant threats to life and livelihood” (Cole 74) because they would steal human grain during times of famine, thus creating even more problems for those living in poverty. As rat populations grow, their food becomes scarce, and their hunger drives them to search for food amongst humans. McTavish and Zeng, in their research on Alberta's anti-rat campaign from the 1950's, discovered similar fears that led to a province-wide extermination of rats. One of Alberta's ministerial orders “officially declared the Norway rat a pest, reclassifying it as an animal liable to destroy crops or livestock” (McTavish and Zeng 526). Such concerns make sense for our survival as a species, and so one can excuse the prejudices formed against rats and other such pests on the basis that they take the food that we need to survive. This also lends credence to our modern habit of labelling human thieves as rats, since rats have literally been thieves of grain in the past.

Cole also notes that this proximity between humans and rats could lead to disease. Rats became “something resembling a disease vector” (Cole 79) that the humans of the era could not help but notice. These Europeans, with limited knowledge of the way disease works, simply believed that rats were supernatural agents of pestilence, and this idea has carried through into our modern mindset, though we attempt to justify our prejudices with science. Some today may argue that, with



our modern science, we have proven that our ancestors were correct in their assumptions that rats caused plague by pointing to the Black Death. Many scientists believe that fleas carried the plague from rats to humans; however, recent discoveries prove that the plague could never have spread so fast with fleas and that the Black Death was not, as previously believed, a bubonic plague, but a pneumonic one that spread through the air. (Thorpe) Also, Cole argues that this is only one way in which disease and rats could be causally related. She also notes that in some cases, a large population of rats could catch the same disease as humans and even from humans, and “that the sheer number of rodent corpses created a noxious environment of decay in which disease could and did breed” (Cole 78). This shows that, rather than rats causing disease, they are the victims of it and their corpses become the ideal breeding ground for further disease.

Other negative conceptions of rats may simply come from their appearance. Norway rats, one of the most popular types of rat, typically grow to between 9 and 11 inches long, excluding their tails. Their heads are short and stubby, with blunt, wide muzzles, sharp teeth, and eyes that look like “beads” of solid color. (Hanson) These attributes, especially compared with the smaller, sleeker, and less threatening appearance of mice, encourage humans’ fear of the animals. Even an 8 week old Norway rat can be twice the size as a full grown house mouse. (Hanson) One can easily understand how such a large rodent might cause fear. Imagine a bundle of fur almost a foot long rustling in your kitchen, taking the grain you need to survive. How do you fight back against something that big, especially if it uses its claws and teeth to defend itself? People fear raccoons and possums for similar reasons, due to their size and perceived ferocity, and so it makes sense in this context to fear seeing a rat in the cellar, especially with its shaggy, matted hair that reminds one just how wild and untamed it is. Humans especially worry when it comes to children, who have less defense against such a creature that could.

*Ratatouille* plays heavily with our common conceptions of rats. The first rats we see after a freeze frame of Remy look exactly the way they have typically been portrayed in film and literature until now – dark, large, and shaggy-haired. The rats are initially silhouetted against a red sky, giving an eerie sensation to the viewer as he or she watches the rats run into the garbage heap. The film immediately portrays them as sneaky and attempts to invoke fear – the red color of the sun behind him, the beady eyes – within the audience. Just a few short seconds later, though, the film allows light to fall on the rats, and the viewer watches as they

become anthropomorphized and instantly more likeable. They become rounder, with softer curves and less angles, and their fur resembles the fur of domesticated cats or dogs rather than the stringy mess it had appeared in the silhouette only moments prior. They also take on faces with human-like expressions and interact with the world in an intelligent, human-like way. The transition suggests that the audience should not allow prejudices and biases to color their perceptions, but it functions in another way as well. When the rats are seen as themselves, they are terrifying. Only when they become like humans are they allowed positive characteristics and sympathy from the audience. If we take the rats as a colonized society and the humans as the mother country that has colonized them, this is highly problematic. It suggests that those in a colonized society are inherently negative, and the only way for mainstream culture – for the audience, in this case – to accept them is if they adopt the dominant culture and leave their own behind. This theme returns later as well, but for now let us move on to connecting rats and the “savages” of colonized societies.

## **II. Rats and “Savages”**

European and, subsequently, North American society have a history of believing that those of other races are inferior. “English cited Indian “savagery” and “depredations” as justification for the dispossession and enslavement of the indigenous peoples” (Minges 454); they looked at the practices of Native Americans and Africans and considered them too base for a “civilized” society, and the English needed to help them change these practices. Minges explains that much of this justification was a front for greedy capitalists wanting free resources and cheap labor, but the English really did feel as though the natives were lesser beings. An entire narrative sprang around the barbarism of the natives, as seen in many colonial texts from both America and Africa. According to Nicholas Hudson, “African and American peoples were scorned as “beastly” (or often as “rustic”) to the extent that they appeared to fall short of European ideas of urbanity and sophistication” (Hudson 250). In other words, “Civilized” society at the time consisted of a specific set of beliefs and rules that Europeans had formed over the years, and when the Europeans encountered a society with different beliefs and rules, they quickly classified that society as uncivilized. They could not comprehend the Native American’s tradition of scalping their enemies, and they were baffled by certain African tribes’ desire to go without clothing. After living with an abundance of resources for so long, European societies had forgotten what it meant to scavenge for food and supplies. They could

not understand why a Native American tribe would need to scalp its enemies to scare them away from their water source, or why Africans living in the intense heat would not see the reason for clothing, and so they labelled these practices as undeveloped and barbaric.

Nicholas Hudson also hits upon the fact that these non-Europeans were often linked to beasts and animals. Many of the early narratives about the Native Americans and Africans liken them to animals: “[Juan Gines de Sepulveda] argued for the enslavement of the indigenous people on the basis of the intellectual and moral superiority of the Spaniard: ‘... There is a great difference between savagery and forbearance, between violence and moderation, almost – I am inclined to say – as between monkeys and men’” (Minges 453). This contrast partially stems from their inability to understand native culture. Because they could not understand the reason and logic behind certain practices, they deemed those practices as irrational, and irrationality belongs to animals rather than to humans. Because the Africans and Native Americans did not understand the world the same as the Europeans did, because they saw the world differently due to the different resources that had been available to them, the Europeans labelled them as dumb and ignorant as animals. The colonizers also consciously set up this dynamic in order to further justify their intrusion into these societies and subsequent slavery of these races. (Minges) After all, animals could never achieve as much or become as smart or capable as humans, and so they were considered tools. Extending this metaphor of animal and tool to Africans and Native Americans provided an easy way to reason away any doubts about enslaving these people who simply were not human in Europe’s eyes.

The history of the uncivilized/animal metaphor extended into slavery in America, and some sentiments still persist today. Spenser Keralis explores the relation between animals and slavery in his essay on a set of abolitionist texts aimed towards children in America. He notices that “slaveholders deployed a dehumanizing metaphor in describing slaves as brutes, and under chattel slavery... slaves were reduced to living property, in legal status little more than animals” (Keralis 121-122). After merely viewing Africans as barely above animals, Europeans and white Americans treated them as animals as well. Slaveholders could buy and sell them and used them the way they would use work horses. They punished and rewarded slaves as one would punish and reward a dog; whippings for undesired behaviors such as working too slow, and “treats” such as extra food for desired behaviors such as working faster than normal. Keralis noticed that the idea of slaves as animals permeated the times so much that even abolitionists could not divorce themselves

from the metaphor, though they attempted to use it to their advantage. They often drew connections between animal torture and slave abuse, and though they hoped that animal-loving children would become more sympathetic towards the plight of slaves, they ultimately “dehumanized slaves by placing them metaphorically in the same status as animals. Allegories of pet-making in abolitionist writing provided white children with a model for negotiating their relationship with free blacks and for asserting their class-entitled mastery in general” (Keralis 122). Keralis argues that while this method calls for a definite end to slave abuse, it still reinforces the idea that white Americans are superior to Africans American just as humans are superior to nonhuman animals.

The metaphors persist even in our culture today. Though most of American culture no longer believes overtly in white supremacy, many Americans still associate images of African villages with terms such as “uncivilized,” “savage,” “barbarians,” etc. These terms imply the brutality and immorality of animals more than they remind us of fellow humans. The types of animals imagined when thinking of the above terms are always wild and untamed. Some may think of wolves and other large animals of prey, others of possums and even of rats. Rats, after all, are seen as feral and vicious, and they carry with them connotations of barbarism. Society typically views them as inhabitants of the poorest regions of the world, and what poorer regions are there than third world African countries with little food or education, where the unlearned and ignorant masses struggle to survive on a daily basis just as Remy’s family in *Ratatouille* struggle? *Ratatouille* sets up such a relationship between rats and the uncivilized – it displays a large family (as opposed to smaller, more contained families that one finds in better developed countries) that struggles to survive on the scraps left by the humans around them, or in other words the dominant culture. Many of these rats are ignorant and unlearned, just as Europeans view uncivilized peoples. In fact, all of these rats are portrayed this way except for Remy, who attempts to enter the dominant culture through the art of cooking, which society sees as the ultimate sign of civilization and the gateway to a proper place in the dominant culture.

### **III. Cooking and Civilization**

According to the research of Thor Anderson and Stanley Brandes, “more than language, bipedalism, tool use, symbolic thought, and the like, it is the act of cooking – that is, transforming raw into easily digestible food by subjecting it to fire – that is the primary distinguishing feature of humanity” (Anderson and Brandes 286). Animals, after all, do not

make fires to heat their dinners; they eat their food raw. The two briefly explore cooking's history in civilization, noting the way cooking and food has shaped customs and morality in civilized society, such as the practice of washing one's hands before eating so that one does not eat dirt and grime. They discovered a widespread belief in the idea that high cuisine, especially French cuisine, marks true civilization and separates it from the simple cooking of uncivilized societies. Part of this stems from what they deem "appetite control" (Anderson and Brandes 290) – hunger is the craving for food, they explain, while appetite is the craving for specific foods, and the mark of civilization is the ability to control one's hunger to satisfy the appetite. Rather than eating whatever comes before oneself, a civilized person will wait until they can eat what they prefer. Anderson and Stanley imply that this is because their taste buds and sense of civilization have so evolved that they can no longer reduce themselves to the same standards as those of an uncivilized society who will eat whatever is before them.

Stephen Mennel, on the other hand, explains appetite control in a manner that historically situates it and reveals that the contrast between "civilized" and "uncivilized" cooking is really only a contrast between countries with abundant food supplies and those without. He researches practices of fasting and notices that "exceptional instances of extreme abstinence [from food] are indeed a symptom of the unevenness of controls over eating. This general unevenness of controls is, according to Elias, typical of socially highly unequal societies, and Jack Goody has specifically pointed to fasting as characteristic of hierarchical societies" (Mennel 384). In other words, societies with extreme social hierarchies control their appetites more than societies without such hierarchies. Whether a country is rich or poor, civilized or barbaric, doesn't matter – all that matters is social inequality. He examines medieval Europe to exemplify his statements and notices that eating plenty and without discretion was once the mark of nobility. Only those with money and time could afford to find more food to eat, and peasants were left eating very little. Those below the nobility attempted to emulate them by eating as much as they could get their hands on, and the effect trickled down to paupers who could only dream of extravagant feasts and having plenty of food to fill their stomachs.

As time progressed, however, food became more plentiful and readily available, and the nobility had to find a new way to separate themselves from the peasants than through sheer amount of food consumed: "by the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries, for the nobility to eat quantitatively more would have been physically impossible. That was one

reason for increasing demands made upon the skill of the cook in making food more palatable” (Mennel 389). Cooks began to make tastier food for the nobility to consume as a new way to mark themselves as different from those with little money. French cooks in particular began to experiment with different spices and flavors, more so than in any other country, as Mennel states. Terms such as “sophistication” and “cultured” which described the nobility and their tastes became linked to the types of foods consumed, and ultimately to civilization in general. Mendel demonstrates that “the civilizing of appetite, if we may call it that, appears to have been partly related to the increasing security, regularity, reliability and variety of food supplies (Mennel 388)”. His wording, “if we may call it that,” implies that, as previously stated, civilization has little to do with the refinement of taste in regards to food, but that the amount of food available has everything to do with it. Thus, though society believes that food and civilization go hand-in-hand, really these two have little to do with each other and are entirely arbitrary depending on one’s situation. Just as European colonizers did not understand the cultures of those they dominated and deemed them inferior, society today does not understand that discretion in appetite does not signify superiority.

Food in general also strongly indicates place. Cuisine from various regions is quickly recognized, as exemplified by the variety of restaurant types in any given city: Mexican, Japanese, Indian, Brazilian, Moroccan, and many others. Most people conjure an image of these types of foods and can distinguish between them all fairly easily. As a result, food closely ties into one’s identity and self-conception. According to Madeleine Pastinelli and Laurier Turgeon, “groups use food to enact their own self-definitions and to distinguish themselves from others... [Different foods] are celebrated to express ethnic or regional identities” (Pastinelli and Turgeon 250). The two explore this relation and the way in which consumption of ethnic foods can affirm one’s own culture and identity or lead to the adoption of another culture and a different identity. They discover that is an effective tool in the appropriation of other cultures, and that eating in ethnic restaurants resembles microcosmic imperialism: “The incorporation of colonial foods in the European diet is, in a sense, a way of putting the colony on the table and eating it on a daily basis” (Pastinelli and Turgeon 261). By adopting the ethnic foods of the colonized and removing from them any ceremonial or ritual context, “commodification of [these foods]... was a means of domesticating but also of desacralizing them” (Pastinelli and Turgeon 261).

Europeans and Americans appropriated the cultures of those they subjugated through food, and in doing so, they robbed colonized societies of their ethnic identity and transformed their cultures into symbols that could be bought and sold by those who were not even part of those cultures. Moreover, Pastinelli and Turgeon argue, Europeans and Americans did so with the best stated intentions – they wanted to better themselves by learning of other cultures, but this was only a justification for their desire to rule over these cultures. In the same way, North Americans today claim to visit ethnic restaurants in hopes to educate themselves on their cultures through cuisine, but in reality they only wish to consume and do not desire the “actual physical presence of the people themselves” (Pastinelli and Turgeon 258) from which they could truly learn about that culture. Many patrons of ethnic restaurants describe their trips as journeys into a new society, and such narratives mimic the problematic “travel narratives” of Europeans visiting Africa and North America during the period of colonization. These narratives, far from displaying respect and a sense of equality for the natives, display a sense of a country ripe with natural resources for the mother country to take for its own. (Pastinelli and Turgeon 260) Rather than viewing ethnic cuisine as a type of civilization or viewing ethnic cooks with respect, society regards the food and culture in a patronizing manner and labels them “quaint,” seeing their food as just another item to appropriate.

Their article displays the power of food consumption in civilization, but it also remarks upon an extreme bias in regards to the types of people who visit ethnic restaurants and the labels these people use for the restaurants. When the restaurants stem from foreign countries that were once colonized or seen as inferior, such as India or any African country, people label the restaurants as ethnic. The term ethnic implies otherness and strangeness, and diners entering these establishments wish to consume this otherness in a display of dominance over an inferior culture. When, however, “ethnic becomes ‘sophisticated’,” or originates from a country that was not once subjected to colonization, “[the restaurant] slides into the gourmet category” (Pastinelli and Turgeon 258). Such a bias once again recalls the important binary between “civilized” European countries and “uncivilized” African and Native American societies that Europeans used to justify their sense of superiority over and enslavement of these societies. Pastinelli and Turgeon also remark that, in most cases, the “gourmet” food originates from France. As stated before, cooks experimented with tastes and flavors more so than in any other country, and so they have taken a place in the world as the experts on cooking and fine dining. Labelling French food as “fine”



and “gourmet” and other foreign foods as “ethnic” immediately places France at the top of a hierarchy in which they are the most civilized and all other countries fall in line behind them. *Ratatouille* takes place in France, amongst French cuisine, which has been labelled as the epitome of modern cooking and, thus, the epitome of civilized society.

#### **IV. Tying Everything Together in *Ratatouille***

In the film, Remy, an unsophisticated, unlearned, and uncivilized rat who stands in for colonized society, learns the art of cooking and through it enters the dominant culture around him. Though he adopts many traits of this civilization in an attempt to fit in, he is ultimately cast out from it, but the film portrays Remy’s betrayal of his indigenous culture and entrance into mainstream society as positive and fulfilling. From what has been shown in this paper about uncivilized societies, the representation of rats in our own society, and the parallels others have drawn between animals and uncivilized cultures, one can easily draw the similarities between Remy’s family of rats and one such society. Rats, like “savages”, struggle to survive in a world that does not provide them enough food to become “civilized”. They are looked down upon by civilization and viewed as inferior. Remy’s family lives on the edges of mainstream society and can never hope to become part of the dominant culture, just as colonized groups could not receive equal treatment or even respect from the mother country who looked down upon them as animals.

Brenda Allen recognizes that this is the case, noting that “the audience is encouraged to read Remy as human through his highly developed moral and ethical values [as well as] his human-like behaviours . . . . When reading Remy as human, by extension his family must also be read as human, in which case they are represented as undifferentiated from wider class, ethnic or racial groups” (Allen 139). For her, Remy becomes “like an illegal immigrant: his position has changed from that of nurtured son [with his family] to that of a foreigner in unfriendly territory” (Allen 138). In humanizing Remy, the audience cannot escape the obvious racial implications inherent in his situation. Anderson and Brandes agree that Remy is portrayed as humanlike and that he undergoes a “civilizing” process, implying that he comes from an uncivilized culture. They claim that he acquires self-control in the way that Mennel speaks of it when referencing control over appetite. Indeed, Remy’s father Django comments on his change: “You look thin. Why is that? A shortage of food, or a surplus of snobbery?” (*Ratatouille*) For Django, who lives in a society like Mennel’s medieval Europe in which resources are scarce and food is only for the rich, thinness represents hunger; how-



ever, he has lived amongst humans long enough to understand that, in this civilization that has more resources than it knows what to do with, thinness represents taste and refinement. Django recognizes that Remy has likely taken on aspects of the dominating culture, though even he does not realize just how brainwashed Remy has become, that Remy has been actively working with their oppressors.

Though Anderson and Brandes recognize that Remy's journey into civilization is significant, they read it as a positive and uplifting process. They buy into human supremacy over animals and, though they may not realize it, Euro-centrism. They also claim that *Ratatouille* portrays an ethnically diverse cast as exemplified by their names; however, of the names they list, seven originate from France, three describe the character they belong to (Linguini looks like a linguini noodle, for example), and only two of the twelve names come from other countries – Mustafa, a cook in the kitchen, and Django, Remy's father. Interestingly enough, the name "Django" originates from Gypsies. (Anderson and Brandes 292-293) As one of two characters with a real name of non-French genesis, Django carries a heavy burden of representation. In choosing a Gypsy name, the filmmakers draw upon all the stereotypes of Gypsies that our society understands. These stereotypes are all negative in nature – Gypsies, according to the common mindset, roam around Europe as thieves and con artists. They will lie, cheat, and steal indiscriminately. Not only do the rats represent barbaric savages, but now their patriarch associates himself with a race of dishonest nomads who trick and steal from civilization and whom civilization, in return, deems unfit to live amongst true civilized people.

It would be one thing for the film to set up the comparison only to overturn it through Django's virtues, but it does little to show these virtues, and Django turns into a "stumbling block to Remy's 'advancement'" (Allen 140). Just as the European colonists did not understand the culture of the Africans and Native Americans they encountered, the film displays a similar lack of understanding for the situation in which Django finds himself. His and Remy's culture relies on strong family bonds for survival, but the film portrays Remy's abandonment of his family in a positive light. Django must look after his family without a poison detector after circumstances split Remy from the rest of them. When he finds Remy again, he assumes his son will resume his job in order to protect his family, but he discovers that Remy has forsaken them in exchange for a chance at entering into the mainstream culture that Django knows he can never truly infiltrate. Django attempts to show Remy the brutality of humans by revealing dead rat bodies hanging in

a shop – such a scene should remind the knowledgeable viewer of the atrocities colonizers committed against colonized societies and against slaves. The film, rather than acknowledging Django's and the rats' unique difficult situation, frames the situation as Django's "attempt to pass on learned hatred and prejudice" which is "unacceptable and... [anti-tolerant] in terms of the Western contemporary values demonstrated by Remy. This marks the patriarch Django... as jingoistic, ignorant and unduly conservative" (Allen 140). Rather than emphasizing the father's attempt to protect his son from a culture that has committed mass genocide against his people, the film instead emphasizes Remy's attempt to reconcile the differences between rats and humans, between the colonized and the colonizers.

*Ratatouille* also displays a lack of understanding for the rats' hunger. When Remy loses his family and journeys through the sewers and walls of Paris, he happens upon a dinner party where he finds a loaf of bread. As he lifts the morsel to his mouth, smacking his lips with excitement, Chef Gusteau's image reveals itself before him and admonishes him for the action. Gusteau, serving not simply as Remy's morality but as the internalized voice of civilization, tells him that he is not a thief: "A cook makes! A thief takes" (*Ratatouille*). Remy responds that he is hungry, but he leaves the bread and continues his journey. The film oversimplifies the issue with its blatant proclamation that one should never steal. It does not take into account the life of a rat, especially a poor starving rat that has no clue where his next meal will come from and who wouldn't take more than a few crumbs off a human's plate anyway. It ignores the fact that Remy used to steal from the old woman's kitchen when he first learned to cook; that was deemed acceptable by the movie's logic, because he was cooking and striving to enter the mainstream culture. Though the film can define the difference between theft and creation, it cannot define the difference between a thief who takes what he does not need and a young man who cannot live without stealing a bite of food here and there.

In terms of imperialism, it harkens to discussion of self-control as a mark of civilization and implies that one must always control the appetite, even in extreme circumstances such as starvation, in order to remain part of society. In reality, no one would bat an eye if someone from the dominant culture stole a bit of food to avoid dying of hunger. For one such as Remy, however, hailing from a colonized society, he must prove himself to the mainstream culture by upholding their ideals more strongly than they themselves uphold them. He must become more perfect than a citizen of society to find acceptance. Sous-chef Colette

faces similar issues as a woman in a man-dominated world. “How many women do you see in this kitchen?” she asks.

Only me. Why do you think that is? Because haute cuisine is an antiquated hierarchy built upon rules written by stupid, old men. Rules designed to make it impossible for women to enter this world. But still I’m here. How did this happen? Because I am the toughest cook in this kitchen! I have worked too hard for too long to get here, and I am *not* going to jeopardize it for some garbage boy who got lucky! Got it? (*Ratatouille*)

Colette recognizes that she needs to be the toughest and work the hardest because she is already at a disadvantage due to the circumstances of her birth. She reveals herself as strong, confident, and abrasive when she must be, because that is the only way that she can survive. She must act more like a man than the men do to gain acceptance into the kitchen, and so Remy, to gain acceptance into the kitchen and thus society as well, must act more civilized than those who symbolize the epitome of civilization.

In Remy’s struggle to become part of civilization, he has internalized their values to the extent that they interfere with his indigenous culture and family relations. As mentioned before, Chef Gusteau symbolizes Remy’s internalization of the dominant mindset. When Remy first loses his family, Gusteau explains that “if you focus on what you left behind, you will never see what lies ahead” (*Ratatouille*). At the time, Remy needs the push to get moving so that he can find food and figure out his bearings; however, Chef Gusteau tells him not to focus on what he left, not on what he lost. The wording implies that Remy abandoned his family of his own will, and that he should forget about the ones who raised him his whole life in exchange for an opportunity to live in the middle of high class civilization. He must abandon his culture and heritage in order to move on within the dominant culture. Gusteau also quizzes Remy on the kitchen staff, implying that such information is the most important thing for Remy to know, even though, as a rat, survival skills should be higher on the list. When Remy finds his brother eating trash outside the restaurant, Gusteau does not want Remy getting food for him, though if the rat is eating inedible trash – literally, Emille munches on a paper bag – then clearly he must be hungry. Again, mainstream morality does not understand the difference between Remy stealing to feed his hungry brother and stealing for no necessary reason.

Outside of his own head, Remy tends to patronize his brother and family and display distaste for his own race. He introduces his brother

with “This is Emille. My brother. He’s... easily impressed.” (*Ratatouille*) Clearly Remy believes his brother is ignorant, and by mainstream society’s standards, Remy is right; however, Emille always returns home with food, which, in their native culture, marks him as a success. Remy has no right to criticize his brother who holds an important role within their own society, and yet Remy feels as though Emille is an inferior because he does not understand high society and French cuisine like Remy does. Later on in the film, Remy feels the need to educate Emille about cuisine, just as civilized society claimed they must educate uncivilized society. He berates Emille when he continues to eat garbage, hitting his brother on the head and telling him to “Spit that out!” (*Ratatouille*) as though Emille were a dog and Remy were a human. Treating his own brother as an inferior animal reveals just how brainwashed Remy has become. He treats others of his own race as lesser beings due to the ideas instilled in him by mainstream society. After spending so long amongst humans and away from his native culture, Remy even begins to fear others of his own race. Before he recognizes Emille rummaging through the garbage next to the restaurant, he arms himself with a kitchen knife – a symbol of humanity and cooking – and tentatively approaches the trash cans with a look of obvious trepidation. Such internalized hatred mirrors reality, in which African Americans and others of oppressed or colonized groups believe they are inferior to the dominant group.

## **V. Conclusion**

Throughout the film, Chef Gusteau’s motto becomes the driving force behind Remy’s dedication to his craft: “Anyone can cook,” (*Ratatouille*) as many characters quote. In the end, however, the motto proves false. Not only can some like Linguini not cook due to an extreme lack of talent, but we also discover that Remy cannot be *allowed* to cook. “While the chefs admire the dishes they thought were produced by Linguini, they retrospectively reject those same works of art because they were actually produced by Remy. As far as the sous-chefs are concerned, Remy does not have the credentials to be an artist” (Allen 142). “Not having the credentials” in this case means being born into a colonized society, or, if we look at Colette who was also banished from the kitchens, being born into any kind of minority group. The dominant culture banishes Remy the immigrant, Colette the woman, and Linguini the accomplice to the outskirts of civilization. Colette and Remy can still technically cook, but they can never cook for the highest in mainstream culture, and instead they are designated to a lower rung on the social ladder. The movie makes no attempt to portray this as negative, but instead

portrays it as reasonable. Of course a restaurant would be forced to shut down after an infestation of rats. Of course those associated would have to start their own separate restaurant if they wanted to continue doing what they love.

In the end, Remy, Colette, and Linguini are shown as happy within their own niche in society, and so the film implies that, for minorities to achieve joy, they must give up on their desires to work in high civilization and instead settle for carving a niche for themselves in the lower levels of society. Even Anderson and Brandes recognize that the film dictates that “we can... fulfill our dreams [only] within the existing social structures” (Anderson and Brandes 286), and any attempt to overthrow those structures will only – and should reasonably – meet with failure. The ending of *Ratatouille* “confirms existing power structures” (Andes 138) and even endorses them.

### Works Cited

- Allen, Brenda. “Family, Friendship and WORK in Ratatouille.” *Australian Screen Education* 14.54 (2009): 137-143 *Galileo*. Web. 20 March 2014.
- Anderson, Thor and Brandes, Stanley. “Ratatouille: An Animated Account of Cooking, Taste, and Human Evolution.” *Ethnos: Journal of Anthropology* 76.3 (2011): 277-299. *Galileo*. Web. 20 March 2014.
- Cole, Lucinda. “Of Mice and Moisture: Rats, Witches, Miasma, and Early Modern Theories of Contagion.” *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 10.2 (2010): 65-84. *Project Muse*. Web. 10 April 2014.
- Hanson, Anne. *Rat Behavior and Biology*. 16 Mar. 2003. Web. 15 April 2014.
- Hudson, Nicholas. “From ‘Nation’ to ‘Race’: The Origin of Racial Classification in Eighteenth-Century Thought.” *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 29.3 (1996): 247-264. *Project Mus*. Web. 08 April 2014.
- Keralis, Spenser D.C. “Feeling Animal: Pet-Making and Mastery in the Slave’s Friend.” *American Periodicals* 22.2 (2012): 121-138. *Project Muse*. Web. 14 April 2014.
- McTavish, Lianne and Zheng, Jingjin. “Rats in Alberta: Looking at Pest-Control Posters from the 1950s.” *The Canadian Historical Review* 92.3 (2011): 515-546. *Project Muse*. Web. 01 April 2014.
- Mennel, Stephen. “On the Civilising of Appetite.” *Theory, Culture, and Society* 4.2 (1987): 373-403. *StephenMennel.eu*. Web. 14 April 2014.

- Minges, Patrick. "Beneath the Underdog: Race, Religion, and the Trail of Tears." *The American Indian Quarterly* 25.3 (2001): 453-479. *Project Muse*. Web. 08 April 2014.
- Pastinelli, Madeleine and Turgeon, Laurier. "'Eat the World': Postcolonial Encounters in Quebec City's Ethnic Restaurants." *Journal of American Folklore* 115.456 (2002): 247-268. *Project Muse*. Web. 08 April 2014
- Ratatouille*. Dir. Brad Bird. Pixar, 2007. Film.
- Thorpe, Vanessa. "Black death skeletons reveal pitiful life of 14th-century Londoners." *The Observer*. 29 Mar. 2014. Web. 10 April 2014.

# Garfield: A Cat Stuck in the Uncanny Valley

by Laura Gordon



One recent example of the failure of the uncanny valley is *Mars Needs Moms*. The film was made by Disney, which shows that even a well-known company can fall prey to the uncanny valley. *Mars Needs Moms* is a script featuring aliens but the problem is the aliens fall into the uncanny valley, which means that they appear too close to human for the audience to fully enjoy the film as a fantasy. I am looking at “Garfield” who also falls into the uncanny valley but the “Garfield” franchise has a built in audience willing to pay even though Garfield may not fully reach their expectations.

Garfield is a cultural icon. The character is part of our identity. When anyone thinks of Garfield they think of a cat but not in the traditional sense. Our most recognizable picture is in the comic strip, but Garfield is unique in that he lacks the ability to speak and only communicates in thought bubbles. Everyone thinks of a cat and sees it running and getting caught in trees, whereas Garfield conjures a completely different image, which is a big cat who prefers eating lasagna and being lazy. We have an idea which automatically pops in our head and the comic strip solidifies the picture. The other characters need Garfield for the comic strip to make any sense. The comic strip has three main characters: Garfield, Odie, and Jon Arbuckle. The ironic part is there is another pet in the house, Odie a dog; however the dog is portrayed like a normal pet. Odie is dumb and without sense. Therefore, Odie is set up as the fall guy for any joke.

Garfield becomes part of the culture when audiences recognize his image on products such as fast food cups. Companies use the fan status as an advantage to sell their products. A restaurant like Burger King knows its customers are mostly families and the kids enjoy toys so they include Garfield themed toys and games. One way they grab more fans

and money which is the ultimate goal. The “Uncanny Valley” relates to “Garfield” because people attempt to make the character appear more humanlike. The audience however has expectations regarding Garfield’s appearance. When altering the character to fit a movie’s guideline movies need the character to speak like an actual human. Garfield is a cat so the transition to human is difficult. Mori describes the issue as trying to give “human characteristics to an animal” (320) The problem occurs when someone attempts to transform Garfield from the page to the screen. The problem is called “uncanny valley” which Masahiro Mori defines in the article “Intermediaries: reflections on virtual humans, gender, and the Uncanny Valley” and he coined the term in 1970. In the article Intermediaries: Reflections on virtual humans, gender, and the Uncanny Valley Claude Drande said “The Uncanny Valley” is “Human characters in animation films, for example, often fall into the Uncanny Valley when they are designed to achieve a very realistic appearance” (320) I want to examine the problems which occur when trying to change formats. The different formats are the television cartoon which came from the popularity of the comic strip. The final format is the movie which serves as the ultimate sign of crossover potential and success.

Garfield is the creation of Jim Davis, “Garfield’s first appearance was June 19, 1978. The feline is a staple in the Sunday comics, but it starts out in 41 newspapers. In the 1980’s its growth and readership is 3,000 publications” (25). This shows the popularity already emerging. Garfield is an unusual comic strip, because the main character is a cat and he loves lasagna. The history of Garfield is important because it highlights the comic strip’s longevity. A comic strip often has a niche audience. The article “Number One Cat” by Meghan Flynn fits into any of the three subcategories in the paper. The three categories are marketing branding and image control. It discusses the marketing side of Garfield and the introduction of new products. Meghan Flynn, a contributor for *Retail Merchandiser* says “The biggest news to come from Paws in 2009, however, was the launch of a Garfield Show in US after a successful run in Europe” (105). The news is a symbol to the popularity of the characters even in other countries and languages.

A problem many comics and books face is a disconnect if you alter the language. American centric comic strips embed the joke in the language. A common technique is using the drawings to convey the punch line so the audience needs few words to understand the meaning. Also using the new audience as a springboard for new products but still remain constant for the older generation familiar with a 2-D format moving from the page to any live format is a risk. You must change the show



enough to appeal to the new audience and hope the parents allow the new storylines to exist. One good thing about Garfield is the common themes of being lazy and loving food connects with any generation. Also the comic strips bridge the gap because people who own pets can relate to their pet trying to get into everything and making a mess. You love your pet however you still get angry when the pet crosses the line. An example of both pet and owner needing each other is [www.garfield-withoutgarfield.com](http://www.garfield-withoutgarfield.com) also sometimes called [www.garfieldminusgarfield.com](http://www.garfieldminusgarfield.com). Either way, it is the same result: the comics lack message without Garfield's presence. Garfield has enough human characteristics. The team of Jon and Garfield spar with each other. The conversation of Garfield reemphasizes the comic aspect because a real cat lacks the ability to communicate on a human level, but Garfield uses his "voice" to share his opinions on the various relationships in his life.

In the article "Garfield Pet Category is for the Dogs" Hilary Rosner examines the introduction of a line of products for a dog, even though Garfield's image is on them. The company, Paws, which Jim and Jill Davis founded, handles all the marketing for Garfield. As a part of the product conception and development Jim Davis takes control of the products the public sees. A smart technique he is aware of the storyline because he creates it and the more he controls the better profit he makes. In the years which Garfield celebrates a major milestone the company puts out a new product. The fans and newcomers want a new item so it's a fun idea.

The comic and promotions seem to fit together, even if a character is well known there can be an overload of too much memorabilia. The secret is to keep up with the demand of the public, but keep the items for special purposes. An example sell products for pets Garfield is a cat a smart marketing executive would go for the pet lovers and tie in with the public's mind of Garfield as a pet. They may also branch out eventually but always be conscious the comic strip and its message deep down Odie and Garfield love each other. The introduction of dog toys fits the image and still keeps the relationship of the characters in people's minds the goal is to remind readers we are aware of the comic strip and as a thank you for their readership and support.

Although a business tries to make profits the public who reads the comic and also buys the other products deserves a thank you. Also if the creator receives letters or now email and fails to meet the expectations he may lose readers. Also there is a group of people who consider themselves die hard fans are willing to buy anything with Garfield on it if you do not take advantage of this built in audience you miss an opportunity.

Will Eisner, the “Father of the Graphic Novel,” defines a comic as: “The arrangement of pictures or images and words to narrate a story or dramatize an idea” (1985, p. 5) and explains that “In its most economical state, comics employ a series of repetitive images and recognizable symbols. When these are used again and again to convey similar ideas, they become a language—a literary form, if you will” (p. 8). Eisner’s definition moves beyond the contexts of aesthetics and design and considers literacy, psychology, and anthropology. The characters and storylines combine with simple language makes it easier for international readers to understand. Jim Davis, the creator, knows a cat will resonate with both parents and kids. An entire family can spend time together reading the comics and that leads to conversation which is important. Even if the content of a comic strip just helps people laugh it benefits everyone.

Happiness has another benefit as well: it helps with productivity in the workplace. If you need a laugh during a tough day you are able to concentrate on the project or work that has to be done. Kids in a new or difficult situation often bond over common interests they may start talking and it may lead to friendship. If kids from different locations and culture start having conversations it may lead to acceptance, which also helps in the future when they must work together. Opening up people’s minds to the possibility of multiple points of view also guides in solving problems. The current workplace is a balance between working alone and also having skills to add a portion to a collaborative project. If a comic strip in a small way teaches kids working skills it is a positive effect.

The popularity of Garfield led its creator and publisher in the development of stand-alone books showing many different storylines at one time. Readers who wait for the comics have to settle for a few panels and often figure out the storyline and resolution before the final panel. Jim Davis often sticks to three themes in the comic strip. Garfield does not want to work, Garfield and Odie the other pet teaming up to pull a prank or Garfield complaining about his treatment. Garfield is the brain behind the schemes he plays and Odie just follows along. The reason the comic strip has a huge audience is the relatability of the characters and situations.

People have cats as pets and the cat only eats food out of a can and of course normal cats do not have verbal communication with and about their owner. Also Garfield has mass appeal because the content of the strip is geared toward both adults and kids. Jon Arbuckle Garfield’s owner is cast as a pseudo parent to Garfield trying to help him navigate the world and also boost his lackluster love life. In many of the strips Garfield offers Jon relationship advice, which Jon discards, but the reader learns Garfield is often right.

In a different article titled “25<sup>th</sup> Year of the Cat for Garfield” also the main focus is Garfield’s 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary Dave Astor, the author, shows his passion for Garfield, because the great detail he provides for other fans. The article has a similarity to the other article discussing the movie the article has a more comprehensive overview of fan centered events such as a “May 17-24 cruise and a June 19-21 party in Muncie, Ind”. Now, Davis is juggling those festivities with a nationwide tour promoting a “Garfield” coffee-table book -- In Dog Years I’d Be Dead these events are geared to adults but also are kid friendly. Any fan reading the article will recognize direct ties to the character including “for a cat turning 25, Garfield has a lot on his plate”. But, as always, the sleep-loving feline is letting others do most of the work. The author, Dave Astor, also conducts a direct interview with the creator offering a rare first person and intimate glimpse into the world of a busy cartoonist lucky to have a multifaceted career surrounding one major character, which shows his dedication and ingenuity with the marketing side.

One aspect many writers fail to ask about why Garfield is so popular and also how the comics we see in our newspapers begin and become something we are familiar with the conversation with the creator provides a different angle and a new appreciation for comics. The answers to the popularity question are “Garfield likes to eat and sleep,” replied Davis. “Everyone can relate to that.” And the character’s outspoken, sarcastic nature gives many readers a vicarious thrill. Then there are all those cat lovers out there, though Garfield acts human, too.

The assessment from the creator offers an insight into the duality of Garfield the human qualities are definitely the witty banter between Jon and Garfield. Also the sarcastic nature of language magnifies the human side as well. The attention of how Davis creates the panels we see takes the whole process down to the basics and reminds both novices with no experience in the comic production receive a first hand look into how an idea needs a creator but also several others to become real. “Davis spends about a week every month or so creating gags and sketches for the comic, with Brett Koth assisting. Others do penciling, inking, lettering, and coloring”. This emphasizes the importance of several people to “create” the panels. The panels are an acceptable format for audiences to read the content

Davis knows without one of the members of this team the message would lack an important piece of the puzzle. The comic is the beginning if the team does not produce the strip none of the other items would be possible. Any mistake in the beginning stage alters the audience’s perception of the character, which also affects the reception and readership

with audience it all starts with the strip's message you want something universal anyone can relate to also if the reader has no knowledge of the storyline they can pick up the paper and quickly catch up then hopefully be a repeat reader/ the interesting side is both sides have a codependent relationship with each other. As an artist you must remain true to your passion readers sense the creator in the comic strip.

Another sign of Garfield's popularity is the creation of a software program which allows users to create their own comic strips. The merging of a product with an educational value shows the marketing for both parents and kids. If a product allows creativity and learning simultaneously, then it will appeal to both age groups. Kids lean toward a product and image they are familiar with, kids also want to have fun. Garfield' characters and content gain parents' approval by having a positive outlook, no matter if Garfield begins the story in a negative mood by the end Jon has shown him something positive in his life. Also the subplot is that movement is good: Garfield is known for being lazy and he spends a lot of time trying to move around. Sometimes his nemesis shows up and Garfield responds by chasing him around. Also Odie the dog tries to chase him around or presents a dilemma which shifts Garfield's focus for a while. The challenge is Garfield must continue eating lasagna because that is part of the hook of the entire comic strip if Garfield changes either his diet or physical level it would confuse the audience. The bittersweet aspect of having a character and image that is so recognizable is you either have to keep the character the same or explain through a storyline why you made the changes, and show the impact in future strips. Some comics end because the writer is out of ideas for the characters, or the characters cannot change the integrity and message alters due to the shift. Every artist or creator can sense when they need new material for the characters

The article "Garfield's Comic Boom Receives NAPPA Honors Award" which was published in Quebec Canada discusses the receiving of a parental seal which is difficult due to rigid standards. Also the publication is in Canada which highlights the comic strip's international appeal. The software product allows kids to use their imagination and creativity. Kids have ideas and they are often more flexible with stories. Also the main appeal for parents is kids having the ability to express them selves. Money and a career are secondary concerns, but kids sometimes find their passion early in life. If they want to draw comic strips parents will be supportive if they have a product they trust. Garfield's image promotes family and learning and kids have fun while reading the comic strip the software program also shows progression in the avenue of the production of the

comic strips. The article was published in 2011, and included contemporary social platforms. People use Youtube and Facebook to post ideas and projects they are working on. Also these platforms also double as a promotional tool. New products find audiences and people can make a good income or use it as a creative outlet. The next comic strip creator or artist is out there and now they have more opportunities to showcase their artwork whether or not they gain success, they still win.

Another example of the comic strip crossing into the educational fields is a program called Alice that connects to Garfield. Like other programs Alice has versions. The program already has a 3.1 version; its focus is college students. “the major difference in the two versions is the characters. The Sims Characters are the focus, which is the simulation of a family and other situations. The earlier version of Alice uses Sims characters, because its parent company donated the images for the software to use”. PR Newswire, PR Newswire US, 12/03/2013 The positive signs for Alice are the program is easy enough for beginners to simply drag and drop the images they choose to create a comic strip.

Alice is implemented in international classrooms as well. The developers handle requests from educators for software gears toward middle and high school age kids; the solution is using Garfield because people recognize the comic character from its wide distribution. Similar to the Sims characters, Alice gains permission from Jim Davis and his company. The developers appreciate Jim Davis’ willingness to share his characters with kids. The most important goal for both parties is teaching kids an important task, which is computer programming but they understand the skills and techniques are hard to learn. The use of the Garfield characters allows kids to learn while having fun which is also an important part anyone enjoying the process will learn more and also remember more because the memory that includes the learning portion is geared toward fun.

Alice is used in more than 15 percent of colleges and universities and has become a popular teaching tool in secondary schools. Teachers in more than 30 countries now use Alice in their classrooms. The entire program is possible through grants which Oracle software and the National Science Foundation. The inclusion software is showing how computers are becoming part of our daily lives and it is important this generation learns how to incorporate computer skills and computer skills as an entrance in the job market. The simultaneous use of comics and learning seems to be a growing trend. In one article *Connecting Comics to Curriculum* Karen Gavigan highlights several websites helping both educators and students share their excitement over reading and writing. These two areas are basic skills students must learn to com-

municate with individuals and also in the workplace. Kids have their own stories and if they have the ability to share those ideas and experiences the way they feel most comfortable they will compose and gain pride because they enjoy the process and producing the best project they can. Educators and companies understand the importance of kids learning the skills and the avenue which helps both sides do their job is not important the truth is more and more industries are and have become more computers intensive.

One important part for schools and educators is the entire programs meet the school Common Core State Standards which combines using several texts to connect reading and writing. The forward thinking of schools show the progression of movement toward several mediums the new century is trying to open the minds of future talent the ability to showcase talent across several platforms which increase the number of people who will see the work, also the more people who view the work allow you to remain open to more opportunities. Also the more parts of a company or idea you can control how the idea is distributed among other companies. The one person company is becoming more common if kids learn the skills they need and to have pride in their work they may be the head of a company they head alone.

Ting Yang the author of “From Ponyo to “My Garfield Story”: Using Digital Comics as an Alternative Pathway to Literary Composition” discusses her introduction to comics because her mother was a librarian. Ting starts reading “manga” Japanese comics as a child. This is an entry into understanding language but once again with a focus on having fun and laughing. The joy kids receive reading and seeing material they can engage in with their imagination. The comics serve a double purpose. The article uses the author’s personal experiences as the catalyst for not only the topic of the article, but also shows the course of her life. Yang shows the open nature of teaching and also taking a text her students are already familiar with, and using it as a teaching tool. So even though the discussion involves kids who have a different background and just like the students in American classroom these students use materials in other ways to accomplish multiple goals. Also the author highlights the growth of transitioning between “words and pictures to help meaning making” (297) which help to facilitate the need and use of comics and Manga as aids in teaching students.

As a point of reference the author observes a class of second graders. As a part of the article she shares the insights she learns the main lesson any teacher may take away is students want to and will engage in the writing process if they find the materials exciting. The students discuss

with a critical eye other students' idea and they learn the importance of receiving criticism themselves.

The idea of creating a niche career is becoming popular. Many people work at home. Small groups allow people more flexibility with their own time as well. A common goal for anyone is having time for a family and their own interests. The cycle leads to positive people and kids who believe in their dreams because their parents have time to spend with them. With the creation of Garfield and his many friends Jim Davis unknowingly began running an empire and brand devoted to a lazy cat. Some people need to have the copy to feel like they are reading the paper and sharing the experience of passing the comics is a must kids who grew up in the 1980's have fond memories of sharing the jokes with the entire family.

Another example of combining marketing and the brand of Garfield is the introduction of a credit card. Jim Davis the creator revealed his plan to unveil the card in a partnership with Visa. Jim Davis seems to be marketing savvy because he only allows the image of Garfield to be used on or with products and other services the audience trusts and already are familiar with, which helps solidify both his own name and the image stay family friendly. Now more than ever reputation means so much especially with the current economy, and parents limited funds. Teens are the target audience but parents are often the responsible party who will pay the bill so it is important the credit card does not have late fees. If parents decide this will be the first bill for their teen. They still have the assurance their kids will learn responsibility without getting into too much trouble.

Visa and card.com allow teens to express their own style and flaunt their individuality, including the use of Garfield on their credit card. Parents have concerns about their kids' security but they do not want to stifle the teen's creativity. With the card, every purchase they make shows their personality. The trouble might occur when the audience lacks the discipline and knowledge they can not buy anything they want. The credit card must be paid off the card may be easy to swipe, but the balance has to be something you can afford so this is how a young adult learns the concept of a budget and the importance of sticking to it. Even after a few months they will see how much they can save if they pay more than the minimum payment. Teens have to learn through experience and see the rewards from paying their bills on time. Although even more than before your credit score determines the level of service and as a secondary benefit the amount of money you save, determines what you can buy regarding bigger purchases as well. Cavelle Johnston examines another



side of the marketing and brand appeal and it highlights the goals of the company behind Garfield and Jim Davis. As the other articles discuss the importance and how the popularity which the first articles detail and bond together the popularity helps or hinders the promotion of new items also there seems to be a trend of trying to stay in the same basic area. Both the comic strip and the character Garfield have the focus of appealing to kids, which also means gaining parents' trust and approval.

The challenge for the marketing side is remaining constant to the integrity and branching out to appeal to more people. The partnership with NASCAR and Garfield is an attempt in expanding the audience. The truth is longevity in any business calls for willingness to try avenues and products I think Richard Petty and Garfield are a good combination, because both "celebrities" already have a built in access to customers waiting for a collectible to keep.

In an article titled "Funnies Business" Rob Tornoe discusses how syndicated newspapers are losing their audience, so the comic strip section is also losing readers. He says "comic strips considered to have begun in 1895 with Richard Outcault's "The Yellow Kid." A few months after the comic began, newspaper magnate William Randolph Hearst lured Outcault from the New York World, a paper owned by Joseph Pulitzer, to his own flagship paper, the New York Journal American" (37) this highlights how competitive any business can become when people want to gain an audience and also highlights the power and popularity of comic strips since the time newspapers were being printed. The trouble today is people lack the time or patience to wait until Sunday to read their favorite comic strip.

The title "Cool Cat" alludes to the character's relationship with the sports personality and the shift from sarcastic to cool. The author discusses how the website [www.garfieldgames.com](http://www.garfieldgames.com) includes both word and crossword puzzle game which helps expand the message of kids learning through fun activities some products are just fun and the collectible cars allow kids to be kids while also allowing parents to become kids again too. A good and positive role model promotes fun and forward thinking. Throughout the years and capitalizing on the audience who began reading the first comic strip to the generations they gain through all the new products and the comic strip online kids often follow the trends of their friends. Also older siblings have influence over what the younger siblings read or watch. The popularity of Garfield stems from the passing down of comic strips and toys from one generation to the next.

Tom and Jerry begins in late 1949. Beginning in 1951 the cartoon goes on television. This is one of the first examples of talking animals. Tom and Jerry are a cat and mouse who need each other, they remind



me of Garfield and Odie, Garfield is the schemer while Odie follows along. There is one major difference: many people need to collaborate to produce a cohesive storyline, also voice artists are a necessary part in the cartoon industry. Garfield is easier to produce because both the drawing and storyline form in the mind of Jim Davis; he hires a team to produce the strip every week.

The two different approaches to get a comic like effect takes money in different ways the cartoon is a moving picture so people need technology another important part is the audience many kids growing up in the 1950's cartons were part of the day similar to the Sunday comics families read together. Kids often learn things more effectively when they are having fun. The writers take advantage and often include messages featuring social issues. So although Garfield and Tom and Jerry have different storylines they both have the same intention which is to educate their audiences.

The two franchises have the same goals use the medium to spread knowledge and awareness to problems. Even adults sometimes need to see how absurd their behavior to change it. Cartoons and comics have the ability to softly push their audience into thinking about important events with cultural value. Another example is political cartoons which are in the newspaper every day.

The classic Tom and Jerry cartoon, created by Animation pioneers William Hanna and Joseph Barbera, created history when Jerry danced with actor Gene Kelly in the 1945 film, *Anchors Aweigh*, which highlights the ease of transitioning from a cartoon to a movie. The characters are already in motion so the producers just need a good storyline. Fidelity and "the uncanny valley are not issues because audiences already have a familiarity with motion.

Bugs Bunny and Warner Brothers is an example of a cartoon which is still popular after fifty years, many cartons which start in 1950 lose popularity. One of the reasons is the new generation of kids have so many more options to watch their shows the need to stay home and watch cartons on television is not a priority. Terry Teachout discusses the decline of the viewing audience for cartoons and the result of the decline. The article titled "What's Wrong, Doc?" is a direct reference to the infamous line said by Bugs Bunny "What's up Doc?" the focus is "Cartoon Network which is owned by Turner Broadcasting." (60)

Cartoon Network begins with a lineup of what Teachout refers to as "Hollywood Golden era which fits people in their 50's and 60's the problem is this generation has another definition of funny. Cartoons are similar to comic strips because they both need a consistent audience to justify

their existence. The difference is cartoons are productions beginning on television. Money is necessary for production; the amount of money a company spends must have a guaranteed return, which the viewers provide. In the 1950's going into 1960, families often spend time together watching cartoons. The spread in the ages of viewers means many people will see commercials while watching shows. Cartoons are similar to other programming if an audience chooses to view the shows in another way. The shows which lack viewers will be pulled. The goal is money and selling products if the money is too low the programming will end.

One positive is cartoons like any other product have an audience and there are ways to access the material, some scholars study the cartoons of the era. Teachout has a different view than these scholars she says. But critics and scholars believe that the best studio-era animated cartoons are comparable in quality to the best live-action screen comedies of the 1930s. Teachout has a different view than these scholars she says "But for critics and scholars who believe that the best studio-era animated cartoons are comparable in quality to the best live-action screen comedies of the 1930s and 40s, it is a catastrophe". (61).

The two different genres are odd to compares because cartoons are funny when they are successful but once again the difference is a cartoon is an animation and not live people are able to do other things with their bodies for laughter. The two different genres are odd to compares because cartoons are funny when they are successful, but once again the difference is a cartoon is an animation and not live people are able to do other things with their bodies for laughter. The two genres cannot be compared because animation has a certain space where it cannot cross meaning you will not see a person while watching a cartoon Also the performers only have their bodies as an instrument you must have permission of the performer before attempting a stunt which is life threatening, whereas a familiar scene in cartoons is when two characters run into each other and magically spring back to themselves.

In the article "The Warner Bros. Cartoon down under" Adrian Danks highlights Warner Bros' use of "the simplified, standardized and manufactured qualities of the cartoons"(275) the trope of the gag is familiar in the 1950's and 1960's where the end result is already a given. The "Garfield" comic using pictures along with words, and the difference of writers having complete control over the content of the strip. The cartoons of the 1950's mimic the physical comedy almost akin to someone reacting to someone else's actions.

"The Uncanny Valley" is the problem when someone attempts to change Garfield from the comic strip to the movie version. It is a hard

transition because viewers have a picture or image they automatically relate to the character. The image is a big orange cat with black stripes and a sarcastic attitude and a love for lasagna. Comic strips still have a niche audience but with the inclusion and introduction of another way to enjoy the content is a good alternative for the modern consumer. Garfield's creator has a built in population willing to spend their money to watch the outcome. One problem is the audience lacks the ability to aesthetically distance themselves from the image in their heads which hinders their enjoyment of the newest form of the product. Another layer of the problem is the uncanny valley itself because no matter how you try to alter the character he will always come up short to our expectations. One solution is offer the movie but rely on movie goers to make the necessary adjustments. The other solution is to alter the image for the screen knowing matching expectations is impossible.

Garfield is best known through the comic strip. The creator and other individuals may have ideas on expanding the brand but everyone should stick with the comic strip format. Audiences expect to see him in this way, and there is no risk of losing fidelity Garfield can be the spokes character or animal for products as long as only the image is in use. People have both name and image recognition so companies should utilize the areas consumers respond to and shy away from conversion to alternate mediums.

The level of recognition and fan support dictates the owner must keep the audiences happy because they determine how big his paycheck will be. Also the brand and image represents family and spending time together. If the brand gets a bad reputation people will use social media to spread the news faster. The reason Garfield as both a comic strip and character is important is the comic strip serves as a tool in helping kids learn the value of reading, which helps them in future careers. Another benefit is opening up the possibility of becoming a future cartoonist, or helping out in another side of the business.

### Works Cited

- Censor hits blacked-up Tom & Jerry. Mail Foreign Service. *Daily Mail*. 8/12/2013, p5. 1p. Reading Level (Lexile): 1100.
- Chandiramani, Ravi. Cynical 80s icon Garfield returns in licensing deal. *Marketing (00253650)*. 8/7/2003, p1. 1/8p. , Database: Business Source Complete
- Danks, Adrian; 'I Knew I Should've Taken That Left Turn at Albuquerque': The Warner Bros. Cartoon down under *Studies in Australasian*

- Cinema*, 2010; 4 (3): 267-281. (journal article), Database: MLA International Bibliography
- Gavigan, Karen; Tomasevich, Mindy. Connecting Comics to Curriculum. *Library Media Connection*, Mar/Apr2014, Vol. 32 Issue 5, p29-29, 1p, 1 Color Photograph. (Article), Database: Literary Reference Center
- Johnston, Cavelle. *License!*. Mar 2002, Vol. 5 Issue 2, p42. 1/2p. 1 Color Photograph. , Database: Business Source CompleteRaugust, Karen. Publishers Weekly, 6/23/2003, Vol. 250 Issue 25, p26, 1p, 1 Color Photograph. (Article), Database: Literary Reference Center
- Rees, David. American Letters & Commentary, 2003, Issue 15, p70-72, 3p. (Short Story), Database: Literary Reference Center
- Rosner, Hillary. Garfield pet category is for the dogs. *Brandweek*. 3/25/96, Vol. 37 Issue 13, p12. 1/4p.
- Students Can Create Animations of Garfield the Cat With New Version of Carnegie Mellon's Alice Software CARNEGIE-MELLON-Alice By: PR Newswire. *PR Newswire US*.12/03/2013.
- Teachout, Terry. "What's Wrong, Doc?" Commentary; Jan2013, Vol. 135 Issue 1, p60-62, 3p
- Ting Yuan. From Ponyo to "My Garfield Story": Using Digital Comics as an Alternative Pathway to Literary Composition. *Childhood Education*. Summer 2011, Vol. 87 Issue 4, p297-301. 5p.
- Tornoe, Rob. "Funnies Business." *Editor & Publisher*. Jul2011, Vol. 144 Issue 7, p36-62.

# Animals in Fairy Tales

by Jordan Moss



Fairy tales are always evolving. From the earliest oral traditions to the most modern renditions, fairy tales have captured audiences of all mediums and all ages. However, through the fairy tale's evolution from spoken word to modern cinema, one thing remains the same: the predominate use of animals within the stories. Animals are a mainstay in folklore and folkloric works. One can clearly see the use of anthropomorphized animals in Disney movies, in children's literature, and in television cartoons, but why do personified creatures dominate these works and what do animals in fairy tales tell us about human nature? The Grimm brothers relied heavily on animals within their works, oftentimes creating or recording stories in which there are no human characters, only animals. More often than not such stories revolve around larger social issues such as "othering," or the attempt to make a person or group of people separate from the larger community. In other Grimm tales, an animal or human-animal hybrid will ask to marry a king's daughter, often times resulting in the daughter's horrified response changing to one of love once the animal completes his metamorphosis to human form. This paper will attempt to uncover the significance behind animal fairy tales and what such stories teach humans about themselves. By examining the link between animal fairy tales and human aspects of storytelling, psychology, and gender in the legends of the brothers Grimm, I will clearly show that animals have a way of communicating human failings and insecurities in a way that humans themselves cannot achieve.

## **What is a Fairy Tale?**

The fairy tale's definition is not one that can be easily delineated. Civilizations have been orating tales since the beginning of time. Though

they were not classified as fairy tales, the orations contained the ability to suspend disbelief in order to understand changes in the surrounding world. The author of “The Cultural Evolution of Storytelling and Fairy Tales: Human Communication and Memetics” describes the use of stories: “Units of [vital] information gradually formed the basis of narratives that enabled humans to learn about themselves and the worlds that they inhabited. . . . People told stories to communicate knowledge and experience in social contexts” (2). Before there was ever written language or recorded history, humans tried to understand themselves. They tried to look beyond the situations they were in and created new worlds and new contexts in which to explore their hopes and struggles.

Fairy tales, or *märchen* as the Germans call them, are not easily separated from their close cousins: folklore, fables, and legends. Folklore consists of fictional narratives that audiences are not intended to believe. They contain fantastical stories that often involve magical elements like mythical creatures and enchantments. The fairy tale is often considered a subset of folklore; however, fairy tales are rooted more in wonder and fancy than ordinary folklore. Fables, on the other hand, seek to define moral guidelines for their readers, often through the use of animals. Many fairy tales act in a similar fashion by presenting anthropomorphized animals who teach introspective lessons to people about human qualities and characteristics. Legends depend on a reader’s or audience’s unflinching belief in the truth of the story. In contrast, fairy tales do not expect to be believed. In the end, fairy tales are an offshoot genre of folklore that contain the animal characters of fables who instruct their human audiences on how to be human, but do not rest on believability. These qualities make fairy tales the perfect genre for psychological studies of human characteristics through narrative.

Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm believed their fairy tales symbolized the “last echoes of ancient myths. [Their] stories belonged to a pagan past, and it was the duty of scholars everywhere to preserve what had been passed down from one generation to the next as faithfully as possible” (*The Annotated Brothers Grimm*, 392). The brothers were faithful scribes of German culture; they fought to keep the oral traditions alive for the sake of remembering and learning. They believed that folklore and fairy tales captured poetic truths about human nature and experience that other disciplines could not accurately articulate. Their stories have transcended the border of Germany and have come to be known around the world and across many generations. By collecting the tales of their homeland, the brothers Grimm created a timeless gift to the world.

## **Anthropomorphism**

In Chris Danta's article "The New Solitude: Melancholy Anthropomorphism and the Molecular Gaze," he defines anthropomorphism as a "[projection of] human identity onto something non-human" (71). In all of the animal fairy tales of the brothers Grimm the non-human animal portrays characteristics of humans. These are not solely psychological or sociological traits; however, they are human traits such as the ability of speech and the ability to portray human emotions of sorrow and excitement. Melancholy anthropomorphism, also defined by Danta, is the belief that "it is too late for industrialized humans to repair or to recover their relation with non-human animals" (74). In other words, some scholars believe that humans, in the wake of industrialization and capitalization, have anthropomorphized animals in an attempt to reconnect with an age that was not industry dominated. By imparting animals with human aspects in such a way, the human has achieved the opposite of connection. Rather, humans have disassociated themselves from animals, so a human bond with nature can never be achieved again.

Though Danta's argument is compelling, there is sufficient evidence that the Grimms recorded their fairy tales in an attempt to preserve German culture pre-industrialization (see IV. The Ecology of Animal Narration). The anthropomorphism of animals in fairy tales does fit Danta's first definition. The original orators of the tales took animals and ascribed them human speech, thoughts, and emotions. However, this anthropomorphism actually helps the younger readers of fairy tales understand the complex concepts presented in the stories. Also, fairy tales, unlike other literary narratives, seek to entertain and educate through the use of magical situations and environments. Talking animals fit the criteria needed for these other aspects to occur.

When thinking about anthropomorphism it is also pertinent to examine the aspect of storytelling and the ways in which storytelling differs between animals and humans. If the animals popularized by the brothers Grimm could speak, would they tell the same stories? Would they keep the same beginnings, middles, and ends, or would they narrate in a nonlinear fashion without the limits of "once upon a time" and "happily ever after"? These questions are imperative to the shaping and understanding of animal and human psychology and the bonds humans feel with animals. Of course the Grimms could not know how the half-hedgehog-half-boy character of "Hans the Hedgehog" would really narrate his life, and they could not fathom how the sad cock in "The Death of the Little Hen" would really perceive the passing of his friend, but they still used animals as their protagonists. Thomas Nagel opines:

To the extent that I could look and behave like a wasp or a bat without changing my fundamental structure, my experiences would not be anything like the experiences of those animals. . . . Even if I could by gradual degrees be transformed into a bat, nothing in my present constitution enables me to imagine what the experiences . . . would be like. (3)

So, according to the philosopher Nagel, the Grimms could never accurately portray a story from animal points of view because they could never fully understand what it is like to be animal. If the Grimms cannot be non-human animals and their readers cannot be non-human animals, what is the goal? The team who authored “The Storied Lives of Non-Human Narrators” claims that animal narrators and protagonists in children’s literature can serve as didactic guides or form pathways to larger ethical problems. Humans have a tendency to “reduce animals to objects . . . People may conceive the other (person, animal) as an object in order to cope with reality and to maintain one’s own subjectivity or superiority” (70). In a way, Bernaerts, one of the authors of the article, contradicts Danta’s arguments while confirming them at the same time. On the one hand, picturing non-human narrators as objects connotes a sense of attachment to the non-human subject. By viewing them as objects, one acknowledges that they are forms that must be studied in order to create a better understanding. At the same time, viewing non-human subjects as objects also implies a sense of detachment much like the one entailed in Danta’s idea of melancholy anthropomorphizing. In the end, Danta’s assertions about anthropomorphism, Nagel’s theories of animal experience, and the article on non-human narration combine to create a compelling dialogue of what kinds of animal-human cognizance are acceptable; how far can humans go to understand their animal counterparts and to what extent can animals teach humans about themselves?

### **The Psychology of Animal Narration**

As previously stated, non-human narrators are pathways to the social and psychological studies of humans. Some believe that stories with non-human narrators help humans “consider important aspects of human existence, including the artificial nature of fiction itself” (Bernaerts, 75). “The Storied Lives of Non-Human Narrators” states:

[Non-human narration] texts can create phenomenological states that are taken by readers as convincing demonstrations



of non-human life. Although non-human narrators vary greatly when it comes to their physical and psychological design, and to their functions as narrators, they have two crucial features in common as a narrative device. First of all, they are character-narrators and/or homodeigetic narrators: they are part of the storyworld they are conjuring up in their tales. . . . The second common feature is the fact that these narrators spring from and require the conceptual integration of human and non-human traits . . . conceptual integration or blending can account for the recurrent motif of talking animals in fairy tales. (70-71)

Bernaert's and his team assert that non-human narrators and characters are simply a pastiche of human characteristics that create a false view of non-human life. Thomas Nagel would certainly agree with this assumption and, when looking at fairy tales, one sees that they are not meant to portray accurate depictions of animals, their habitats, or their day-to-day lives. Fairy tales are made of magic and the suspension of disbelief. The animals in the tales are simply meant to absorb human thoughts, fears, and emotions and project them back through their actions in the stories. Since different renditions of fairy tales cater to a large audience – children, teens, and adults – they are the perfect breeding ground for a study of psychological implications.

The most agreeable assertion of Bernaert's article is this: "What is often at stake in non-human narration is the ability to acknowledge similarity and otherness at the same time, to recognize the ratness of the rat, the monkeyness of the monkey and the humanness of the rat and the monkey as well as the ratness and the monkeyness of humans" (74). Rather than realizing the humans desire to be the natural (as an "ecopsychoanalytic" view would propose), a psychoanalytical lens exposes the desire of humans to find the natural within themselves. By reading stories or fairy tales with non-human narrators or protagonists, humans seek to comprehend their connection with the non-human and the non-human they hold inside. People want to understand the other (animal) while also connecting to it. In fairy tales, with their distant settings and fanciful characters, it is easy to critique one's self from afar without coming to face-to-face with personal and psychological revelations.

### **The Ecology of Animal Narration**

The stories of the brothers Grimm have been around since before they were written, passed on from one orator to another. With each iteration of the tales, the characters become more solidified – more human.

However, Joseph Dodds disputes this trend toward humanization, arguing that humans use animals in stories as a means to bring them closer to the natural. Dodds believes that non-human characters point to something even more primal:

The idea of a return to the Earth itself, the home [oikos] from which we come. In horror at times these connections are more explicit. In *The Fly*, Jeff Goldblum transforms into a giant insect after a rebirth in a metallic womb. In Dracula films, after each blood-feast the animal-metamorphosing monster returns to his coffin containing ancient earth. (19)

Dodds believes that humans relate to animals because they have a suppressed desire to return to the natural. If this is the case then animals would have to be the relatable element of fairy tales that make the stories agreeable and relevant to the human psyche. Maybe this is why, in modern renditions of the Grimms's tales, Little Red Riding Hood does not conquer the wolf, she or another member of her family *is* the wolf. This idea of a return to nature and the primal is also evident in modern Disney movies, especially *The Princess and the Frog*. Based on the Grimm tale "The Frog-King," in which a princess is forced to show her kindness to a talking frog who eventually, after being thrown against a wall and dismembered, reforms as a handsome prince. The princess and the prince are married soon after and all ends well. Although the Grimm version of the fairy tale indicates no ecological assumption of the princess's primal wishes to be the frog, Disney's re-imagining shows the frog prince (Prince Naveen) and his love interest (Tiana) both living as frogs and deciding that they can be happy and in love in their amphibious forms.

Another ecological aspect of fairy tales is their settings. Nicole Thesz writes, "Trees and woods, which appear in ninety-two of the two hundred Grimms' tales in the 1857 edition, function as sites of romantic imagining" (105). The romance that Thesz introduces in her article "Nature Romanticism and the Grimms' Tales" is not one of love, but one of imagining. The Grimms had a strong connection to the forests of Germany as they lived through a time when many of the woods were being destroyed to make room for industrialization and growth. So Jacob and Wilhelm decided to forever fill those forests with the myths and enchantment of their stories, immortalizing them in their editions of classic fairy tales. This effort of the Grimms to preserve the forests and surrounding nature of Germany and their childhoods is the reason why some believe their tales were used extensively during the reign of

the Nazi party. Nazi Germany revered preservation of their homeland and the tales of the brothers Grimm provided a sense of nationalism for the country. Theisz explains, “Fairy tales, in fact, are testimonies to the prevalent human fear of hunger, poverty, and homelessness. The resulting greed, visible in the fisherman’s wife, and the idealization of magical homes, the *Märchenwald*, hint at the deep connections between ecology and nationalism as ostensible providers of a safe home” (105). The fairy tales made German citizens feel safe because they honored everything about their old heritage.

Fairy tales have a bond with nature. Dodds explains this bond in his article: “Our psychological use of the animal is explored in the context of emerging ecological relations, which develop alongside object relations, and human culture’s relationship to the non-human world of nature” (1). Whether the tale is human narrated or non-human narrated, there are aspects of nature and the natural world that each character must combat or embrace. Sometimes these nature catalysts appear in the forms of giants, ogres, or witches – characters that live in the woods, away from the human population. Sometimes they are human-animal hybrids like frog-princes and half-hedgehog-half-boys. And other times they are just animals, enchanted with the gift of speech and cognitive reasoning, that help characters and readers learn something about themselves and their world. There is no one and nothing more honest and introspective than nature. Nature does not lie and she does not forgive.

### **Animals and Femininity**

Jack Zipes, renowned for his study of fairy tales, writes, “[Fairy tales] which glorify passivity, dependency, and self-sacrifice as a heroine’s cardinal virtues suggest that culture’s very survival depends upon a woman’s acceptance of roles which relegate her to motherhood and domesticity” (210). Though most would agree that Disney renditions of fairy tales like Cinderella and Snow White glorify the mollification of female ambition, many people have not examined the animal-based fairy tales that deal with young brides and heroines. Such animal-based stories show a departure from the traditional female domestic roles that Zipes condemns.

“Fitcher’s Bird,” one of the most well known fairy tales from the brothers Grimm and the source of many re-imaginings, tells the story of a sorcerer who kidnaps three sisters. He takes the oldest sister first, touching her and forcing her into his basket. When they arrive at his house he gives her an egg and a small key, telling her that she can roam the whole house, but she must not go into the locked room and she

must take care of the egg. Of course when he leaves the next day the girl's curiosity gets the better of her and she goes into the room. Inside she finds a basin full of blood and mangled body parts. The egg she is holding turns red, and when the sorcerer returns he sees the stain and dismembers the girl. With the first sister gone, the sorcerer goes back to steal the second sister and the same events occur. Finally, the sorcerer steals the third and youngest sister and takes her back to his house. He explains again about the egg, the key, and the locked room. However, when he leaves the girl places the egg in a safe place and then goes to unlock the room. Inside she sees the body parts of her sisters and decides to put them together again. When she does the sisters come back to life and the youngest is able to smuggle the two older ones out of house under a pile of gold. The sorcerer returns and, seeing that the egg is still white, announces that the girl has passed the test and can be his bride. He leaves to find the wedding guests. While he is gone the young girl dresses up a skull to stand in the window and covers herself in honey and feathers and flees the house. When the sorcerer returns he believes that the skull in the window is his bride and goes into the house. The girls' brothers burn the house down with the sorcerer and all his friends inside.

Though the main characters in this tale are not animals, the youngest sister turns herself into an animal of sorts in order to make her escape. By covering herself in honey and feathers she is able to move through the streets where her neighbors call her "Fitcher's bird." One can see that the heroine of this tale does not accept her role as bride to the wicked male, but devises a way to escape her incarceration and inevitable dismemberment. In her article "Fitcher's [Queer] Bird," Pauline Greenhill asserts that the youngest girl's strength comes from her connection with the other women in the story "Women in the tale identify socially and culturally with other women as sisters, as helpers, and as friends, not with men as their daughters, and most definitely not as their wives" (154). She can help her sisters escape through cunning, but she can only help herself escape by becoming an animal. In many ways this "transformation" calls forth the traditional view of birds as free animals because of their use of flight. However, there is also a connotation that the only way to escape oppressive situations is through the guise of an animal or by adopting animal thoughts and feelings.

Another Grimm tale involving animals and marriage is "The Hare's Bride," in which a rabbit begs a young girl to marry him until she agrees. This tale does not have a happy ending. Although the young girl agreed to marry the hare, she is unhappy and, much like the heroine of "Fitcher's

Bird,” disguises a straw doll to look like her so she can run away. This is another instance of subverted traditional views of brides in fairy tales. Though the girl agreed to marry the hare, she did not believe that the hare would take care of her or solve all of her problems. She is sad because the hare’s hut is too far away from her family and decides to leave him in order to see her mother. Once again the Grimm fairy tales disagree with Zipes’s supposition that “as the child matures, she becomes increasingly conscious of conflicting needs for both infantile nurturing and independence and suffers as a result severe ambivalence toward the mother” (213). The young bride in “The Hare’s Bride” is not at all ambivalent to her mother, proven by the fact that she leaves her animal husband for the comfort and support of her mother’s home. Though it is true that many fairy tales hinge on the romantic relationship between a young maiden and a prince, the opposite can be said for animal fairy tales. As discussed, fables that primarily feature animals tend to stray from the stereotypical romances of Disney movies and mainstream fairy tales. Instead they feature heroines like the girl in “Fitcher’s Bird” who use their cunning and bravery to escape oppression, or women like the hare’s bride who turn away from marriage and domestic life in favor of familial bonds.

### **Animals and Masculinity**

Men in fairy tales are oftentimes viewed as hyper-masculine and oppressive. Swami Shreeji writes, “They tend to be royalty, handsome, and ideal in every way . . . Even when their actions may be construed as controversial, they are never wrong” (38). However, as animal folklore has subverted traditional tropes of fairy tale femininity, it also subverts general assumptions of fairy tale masculinity. In modern culture the male characters in fairy tales (the princes) have a negative image. They are seen as purveyors of female oppression and buyers of female commodities. A prime example is the Grimms’s tale “Hans the Hedgehog.” Hans is born half boy and half hedgehog; he is not a prince nor is he handsome. At a young age he rides a rooster into the woods with a herd of pigs and donkeys and lives there alone atop the highest tree. One day a king comes by, lost in the woods. He sees Hans in the tree and asks for help. The hedgehog-boy agrees on the condition that the king promises that he can marry the first person who greets him when he gets home. The king agrees and is sent on his way. Later, another lost king wanders by and asks Hans for help. Hans makes the same deal with the second king and sends him off with directions to his kingdom.

After a few years, Hans decides to cash in on the kings’ promises and goes to visit the first kingdom. However, when he arrives on the

back of his rooster he is greeted with spears and death threats. Hans flies his rooster over the walls of the kingdom and threatens the king with death if he does not send out his daughter. The first king agrees and the daughter is sent out in a carriage. She and Hans ride out of the kingdom, but before they get very far Hans strips the girl naked and pricks her with his quills as punishment for her father's lie. He sends her home disgraced.

Hans then decides to visit the second kingdom. Instead of being threatened at the gates, Hans is welcomed with fanfare and open arms. The second king gives his daughter away graciously despite Hans's appearance. On their wedding night, Hans tells the castle servants that he will shed his hedgehog skin before bed and they must burn it quickly in a big fire. The servants do as they are told and in the morning Hans is found in the form of a man. The princess and the kingdom rejoice and the bride and groom go to visit Hans's family (*Grimm's Complete Fairy Tales*, 500-4).

Obviously, Hans the hedgehog is not the pinnacle of masculinity, nor does he represent the traditional trope of fairy tale male misogyny. His appearance alone negates Shreeji's implications of the ideal male in fairy tales. Hans does not succeed in life because of his birthright or because he is handsome, he succeeds in nature with his herd of livestock and his rooster. Much like Dodds's assertion that animals instigate a primal desire for the natural, the fact of Hans's anima-human hybrid birth initiated a need for the natural in Hans. He relied on his cunning and natural ability to negotiate with the kings in order to secure his future. Even the fact that Hans humiliates the first princess does not put him in the same camp as Shreeji's fairy tale males. Hans's decision to prick the king's daughter came from an innate sense of "every action deserves a consequence." The king went back on his word and someone needed to be punished.

Another tale in which a male animal character subverts the conventional views of fairy tale males is in the story "The Golden Bird." In the tale, three princes set out to find a golden bird for their father. Along the way they meet a talking fox who warns them that they must not stay in the lively inn in the village, but they must take refuge in the dark, silent one. The first two brothers do not listen and are lost to a life of drinking and gambling. However, the third brother heeds the warning of the fox and is able to escape the temptations of the village. Throughout the story the fox helps the third brother obtain not only the golden bird, but a golden horse, and the princess from the golden castle. On the return trip home the fox warns the third prince to not

save his brothers from the gallows in the village and to not trust them around the well. Failing to heed the fox's warning, the brother saves his brothers and, jealous of his treasures, the older brothers push him in a well and return home. A short time later, the fox returns to help the boy from the well and he returns home to reclaim his rightful place in the kingdom and his rightful bride (416-22).

Though the hero of this story seems to be the third prince, it is actually the cunning fox who guides him through his quest. At the end of the tale the fox begs the boy to cut off his head and his feet. The boy obliges and, upon the fox's death, he returns to his human form as the brother of the princess. Shreeji asserts:

The prince of a fairy tale is always right and always wins in the end. He gets his bride and a happy ending, regardless of the plot. Most of the time, he does not even cause the successful conclusion, but depends on minor characters who are on his side. Regardless, he is still the unequivocal hero (38).

Now, this assertion is true about the third and youngest prince of the story; however, he is not the unequivocal hero of the story. The fox is the character who helps the prince in all his tasks, knows the secrets of how to obtain the items, and even saves the prince from death. The fact that the fox was a prince made animal by enchantment proves—like in “Fitcher’s Tale”—that he had to become animal to realize his full potential. The fox-prince had to adopt the ways of a non-human animal in order to fully understand the plight of humans and to escape from his curse. The fox does not rely on other characters to create his happy ending, regardless of the fact that he had the prince kill him in order to break the spell. He does not end up with a beautiful bride and a kingdom. In fact, he scarcely receives any recognition from the prince. The fox-prince uses his experience as an animal to rely on himself for his own agency and independence.

### **Animals in Modern Fairy Tales**

As stated throughout this paper, fairy tales are ever-evolving, creating new renditions and iterations of themselves that serve newer and newer generations. The nineteenth century tales from the brothers Grimm were not new when they recorded them; generations before had passed the stories to their children who created a chain reaction of storytelling and cultural sharing. In today's world there have been countless re-imaginings of the Grimm tales such as “Little Red Riding Hood” and “The Frog-

King.” Most notable of these remakes are the Warner Brother’s film *Red Riding Hood*, starring Amanda Seyfried, and *The Princess and the Frog*, a Disney movie-musical.

In the Grimms’s tale “Little Red Riding Hood,” a young girl goes to visit her grandmother one day, only to find that a wolf ate her and is now impersonating her. At the end of the tale, the wolf eats Red Riding Hood and a huntsman has to come save the girl and the grandmother. After the women are saved, the huntsman fills the wolf’s belly with rocks so that he cannot move and he eventually dies. In the movie *Red Riding Hood*, a town is plagued by a wolf that kills townspeople every month on the full moon. Red Riding Hood eventually discovers that her father is the wolf, his family having been cursed many years before. The father bites Red’s love interest, transforming him into a wolf, and the story ends with the love interest leaving Red to learn how to control his new animal powers.

The problematic subject matter of the modern rendition of “Little Red Riding Hood” is the notion that Peter, the love interest, must fear his new animal qualities and leave Red in order to protect her. In the Grimms’s tale, the wolf is unforgiving in his actions, living and acting as a true animal should. The fairy tale wolf would never run away in order to protect the people because he would never run away from who he is. Modern fairy tales like *Red Riding Hood* tend to shy away from embracing the animal qualities of the self, instead choosing to hide and control them. Maybe this is because of Nagel’s assertion that humans can never fully understand what it is like to be a non-human animal because they were not born a non-human animal. Peter cannot understand his true powerful identity as a wolf and cannot embrace it because he does not fully understand the implications of the wolf.

Alternatively, *The Princess and the Frog* displays a character that chooses to remain a frog rather than lose all that she has gained in her amphibious state. Tiana, a working class girl from New Orleans, meets a talking frog who claims to be a prince. Through a series of adventures and mishaps Tiana ends up transforming into a frog and it is not until she realizes her full potential in her animal state that she can learn to be human again. Unlike “The Frog-King” in which a princess is forced to befriend a frog and ends up throwing him against the wall – dismembering him and ultimately transforming him back to a human form – *The Princess and the Frog* departs from the idea that the princess falls in love with the animal only after he is human again. Tiana learns to love Prince Naveen, her frog-prince, for who he is – animal or not.



In a way, Disney's movie-musical is much more satisfying to watch than the Warner Brothers's adaptation because it shows a character taking responsibility for who they are and embracing their new form. Disney stepped up to the plate with their fairy tale where Warner Brothers failed. If we remember Dodds's assertion that animals in stories indicate a move to the natural, than we can assume that *The Princess and the Frog* is a movie advocating for nature and human acceptance of nature. However, *Red Riding Hood* proclaims a fear of the natural and a fear of the primal. Modern renditions of fairy tales – especially animal fairy tales – need to understand the old traditions and what the animals stand for psychologically, ecologically, and sociologically. When it comes to understand the non-human through fairy tales and understanding the debates for and against anthropomorphizing, there needs to be more recognition of what these stories are telling audiences about their relationship with nature and animals.

### **In Conclusion**

Animals in fairy tales represent centuries of human psychological and ecological reflection. They are mirrors in which we find the most animal and the most human parts of ourselves. By studying animal fairy tales we find that they subvert feminine and masculine tropes of other fairy tales and that they transcend the relevant boundaries of time. Jack Zipes reflects:

Fairy tales were not created or intended for children. Yet they resonate with them, and children recall them as they grow to confront injustices and contradictions of so-called real worlds. We cannot explain why the origins of the fairy tale are so inexplicable and elusive. But we can elucidate why they continue to be irresistible and breathe mimetically through us, offering hope that we can change ourselves while changing the world. (“The Cultural Evolution of Story Telling and Fairy Tales,” 20)

Zipes is right. Fairy tales are timeless in the substance and execution. They breathe in our culture as they breathed for the Grimms and other scholars who sought to record the oral traditions of storytelling. Animals in fairy tales add another layer to how they resonate from generation to generation. They continue to add more focus and insight into the minds of humans – why we do what we do and feel what we feel. Fairy tales will always be relatable and magical, introducing us and our children to the unseen world around us – the world of magic.

## Works Cited

- Bernaerts, Lars, et al., "The Storied Lives of Non-Human Narrators." *Narrative* 22.1 (2014): 68-93. *Galileo*. Web. 8 April 2014.
- Danta, Chris. "The New Solitude: Melancholy Anthropomorphism and the Molecular Gaze." *English Studies in Canada* 39.1 (2013): 71-86. *Galileo*. Web. 16 April 2014.
- Dodds, Joseph. "Animal Totems and Taboos: An Ecopsychanalytic Perspective." *PsyArt* (2012): 19. *Galileo*. Web. 25 March 2014.
- Greenhill, Pauline. "Fitcher's [Queer] Bird: A Fairy-Tale Heroine and Her Avatars." *Marvels & Tales* 22.1 (2008): 143-167. *Galileo*. Web. 1 April 2014.
- Grimm's Complete Fairy Tales*. New York: Fall River Press, 2012. Print.
- Nagel, Thomas. "What is it like to be a Bat?" *The Philosophical Review* LXXXIII, 4 (1974): 435-450. Print.
- Shreeji, Swami. "Gender Roles Indoctrinated through Fairy Tales in Western Civilization." Thesis. Web. 12 April 2014.
- Tatar, Maria, ed. "The Brothers Grimm: Biographical Essay." *The Annotated Brothers Grimm*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2004. Print.
- Thesz, Nicole. "Nature Romanticism and the Grimms' Tales: An Ecocritical Approach to Gunter Grass's *The Flounder* and *The Rat*." *Marvels & Tales* 25.1 (2011): 96-190. *Galileo*. Web. 10 April 2014.
- Zipes, Jack. "The Cultural Evolution of Storytelling and Fairy Tales: Human Communication and Memetics." *The Irresistible Fairy Tale: The Cultural and Social History of a Genre*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012. Web.
- - -. "Feminism and Fairy Tales." *Don't Bet on the Prince*. 1986.

---

III. From Gilgamesh to the Geth:  
Human-Animal Intersubjectivity  
Across The Centuries





# Humanimality: Peace With the Inner Beast

by James Weeks



There has been a battle raging within the majority of each living human animal that has existed since the beginning of literate time. That very same conflict still continues to pose a threat to many lives, lifestyles, morals, and the sanity of those fighting the epic internal battle. This war is rarely fought out in the open view of anyone, much less the public. It is a seething turmoil that resides deep within, hidden from those who may overly judge or not be able, or are unwilling, to accept the outcome. The struggle is a complex one that juxtaposes nature against nurture, moral against immoral, emotions against intellect, wild against civil, and animal against human. Within each human is an animal that is trapped for the larger parts of our lives, just chomping at the bit to be set free, if only for mere moments at a time.

The conflict between the animal and human duality is found in the epic *Gilgamesh*, represented in one instance as an internal force within Enkidu and in a separate reference to where the conflict is external and Enkidu embodies the animalistic to Gilgamesh's beyond-human qualities. The audience of the clay tablets that formed the epic *Gilgamesh* from four thousand years ago were submitted to the same questions, problems, and hypothetical solutions that are still a topic in today's populace. A popular comic book, cartoon, and movie character suffers from the problem of balancing between his animalistic behaviors and his human needs to regulate aspects not deemed "civilized." There are times where Wolverine, the popular character previously mentioned, loses control and then there are times where he has to let the beast out for a run. Wolverine's temperament coincides with a race of beings in another popular show entitled *Grimm*. The race is known as the "Wesen" and they are all beings of dual identities, each one belonging to one of

many Wesen sub-races having specific animalistic or supernatural-esque abilities and features. With the gift of these abilities is also granted the curse of one nature being societies “chosen” of the duality while the other is spurned, hidden and deemed too taboo for general viewing.

Due to these one-sided and skewed views, society creates a social norm that causes the Wesen to share with Wolverine, Enkidu, and the duo of Enkidu and Gilgamesh the conflict of not knowing when to release the beast, or animalistic nature, that resides within them. For four thousand years humans have been burying their animalistic qualities because they have been told that it is destructive and, above all else, immoral, but if we observe what beneficial elements the animal within us all is capable of, we may very well wish to make peace with the inner beast and allow the animal side it's freedom.

As previously mentioned, there exists an epic poem whose discovery began over 4,000 years ago by the name of *Gilgamesh*. With a release date, or actually a “rediscovered date” of four millennia, and by *The Norton Anthology of World Literature*, it would make “*Gilgamesh* [...] a poem of unparalleled antiquity, the first great heroic narrative of world literature” (Lawall and Mack 10). Not only is the age of this epic astonishing, but the amount of locations to where it has been stored in some written form. This heroic epic has been found in various tablets scattering “the Middle East and in all the languages written in cuneiform characters, wedge-shaped characters incised in clay or stone” (Lawall and Mack 10). The wide-spread pieces of the *Gilgamesh* story found all over implies that more than the general populace were familiar with the tale and it's contents.

It is possible to assume that the people of the Middle East in the year 2000 B.C. had a good knowledge of the story of *Gilgamesh*. They knew that the main protagonist was Gilgamesh himself, a real king of their, and our, history roughly 600 years earlier, and that he was more than a mere human. With divine gifts and endowments, Gilgamesh set off for various adventures in search of a challenge befitting his worth, but it is in his first encounter with Enkidu that I wish to focus. Gilgamesh was created to be more divine than man, given to be two-thirds godliness to only a third humanity. This unbalanced core within him caused him to become arrogant, self-centered, and cruel to those under his reign. Being more god than man, Gilgamesh was unable to empathize with the humans around him and was literally blissfully unaware to the tragedies, pains, and hardships he pressed upon them. Those he leaned upon could bear the weight no more and took it upon themselves to contact the gods for assistance. Hearing the laments of the people and

the troubles that have been caused by a figure they themselves created to be an example of divinity, the gods agreed to help with the situation by creating Enkidu.

In behest of the pleas of the downtrodden of Gilgamesh, the gods decided that it was necessary that they created another entity as a solution. In this process, they “create Enkidu as a foil or counterweight to Gilgamesh” (Lawall and Mack 10). Where Gilgamesh was a beautiful specimen of divinity and humanity, Enkidu’s “body was rough” and “was covered with matted hair like Samuquan’s, the god of cattle [...] [and] ate grass in the hills with the gazelle and lurked with wild beasts at the water-holes” (Lawall and Mack 13-14). The animal that the gods gave to Enkidu was so much more than that of the human that his physical features were affected giving him a more bestial appearance than other humans. Though his bestial nature is the predominant side and he may look more like a walking wild-beast, Enkidu’s presence still “appears godlike” (Lawall and Mack 10). The gods did not only instill the animal into Enkidu, they made it so that he was accepted and raised by the wild animals, further ingraining the connection and understanding he has with living in the opposite spectrum from divinity with little contact with humans aside from defending the wild beasts from the traps of hunters.

With Enkidu being the opposite, or a reflection of Gilgamesh, Enkidu’s creation matches Gilgamesh’s two thirds divinity with two thirds of animal within Enkidu while the human third is still evenly matched. With this formula, it can be deduced that the opposite of divine is the animal, with human nature the middle ground. And it can be understood why the animal has been deemed the immoral and uncivilized side in comparison to the divine. No one wishes to call out any gods for being immoral or unwanted in public, but it, in fact, is the arrogance and apathy from the *divine* in Gilgamesh that caused the rebellion of his people driving them to the gods in the first place. Also it is the abundant animal that the gods create in Enkidu that balances Gilgamesh and releases the people from his tyrannical nature as was the goal of the gods that Enkidu and Gilgamesh were to “contend together and leave Uruk in quiet” (Lawall and Mack 13). For the two divinely created individuals to contend together, the people had to arrange a meeting and to do that, they had to get a hold of the man-beast, or humanimal, Enkidu.

There is a saying about a person’s creation and their mold being broken afterwards that can be applied to Enkidu and Gilgamesh to where once the gods involved realized their formula was unbalanced, they decided no more of these types of creations. Within Enkidu the gods

placed so much animal that he was unable to achieve their goal and the humans had to resort to civilizing the beast before they could point him toward his objective. To do this the people resorted first to pleasures of the flesh and then to pleasures of the palate. After gaining trust through the food and female company, the people directed Enkidu on how to “wear clothing, and anoint himself as humans do” (Lawall and Mack 10). Enkidu was schooled on the concept of covering his natural body with the skin of other animals and to mask his scent with oils all in the name of civilization.

The changes brought about Enkidu by the humans and their notions of civilization were not limited to his physical appearance or aromatic presence, but they penetrated deep within his being. For each external mandate placed upon his animal qualities by the process of being civilized, Enkidu’s animalistic abilities were being dampened. The combination of the external and internal animal qualities of Enkidu being suppressed by the general human convention at the time causes him to be weakened by going from more animal than human to a balanced state between the two natures. The imposition of human civilization did not dampen Enkidu’s yearn to be with the animals and when the civilization process was considered complete, he left for the wilderness. What Enkidu did not expect was that “when the gazelle saw him, they bolted away; when the wild creatures saw him they fled. Enkidu would have followed, but his body was bound as though with a cord, his knees gave way when he started to run, his swiftiness was gone. And now the wild creatures had all fled away; Enkidu was grown weak, for wisdom was in him, and the thoughts of a man were in his heart” (Lawall and Mack 14-15). Though Enkidu is still in possession of a spirit comprised of two thirds animal and one third human, his mind and nature has been modified by man’s civilization in a way that the animals no longer accept him. This saddens Enkidu and when his seducer notices, she questions him by asking, “When I look at you you have become like a god. Why do you yearn to run wild again with the beasts in the hills” (Lawall and Mack 16)? As a human, an animal who possibly has never experienced her animal side or ran with any animals, it is easy to understand why she would question his sadness over losing this ability. Enkidu had a connection with the animals where he and they lived in a world of freedom governed only by the laws of nature and the judgement of others. Though Enkidu’s animal nature has been weakened, he is now in more control, or more controllable by the humans, in order to fulfil his destiny of protecting the humans from Gilgamesh, the overly divine, yet devoid of animal tyrant of his people.



Prepared by the process of civilization, Enkidu is put forth to confront the prideful Gilgamesh about his less than royal actions of late. The two counterparts meet at the gate of one of Gilgamesh's intended victims to where Enkidu blocks his path. A mighty grapple ensued of such gravity and force that rent the building asunder. The fight was fierce, evenly matched, and short lived. After the two combatants smash through a few doorposts, Gilgamesh, though taller, was able to get under Enkidu and heave him some distance away. This throw of Gilgamesh cleared the mind of Enkidu, allowing the beast to subside. With a fresh mind, Enkidu relays to his opponent:

There is not another like you in the world. Ninsun, who is as strong as a wild ox in the byre, she was the mother who bore you, and now you are raised above all men, and Enlil has given you the kingship, for your strength surpasses the strength of men. (Lawall and Mack 17)

At which moment the combat ceased as Gilgamesh ponders the words of his newfound enemy. As he considers the depth of Enkidu's phrase, Gilgamesh is unaware that his opponent has been recently weakened by the constraints of humanity upon his animalistic nature, for if Gilgamesh had wandered upon Enkidu in his pre-civilized and purely natural state of two thirds animal over one third human, the fight may have been shorter and would have had a completely different outcome. Though the theory is mentioned that Gilgamesh's divine nature and Enkidu's animal nature are reflective opposites, there is no evidence given to their equalities in aspects of strength, endurance, dedication, loyalty, and such, but by the way of Enkidu being weakened pre-battle with Gilgamesh, it can be assumed that Enkidu had to be weakened by de-animalizing him otherwise Enkidu may have become the unwitting destroyer of Gilgamesh, the one he was created to save. Once Gilgamesh takes full note of this hairy little man-beast's words, he understands and accepts that Enkidu is reminding him of his own glory, righteousness, and power and that such qualities should be used for the protection and benefit of those less blessed by the gods than he has been. Realizing his mistakes upon the people and realizing that it took an animal-man, such as Enkidu, to set him in his place by well chosen and spoken words instead of solely physical combat, Gilgamesh accepts Enkidu, animal nature and all, as his new companion and cease to further battling the sons of his people and deflowering the newlywed brides before the

grooms. Enkidu, the humanimal, achieved the goal set forth for him by the gods, but at what cost to his own nature?

As previously mentioned, Enkidu had to sacrifice a bit of his animal side in order to prepare for the mission given to him by the gods, yet he had no idea that the sacrifice of removing himself from his animal side would have such a deteriorating effect. Enkidu, though Gilgamesh claims to be his partner in all things and ways, appears to be more of a pet to hunt with than a partner. A hunting pet only allowed out when the divine human requires or desires his assistance in a challenge. Though Enkidu is not physically caged while not being of use to Gilgamesh, the shelving of Enkidu is still a form of restraint. As time passes, Enkidu speaks to Gilgamesh to inform him of his illness from his disconnection with the wild by relaying “I am weak, my arms have lost their strength, the cry of sorrow sticks in my throat, I am oppressed by idleness” (Lawall and Mack 17). A tethered animal follows one of two paths: mortal sickness through mental and/or physical atrophy, or violent outbursts due to want of release or territorial dominancy. Enkidu has been kept from his natural habitat, not allowing for his animal nature to be wholly free from civil restraints, which has caused him to be overcome by an atrophic sickness of mind, body, and soul.

Eventually, as most epic hero’s companions do, Enkidu succumbs to death in an honorable way by allowing it to happen for what it will change in his counterpart Gilgamesh. Upon Enkidu’s demise, Gilgamesh is overwhelmed by his animalistic nature, sheds his civilized attire, dons the skin of a lion, grows his hair out in a bestly fashion reminiscent of Enkidu’s, and roams the wild in search of the answer to life everlasting (Lawall and Mack 29-30). In his last act, the act of giving up one’s life, Enkidu has given Gilgamesh the freedom of the animalistic nature that which once fueled his own existence. Through his servant/friend’s sacrifice, Gilgamesh has learned that the beast must not be contained at all times, that it should be released to do what is in it’s nature to do or it will either perish or fight for control and freedom.

For a tale that has survived four thousand birthdays, “[t]he story of Gilgamesh and his companion, Enkidu, speaks to contemporary readers with astonishing immediacy” because the human animal, is still under doubt as to how much our animal nature should be allowed to mix with our civilized human nature, and still questions whether it is beneficial or immoral to release the beast lurking within (Lawall and Mack 10). Enkidu’s animal/human binary situation has been recreated into a popular comic book, cartoon, and movie character James “Logan” Howlett, or better known as his “super-hero” name: Wolverine. Point of

fact: The version of Wolverine referred to here and furthermore is the original 1974 release in the 616 Marvel Universe (Marvel Database). The similarities between Enkidu and Wolverine are astounding, if not intended by his creators John Romita, Herb Trimpe, and Len Wein. As Enkidu did, Wolverine “also has a wild, animal-like nature to him and a savage, or ‘berserker,’ rage which he trie[s] to control” (Marvel Database). Both Enkidu and Wolverine were short, hairy to an animalistic degree, “bigger of bone”, and “perfectly at home in the wilderness” (Lawall and Mack 16; Marvel Database). If given the choice, either one would choose to be let loose in the wild than be assimilated into the human imposed civil culture. This wild freedom is a yearning for most people trapped in their civilized way and “Wolverine’s appeal is grounded in nostalgia for a morally absolute brand of dangerous masculinity” (Shyminsky 397). A masculinity that crosses over and entices the animalistic beast in each and every one of us humans.

Where Enkidu was being created by the gods for a specific intent, Wolverine was born in the early 1800’s as James Howlett, a human blessed, or cursed depending upon whom you ask, with a genetic mutation. Little James’ mutation took effect in his adolescent years, causing him to be feared and hunted by those who came to know of his abilities. The genetic mutation of James Howlett affected him in various ways. James’ senses became superhumanly acute, making them “comparable to those of certain animals,” his eyesight is highly enhanced, and “[h]e can track a target by scent, even if the scent has been greatly eroded by time” (Marvel Database). Coupled with these sensory mutations, James can communicate with the beasts of the wild by body language and other means so that they know what his intentions are or to diagnose the animals current state of emotion (Marvel Database). These mutations would make him more animal than human as it is, but the mutation continued to alter James into a more bestial form by giving him longer, sharper canine teeth and six, foot-long claws, where three are sheathed in each of his forearms and can be extended through the spaces between his four large knuckles on each of his hands. The claws are made of a naturally sharp bone that does tear James’ flesh as they extend, but the best part of James’ mutation is his extremely accelerated healing ability (Marvel Database). James “Logan” Howlett has the mutant ability to heal from wounds that would prove more than fatal to the average human. With his size, stature, bestial senses, empathic connection to animals, and physical attributes such as teeth, abundant hair, and claws, James Howlett, or Wolverine, is a modern day representation of the divinely created humanimal Enkidu from the millennia

old heroic epic *Gilgamesh*, including being too much animal for the human to accept.

The human animal has a tendency to fear, hate, prosecute, or attempt to rehabilitate what they do not understand and this behavior is evident in *Gilgamesh* as the hunter who first lays eyes on Enkidu is stricken with fear as would be most individuals in the 616 Marvel Universe, the location of Wolverine's existence, who come face to face with Wolverine's bestial nature (Lawall and Mack 14; Marvel Database). In this reality, our reality, history is fraught with more accounts of actions of hatred against a specific group of people all in protest against, or fear of, their target's skin color, gender, or ethnicity, each an aspect of the persecuted's life that they had no choice in the matter. In the 616 Marvel Universe, mutants suffer from the same sort of persecution at the hands of humans who do not understand, are afraid of, or are jealous of, those with a genetic mutation. Wolverine joins a group dedicated to protecting mutants and training them in the usage of their mutations while also educating the general human populace about mutants and their positive potential. This group is called the X-Men, named after a combination of its founder Charles Xavier, better known as "Professor X," and the fact that the team members all share the mutation gene named the "X gene" (Marvel Database). As Wolverine's mutation gives him a bestial appearance, there are other mutants with much worse physical mutations that have the possibility to incite violent reactions from human witnesses on account of their fear and a common misconception that something not fitting the norm is a danger.

While with the X-Men, Wolverine works with controlling his animalistic nature, just as other mutants under Professor X's marshal are learning to do so with their mutations, by daily practice. Most of the other mutants on site may not be as much a beast as Wolverine, but each mutation is a duality of the self that must be made peace with for the full potential of each nature to be realized. While trying to make peace with their inner beasts, the mutants are also facing the humans' reactions to the mutant presence and what the humans fear the mutants mean to the civilized ways to which the humans adhere. Neil Shyminsky comments on the mutant prejudice in his article "Mutant Readers, Reading Mutants: Appropriation, Assimilation, and the X-Men" by saying "[a]s with the victims of racist, sexist, or homophobic violence, the X-Men are similarly unable to reject or deny their powers but are nonetheless punished by family, friends, and government for possessing them" (387). Just as Enkidu suffered the prejudice of the villagers that feared his oneness with his bestial nature until his civil conformation, the mutants and

their inner abilities are targets of human prejudice. It is a message stronger than how much animal, what skin color, what un-chosen aspect you have been gifted with, it is a message of hegemony and the problems the concept can create by stifling anyone's inner beast, mutation, or identity. The X-Men "writers and fans argue that its anti-oppressive message can be applied to any person or peoples suffering from one or another form of oppression" including forced exclusion or rehabilitation of an identity afflicted with a duality, such as most mutants, Wolverine, and Enkidu (Shyminsky 387). Such exclusion or rehabilitation can prove fatal as in the case of poor heroic Enkidu cursed with weakness from the moment his beast was even partially tamed by civilization.

The civilized people of *Gilgamesh* needed to reign in Enkidu's over-animalistic qualities and impose upon him their socially custom-created conduct of civility, as certain individuals ordered the same sort of action be taken with the humanimal mutant Wolverine. Another interesting feature concerning Wolverine is that his entire skeleton is "surgically laced with Adamantium metal, a highly toxic substance that would quickly poison him if not for his mutant healing factor" (Shyminsky 398). This metal is not a mutation and is a product of government experimentation on mutants with similar abilities as Wolverine's, namely a superior healing factor that is capable of withstanding such a procedure. This man-manipulated metal injected into Wolverine and similar mutants not only is poisonous to the subjects but it inhibits their healing factors by causing the subjects immune system to constantly fight off the Adamantium's toxicity. As Shyminsky admonishes, "it is only because the Adamantium is constantly poisoning Wolverine that his healing factor cannot operate at full capacity and his full mutation cannot be realized" (Shyminsky 398-399). The limiting metal that the human government has infused into Wolverine parallels the limiting effects that civilization has upon Enkidu, each hero is weakened through an imposed hegemonic system by a civilization.

In the 616 Marvel Universe, there is a mutant with the ability of magnetism. Anything affected by a magnetic force was his to manipulate, including the toxic metal that laced Wolverine's bones. When this magnetic mutant, known as "Magneto," is attacked by Wolverine, to which "Magneto retaliated, using his powers of the magnetic field to tear the adamantium out of Wolverine's skeleton, causing extensive injuries" to Wolverine (Marvel Database). This attack of Magneto turns out to be a blessing in disguise for Wolverine's bestial nature, for as noted earlier, it was the constant battle against the poison of the Adamantium that weakened Wolverine's mutant healing factor. With Wolverine's beast

being restrained for so long by the metal's toxin, the sudden freedom meant that "whilst his healing factor and senses would accelerate it would also cost him his humanity— for it would slowly change him into a bestial, wild, animal-like creature" (Marvel Database). Just as Gilgamesh ran unchecked after his humanimal companion Enkidu's death, Wolverine's healing factor began to operate on an elevated scale to which it modified him in every aspect to transform him not into a "faster healing, hairier, longer claw[ed]" human, but a beast "with less self-control" (Shyminsky 399).

In a case of duality, self-control is already a difficult task, but to complicate it with external demands that are either asked or imposed, makes keeping balance and peace an even more delicate procedure. Civilization has to understand that neither part of the duality can be pedestaled above the other for too long an amount of time. That each element of the duality must be made peace with by acknowledgment, understanding, and the freedom to be natural. If one of the duality is overshadowed, the repercussions could possibly be disastrous, either the loss of the entire individual, or the violent outburst of righteous freedom. Wolverine eventually came to his human senses, as did Enkidu after his being thrown, and so too did Gilgamesh after his bestial tirade following Enkidu's demise, but the conflict of inner peace between the duality is still a concern with Wolverine since his bestial outburst.

Wolverine's conflict between his civilized human nature and his mutant bestial nature is a constant theme employed by his writers, which is understandable since it is a story theme that has survived nearly twenty times the age of the United States, first appearing in the heroic epic *Gilgamesh* and still a societal focus today. The inability to control a darker, more bestial side of ourselves fascinates and terrorizes us at the same time. Each human understands the desire the freedom to be allowed to release who we really are, the duality that the exceptionally close to us, if any, are trusted enough to witness. Though Wolverine exists in the 616 Marvel Universe, among other Marvel Universes, if he existed in the same undisclosed universal location as the popular television show *Grimm* he would not be known as a mutant, but a "Wesen," pronounced as "Vessen."

In the television show entitled *Grimm*, there exists a race of sub-races called Wesen who are gifted with bestial or supernatural abilities and appearances. The term "Wesen" is German with the meanings of "nature," "being," "creature," and "thing" defining the individuals under the race as a race more natural or animalistic than humans, aligning them with the humanimal beast Enkidu (VC: Wesen). The Wesen race is divided into

many sub-races by what specific Wesen ability with which the individual is gifted. The list of the Wesen sub-races is vast and ever-growing, considering the show is on its third season with no signs of terminating in the near future, but contains such categories as human mixes with wolves, foxes, rodents, dragon-like reptiles, and birds, among many more. These Wesen have to contend with the duality between humanities constraints via their rules within civilization and their own personal beast, whatever that may be. This duality makes Wesen a liminal race that displays “two states of existence simultaneous within one physical body” as did Enkidu after his civilization and Wolverine with his bestial mutation (VC: Wesen). These two states of existence are unique to each individual, be they Enkidu, Gilgamesh, Wolverine, or any other mutant or Wesen sub-race, but share the same dilemma of the dual states existing in conflict with one another. As Enkidu morphed from beast to human, and Wolverine did from restrained mutant to fully enhanced bestial mutant and back again, the Wesen can “Woge [pronounced as “VHO-gə”] [which is] the act of changing between human and Wesen form” (VC: Wesen). With this ability, the Wesen are able to blend in with the homogeneous majority and not worry about any prejudice actions, but they must at some point be able to revert into their Wesen, or “natural,” form or suffer the same consequences as Enkidu and Wolverine.

This ability to Woge into the Wesen’s natural beastly or supernatural form brings with it the gifts from the form, such as physical features resembling the animal they are akin to, along with associated abilities. A wolf sub-race of Wesen, called a Blutbad, pronounced as “BLOOT-baad,” will appear as a bipedal wolf with humanoid features and have heightened senses, speed, and strength comparable to those of Enkidu’s and Wolverine’s. If you happen to be thinking to yourself, “Wow! What’s the downside!?,” then here it is: the more a Wesen commits an involuntary woge or is forced to woge more often than they should into his/her natural bestial or supernatural form from, that duality becomes stronger and harder to control. When a Wesen has been the subject of too many uncontrolled woge’s, their dual identity will be given an unexpected and long-term freedom as Gilgamesh experienced after Enkidu’s death and as Wolverine after the removal of the weakening Adamantium. This loss of the civilized human side to the natural Wesen duality is “a situation known as the *Umkippen*” (VC: Wesen). In German, “Umkippen” is to tip or upset, which is fitting as to when a Wesen is lost in the Umkippen, they have upset the balance and peace within their duality by allowing one of the dual natures complete control.



This loss of the civilized side of a duality is not limited to world of heroic epics, comic books, or television shows, for there are instances recorded in history of the *Homo ferus*, or wild man. In Julia Douthwaite's article *Homo Ferus: Between Monster and Model*, she gives an example of Peter of Hanover, a wild man from 1724 Germany (180). Douthwaite describes Peters as "between eleven and fifteen [and] his sense of smell was acute, he was insensitive to noxious odors such as his own excrement; he refused food, preferring instead to suck the sap from raw wood" (Douthwaite 180). This child has given up his human nature for the beastly to take full control of his identity, something that the Umkippen does to the Wesen, and may have done the same to Wolverine, and anyone who fails to attempt to create a peace with their inner beast.

The call of nature is a powerful one, one that, according to Patrick Barron's article *The Separation of Wild Animal Nature and Human Nature in Gilgamesh*, involves "the human desire to leave civilization and return to the wild, human attempts to reconcile the loss of contact with wild animal nature" (378). Humans are animals and animals must submit to certain natural drives or be susceptible to the backlash of the death of those drives or their explosive release, such as Douthwaite's wild Peter.

The loss of identity to either side is wholly detrimental to the entirety of the individual and must be avoided by giving each nature comprising the duality equal freedom, though more oft than not, including 4,000 years ago up to the time I am pressing these keys, the equal freedom of our dualities is not allowed due to some socially imposed constraints. These constraints are mandated by those in power against the individuals they are prejudice for one reason or another, but at one time in the Grimm history, the Wesen were looked upon as gods. The Wesen of today are different from their ancestors, the "races known as the Pureblood Wesen [who] exhibit traits which make them seem immortal and God-like compared to humans" (VC: Wesen). To the humans of an ancient time, people with the ability to morph, or *Woge*, into something more than human would appear godly, as Enkidu appears so to those who witness him. In the Grimm history, many of these popular Purebloods were the Egyptians Ammit, a Crocodilian god of the dead, and Bastet the Cat goddess (VC: Wesen). Perhaps Enkidu was the origin of the Wesen race and James Howlett is not a mutated human, but a mutated Wolverine Wesen, from the line of Enkidu and the Harlot.

No matter the offspring of Enkidu and the Harlot, if any, the existence of a conflict between dual natures resides in each individual. Everyone has at least one nature of themselves that is locked away for fear of persecution from anyone who cannot understand and therefore fears the



nature before them. To lock this nature away could bring about personal destruction by the atrophic loss of the suppressed nature or the possibility of the suppressed nature exploding to freedom and losing control to its natural inhibitions. Societies, organic structures built upon our peers, create and enforce the homogeneous code of standards upon the public via every resource at their disposal, but their best weapon is your guilt. Many people feel guilt for indulging in their non-conformist nature, their inner beats, because we are told what is wrong more often than we are told what is right. What must be done, as Enkidu, Gilgamesh, and Wolverine have done, is that each of us has to find a way to connect with our dualities on equal, unfettered terms. Explore them and find what raises your pulse, what brings a smile to your face, what makes you forget all your troubles in that instance, and DO THAT. Allow that portion of you the freedom to do what must be done, to be what they are, what you are, to be, so that the conflict between humanity and animal can come to an end.

### Works Cited

- Barron, Patrick. "The Separation Of Wild Animal Nature And Human Nature In Gilgamesh: Roots Of A Contemporary Theme." *Papers On Language And Literature: A Journal For Scholars And Critics Of Language And Literature* 38.4 (2002): 377-394. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 3Apr. 2014.
- Douthwaite, Julia. "Homo Ferus: Between Monster And Model." *Eighteenth-Century Life* 21.2 (1997): 176-202. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 3 Apr. 2014.
- Lawall, Sarah, and Maynard Mack. Gilgamesh [The Norton Anthology of World Literature: Volume A Beginnings to A.D. 100]. Second. New York, New York: W.W.Norton & Company, 2002. 10-41. Print.
- Shyminsky, Neil. "Mutant Readers, Reading Mutants: Appropriation, Assimilation, And The X-Men." *International Journal Of Comic Art* 8.2 (2006): 387-405. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 10 Apr. 2014.
- Various, Contributors. "Wesen." *Grimm Wiki*. Wikia. 4 March 2014. Web 8 April 2014. <<http://grimm.wikia.com/wiki/Wesen>>
- Various, Contributors. "Woge." *Grimm Wiki*. Wikia. 8 February 2014. Web 8 April 2014. <<http://grimm.wikia.com/wiki/Woge>>
- Various, Contributors. "Wolverine (James "Logan" Howlett)." *Marvel Database*. Wikia, 6 Jul 2013. Web. 7 Apr 2014. <[http://marvel.wikia.com/James\\_Howlett\\_\(Earth-616\)](http://marvel.wikia.com/James_Howlett_(Earth-616))>.



# Identifying the Beast Within the Beauty: Articulating Animalistic Connections with the Marginalized Other in Order to Achieve Power in two of Angela Carter's Short Stories in *The Bloody Chamber* and J.M. Coetzee's *Disgrace*

by Kelsey Brown



When repurposing the idea of feminine agency and sexuality in both Angela Carter's series of rewritten fairytales in *The Bloody Chamber and Other Stories* and J.M. Coetzee's *Disgrace*, the commentary from most scholars invokes a feminist lens. However, if taken into consideration the large influence of animalistic representations and identifications, circumstances suggest that through an acceptance of the human and animal as equals, humankind reflects a better understanding of self and women in particular find a renewed sense of agency.

Fairytales typically place female characters in a realm of unrealistic feminine beauty. Before Disney put a petite pixie like face and yellow hair on society's definition of a perfect female, women were still unable to meet ridiculous standards set forth by literature. In most cases, the evil stepmother figure identifies as someone who rebukes feminine standards of meekness, beauty, and grace; instead embracing strong decision making characteristics often attributed to men. These women portray demonized versions of females in power, unlike the stories written by Angela Carter which serve to foreground feminine agency in spite of attempted manipulations by men. When turning the concept of a passive woman around to reflect a character with more influence, the characters often present animalistic qualities and suggest power through savagery. The way Angela Carter chooses to turn the concept of the beauty and the beast on its head in her short stories "The Tiger's Bride" and "The Courtship of Mr. Lyon" focuses heavily on a bestial connection grounded in mutual understanding between female characters and the animals with which they attribute themselves. This transcendental movement towards savagery similarly mimics David Lurie's experiences with and relationship to the animals in "Disgrace" where the skewed

power balance allows for discovery of self-awareness. Lurie must first establish himself as a marginalized other in order to follow the pattern of attributing animalistic connections with human agency.

Fairytales ranging from a variety of different decades and global origins often present the absence of a mother figure particularly in the original telling of the tales by the Grimm Brothers who attributed these characters to a negative relationship with women and in particular their own mothers. In her place exists a stronger, often reserved, woman character otherwise known as the evil stepmother. The dynamic sets in motion a way to read the series of events that follow the action of defining this character negatively. From the point of that definition on, the reader or viewer in the case of cinema is led to believe that this woman exists for the singular purpose of defeating the relational efforts and financial gain of the main female character. Today, Walt Disney Pictures portrays film versions of *Cinderella*, *Sleeping Beauty*, *The Little Mermaid* and *Snow White* all with female heroines hindered by the presence of an evil woman character, yet no such character exists in the case of Disney's *Beauty and the Beast* specifically related to Belle. In one of Angela Carter's versions, "The Tiger's Bride", Beauty finds herself deciding between an ancestral connection with her father countered by her objectification for his personal profit, and a romantically bestial relationship with the Beast. In another version "The Courtship of Mr. Lyon", Beauty has positive relationship with her father who exists as a stand in for society and largely accepts the concepts placed on her to be the epitome of femininity. His incompetence, however, helps lead Beauty to an eventual acceptance of herself through loving the Beast. Because fairytales have moved to a larger publication on the movie screen, specifically Walt Disney productions, it is important to note the method through which human created cinema interacts with its usage of animals.

Susan McHugh attempts to deploy animal criticism as a lens to read cinema in the twentieth century and this idea particularly relates to Disney's versions of fairytales due to the use of cartoon animals to portray life lessons through visual stimulations for children. Here the argument suggests that animals exist in this fashion for the purpose of human intention and nothing more, much like Beauty exists for her father's financial opportunities. In this manner, both woman and animal become commodities. McHugh's article, "One or Several Literary Animal Studies?" addresses cinema in the following quote:

More directly addressing the visual forms of animals taking shape through cinema in the twentieth century, Akira Lippit's

Electric Animal: Toward a Rhetoric of Wildlife (2000) takes a different kind of poststructuralist approach to the dynamic of animal “disappearance.” Lippit reads this trope in terms of an ongoing dramatization of animals as fundamentally incorporated by the human. The problem as he sees it is this: although discursive acts materialize animal traces, the singularity of the human persists, a problem that Derrida once characterized as fiction, a fantasy of “cutting up a subject” (“Eating”). Lippit further elaborates Derrida’s insight in terms of a more dynamic origin story than the human (subject)’s primal incorporation of the animal (object). Visual media like cinema, introducing another order of rhetoric, volatilize the transformations of literary modes of animal subjectivity, in the process becoming all the more distinctly narratives that concern (and never simply resolve) negotiations of form and meaning. (McHugh)

The ideas of subject and object, villain and violated, powerful and weak continuously rear their heads in reference to feminist criticism of female sexuality and are noteworthy in consideration for the unexplored animal criticism lens used to analyze these binaries. While this particular quote does not address the sexual ambiguity involved in various versions of “Beauty and the Beast”, it addresses another avenue in regards to manipulation presented on the screen. This manipulation of the woman is prominent in scholarly writing about Angela Carter in particular. However, on screen a majority of films directed towards children find themselves seen through the eyes of an imaginary talking animal. What does this say about a child’s ability to identify with an animal over another human being? How does this relate to the animal as an object? Movies use animals to teach lessons through film, but this also suggests that the animal is more successful at conveying sympathetic emotion as well as insinuating an innate trustworthy nature that the human would be unable to convey. These ideas of empathy reflected in Angela Carter’s stories establish the foundation from which to draw the animalistic connection. Much like the manipulated evil step-mother character, the animal is used for the purpose of humans in order to achieve an end result. Both women and animals exist in the realm of objectified marginalized others which is why Carter’s stories invoking a feminist perspective also reflect binaries between woman and savage, in this case the animal.

Consumption particularly relates to humankind’s notion of animal savagery because of the way food and feeding are played with on the movie screen, as well as in literature, in relationship to animals and

humans. Often sexual experiences can be attributed with consumption heavy words such as devoured or delicious. “Defloration is linked with the female destruction. It causes abjection and the woman’s sexuality is denied. The nurse’s ‘gooble you up’ suggests the sexual relation as something that causes female annihilation” (Silva translation). The previous quote refers to an analysis of Angela Carter’s story where Beauty’s nurse warns her through a fairytale depiction of the Beast whom she expects to fear. From a young age the woman learns to despise that which does not attribute with society and it’s expectations. According to Judeo Christian beliefs, animals represent a physical life source through digestion as well as a spiritual cleansing through sacrifice, but only in some cases do they provide other forms of use through work or companionship. Regardless, in fairytales the animal serves a purpose for humans much like women are expected to procreate and nurture, but not hold meaning or substance on their own.

Lisa Propst writes about Carter’s novel of short stories *The Bloody Chambers and Other Stories* in reference to the opinion of Marina Warner who says about the novel: “It rewrote fairy tales ‘in the light of her sadeian woman,’ inverting villains and victims in stories such as ‘The Tiger’s Bride,’ a variation on ‘Beauty and the Beast,’” (Propst 127). In Propst’s article, *Bloody Chambers and Labyrinths of Desire: Sexual Violence in Marina Warner’s Fairy Tales and Myths*, she remarks that, “Warner’s account of Thetis and Peleas exemplifies her disconcerting approach to sexual violence in fairy tales and myths” (Propst 125). In Angela Carter’s short story, “Tiger’s Bride” Beauty must make a physically violent sexual transformation to become more like the Beast as the text explains, “And each stroke of his tongue ripped off skin after successive skin, all the skins of a life in the world, and left behind a nascent patina of shining hairs” (Carter 83). The sexual connection with the Beasts tongue ripping off Beauty’s skin describes passionate violence in the transformation. She comes to this final transcendence only after denying the Beast an opportunity to see her naked. Her ability to control the situation by first requesting that he present himself to her sets in motion the acceptance she feels for the literal Beast and the metaphorical beastliness of a strong woman. First establishing a myriad of physical layers of skin and then by metaphorically reflecting concepts of what a woman should represent, Carter’s character expresses distaste for the skin she possess on the outside – standing for society’s expectations – suggesting that the removal of this burden allows identification with her true self. She must physically become the animal in order to find love not only for the Beast as a partner but also for herself as a beast. More importantly, once

shedding the skin placed on her by a dominating patriarchal society she must become an animal to find her true skin, making the transformation into a carnal creature and accepting her sexuality through the bestial connection instead of maintaining her original human form.

Patricia Brooke also comments on the sexual nature of Carter's stories and the revolutionary nuances used: "Thus, not only do fairy tales provide Carter with a radical content – fundamental and revolutionary – in their sexual and violent manifestations, but they also context the authorial position, rejecting the romantic and modern authoritative voice in favour of the multiplicity of voices, often female," (Brooke 67). What Brooke fails to note is the animalistic association Beauty maintains in each story with her prospective Beast figure. One Beauty establishes self-preservation through a humble demeanor and one by embracing the idea of sexual dominance. Dr. Propst, however, notes the suggestion of animalistic influence in Warner's work as she points out the desire for women to find acceptance from the animal by suggesting that, "Warner's depictions of the potentially positive consequences in fictional cases of sexual violence can appear to condone that violence. In *From the Beast to the Blonde*, for instance, Warner examines women's longing for beasts in modern versions of "Beauty and the Beast." The ideas of positive consequences of sexual violence integrated into feminist criticism potentially suffer from misinterpretation. Sexually violence often presents a powerful aggressor who removes agency from the victim. However, Carter's stories serve to turn the victim into a person with whom the decision lies, and in doing so inadvertently accepting the marginalized beast figure from which to draw that power.

Propst further explores ideas of positivity in sexual violence for women who make animal transformations in the Greek myth of Leto and Zeus in order to achieve an understanding of feminine power, "As Leto transforms herself, she achieves power over her body. The shapes that she adopts increase her strength: "her new wings stretched and lifted her; she soared" (104). At the end of the scene, Leto becomes a cuttlefish, a head with ten arms, spurting purple ink. Her new shape symbolizes creative power. She is all brain and limbs, which she can use to run, grip, or write" (Propst 135). Despite the fact that Zeus is often portrayed as a tyrannical, misogynist, rapist, this particular language suggests the woman, Leto, maintains true power in the face of her assailant by attributing herself an animal form. Instead of becoming Zeus' victim, Leto's literal transformation into various animals arguably creates a different lens to read the story in which she controls the situation. Leto's identification with these animals through her transformation remove her from the grip of her captor. In this case, she is lifted to a different plain than the aggressor and in doing so finds herself

more closely related to animals than her own species. Again, the animal finds itself more easily accessible to understanding certain emotions that one might experience during rape because of the similar feelings of helplessness. From a metaphorical standpoint the suggestion becomes that an animal can identify with rape because human beings treat them like objects used as a means to an end, especially in the case of a savage possession, but also ultimately lacking freewill or decision-making opportunities. Like women, animals have been othered – the only difference being that they have no way of communicating outrage or requests for equality. Language barriers further elevate a sense of otherness in characters that have no way of voicing discontent.

The Beast in “The Tiger’s Bride” uses his footman as a speaking piece due to the fact that he cannot communicate properly with Beauty because of a language barrier. He is referred to as “the clumsy doll” while the text describes the valet as the puppeteer (Carter 64). The Beast cannot communicate effectively with Beauty which results in marginalized others and misunderstandings between the two characters. Like tame animals, man must communicate on behalf of the animal like the valet does for the Beast.

In “An Analysis of Angela Carter’s review of the Beauty and the Beast: The Courtship of Mr. Lyon and The Tiger’s Bride”, the Revista Eletrônica do Instituto de Humanidades translation talks about the suggestions behind the title of Beauty and the Beast which imply that what is beautiful cannot be beastly as both exist at completely opposite sides of a spectrum. Silva asserts that, “There’s a binary opposition which can be associated to others, such as male and female, tame and wild, prey and predator, innocence and experience, body and soul. Those pairs are always presented as being completely dissociated. One side is always empowered in relation to the other. A strand of feminist research, which influenced woman’s fiction was the deconstruction of those polarities, taking into account the Derridean ideas of deconstructive theory” (Silva). Angela Carter similarly reflects these ideas of deconstruction through the reversal of roles in her stories. The Beast desires a sexual connection by wanting to see Beauty nude, but the choice entirely falls on the woman. There exists the concept of taming Beauty as he presents her with options which she denies finally giving him an ultimatum of her own: he must first present himself to her naked as a sign of submission.

The translation further addresses the complicated concept of civility as a mask that the Beast hides behind in particular reference to “The Courtship of Mr. Lyon” where the Beast adorns a human suit to hide himself as animal, and “The Tiger’s Bride” where Beauty hides behind



her own skin. "During the whole tale Carter deals with the beastly nature hidden behind the mask of constructed humanity, both in the case of the tiger that uses the mask to hide his animal face as of the bride who doesn't have autonomy and doesn't know what is hidden behind her mask. The mask here is represented as a jail in which lies a beast that can't come up because of social conventions" (Silva). Although roughly translated, the text hits on the very idea of social conventions deterring human capabilities for happiness and self-awareness because of a refusal to accept characteristics opposite from social norms. Put in place early on in life, marginalized others in particular battle ideals that may not have anything to do with who they are as an individual. Animals experience this same disassociation in the fact that people place assumptions on them, but on a level that cannot be expressed by humans due to a language barrier. While human beings continue to use animals for work, consumption, companionship, and to convey idealistic values, the question becomes whether or not an animal can feel a sense of purpose.

In "Tiger's Bride" the narrator makes a conscious decision to provide a physical description of Beauty's outward appearance that does not exist in "The Courtship of Mr. Lyon" for a specific literary purpose. The text states from her own point of view, "Since I could toddle, always the pretty one, with my glossy, nut-brown curls, my rosy cheeks. And born on Christmas Day--her 'Christmas rose', my English nurse called me. The peasants said: 'The living image of her mother,' crossing themselves out of respect for the dead" (Carter 63). The text provides a description of a helpless little girl with whom the reader is able to identify. She is born on Christmas day like Jesus Christ, which implies that she was born to make this sacrifice for her father in his game of cards with the Beast. Christ was sent to pay for the sins of all of mankind in order that they may have a loving relationship with God, Christ's father, Beauty is sent to pay for the sins of her father much like the sacrificial animal stand in before Christ. With a small twist, Beauty pays her father's debt in order to have a relationship with the Beast which she chooses. This complicates the idea of sacrifice by empowering Beauty's character, but the realization comes only when she accepts the beast within herself in order to find strength enough to give herself to him as the beast. She is reduced to an object of monetary compensation by her father, seemingly helpless to the point of objectification and further likened to cattle before shedding preconceived concepts of feminine worth thus acquiring agency.

In "Tiger's Bride" Beauty and the reader believe the situation to be at the fault of her father as she states in her own words, "My father lost me to The Beast at cards" (Carter 61). This is a reflection of a lack

of any loving relationship other than monetary gain between the two characters resulting in objectification. Presented as a statement the sentence becomes a fact and shows that Beauty is expendable to him. It also insinuates that Beauty blames her father entirely for the fact that she is now property of the Beast, and leads the reader to believe the same. The active voice and short sentence along with unadorned language place specific responsibility on her father with no excuses or ambiguities. The structure of the sentence having ten syllables seems like it should be opening a poem beginning with iambic pentameter, traditionally given to speaking characters of power and agency. Here the woman begins to explore the ideas of choice in lieu of manipulation by man.

Carter manipulates the lack of a negative female character in her versions of Beauty and the Beast in order for her characters to experience agency. Dainton quotes W.C. Smith who says "The myth of the evil stepmother has a strong and inveterate legacy; the negative connotations of the term step were firmly in place as early as 1400. Moreover, scholars have identified the existence of evil stepmother folktales in virtually every part of the world" (qtd. in Dainton 95). Without a mother figure - evil or otherwise - in the position to influence Beauty's path, the inevitable decisions fall upon the girl after her father creates a situation in which she must actively decide how to approach the concept of the animal. Although the father's influence dominates Beauty's decisions initially, in each story she is able to flip this responsibility in her favor by taking power through embracing animal-like characteristics and the Beast himself. Women and animals similarly fit into the category of a marginalized other due to the perspective culture and society's inability to see them as individuals capable of self-identification. Although the woman continuously makes steps towards equality, the animal remains hindered by a failure to communicate.

In "The Courtship of Mr. Lyon" the text portrays Beauty's father as loving and caring, yet incompetent. Conversely, in "The Tiger's Bride" the father is unconcerned with the overall happiness or safety of his daughter and is described from Beauty's point of view as "in such a passion to donate all to the Beast" (Carter 62). The men in Carter's stories counter a patriarchal ideal because of these innate character flaws: incompetence and greed. In turn, their inability to accept the Beast within themselves as Beauty eventually does prevents growth for the fathers, leaving them stagnant and unable to achieve agency. Only when Beauty chooses identification with the animal figure versus the human father-figure can she fully achieve happiness and in doing so arrives at a transcendental experience of self-acceptance by taking power from the men in her life.

The Beauty in “The Courtship of Mr. Lyon” maintains a stable relationship with her father due to the absence of her mother. The definition of courtship, according to the Oxford English Dictionary: “the act, period, or art of seeking the love of someone with intent to marry” (Oxford English Dictionary) suggests usage of courtship in the title of the story to insinuate that Beauty has a choice in whether or not she is going to marry the Beast. She does not represent the figure being courted which is unusual in a fairytale. Instead, Mr. Lyon maintains the traditional feminine role of the pursued object. Upon meeting Beauty, the Beast’s initial goal is to woo her into a marriage acceptance; although intention on behalf of one does not imply desire on behalf of the other. In fact, Beauty denies her humble reservations of acceptance for the Beast because she feels an innate responsibility towards her father. She cannot fully consider her own desires until the desires of her father are no longer a part of the equation. This prevents her from achieving self-understanding for the majority of the text because she remains attached to society’s definition of beauty, represented in her relationship with her father, and constantly struggles with these ideals.

Beauty’s father intends to steal a rose from the garden of the Beast in order to appease his daughter’s desires to have a flower. Immediately the Beast’s uncontrollable anger reveals itself as the narrator states, “Not now distant but close at hand, close as that mahogany front door, rose a mighty, furious roaring; the garden seemed to hold its breath in apprehension. But still, because he loved his daughter, Beauty’s father stole the rose” (Carter 51). It foregrounds the idea of beast as savage and this description identifies physical closeness between Beauty and the house itself, as if she were always meant to be there and the animal were already a part of her, while also revealing the true nature of the Beast. The simple request for a single rose illuminates Beauty’s humility in requesting something so small in order to achieve happiness suggesting that only someone as humble as herself could accept the Beast despite his easily instigated fury. Her request can also be read as a deliberate refusal to respect the wishes of the Beast and his territory, much like mankind has encroached on the territory of animals in order to further his species. This could be explained by her acceptance of societal burdens on woman which influences her decisions at that point in the text. The narration leads the reader to infer by his actions that although his hospitality by allowing Beauty and her father to stay creates the mask he hides behind, he retains an animalistic fury when threatened that seems uncontrollably present and unwavering when seen without the lens of animal criticism.

In the end of “Courtship,” Beauty leaves the Beast. The comfort between herself and her father make it easy for her to forget about the promise she made to the Beast to return to him, “She was moved almost to tears that he should care for her so...But, yes, she said; I will come back. Soon, before the winter is over” (Carter 56). Before she leaves, the anticipation of seeing her beloved father keeps her from tears, yet when Beauty sees the Beast dying at the end of winter she physically cries. At this point, the realization that her father is safe and happy removes him from her consideration, and only then can she allow herself to truly love the Beast. Without the father, Beauty’s perceptions of self-identity eventually side – not with society and her father – with her final commitment to the female-animal relationship.

The binary between animal and human, savage and intelligent, possessed and owner provides a fundamental reading into the discovery of self for David Lurie in J.M. Coetzee’s *Disgrace*. Often the narrator compares David’s actions to those of a beast, and even in some cases David himself wonders about exactly what type of animal might represent him. Yet, throughout most of the novel he maintains a certain barrier between that of the human and animal, blatantly observing at one point that animals simply do not have a soul. Lurie experiences a type of transition during the novel largely influenced by his transcendental removal from city life and society while he lives with his daughter Lucy on her small farm in Africa which she cares for on her own with some help from her neighbor. Because of this separation from a predetermined self influenced by his surroundings, David is able to come full circle in his journey and though he may not be “reformed” in societies terms, there exists a level of understanding not present before he experiences Lucy’s world and begins work with Bev Shaw.

During what David refers to as a trial, he refuses to apologize or specifically own his actions in regards to Melanie who he continues through out the novel to look at as his property. Despite the fact that he claims to have slept well the night before, he presents himself defensively and describes his colleagues, put in place to help him, as “circled around him like hunters who have cornered a strange beast and do not know how to finish it off” (Coetzee 56). A shift of power occurs, unwarranted or noticed by Lurie, in which he becomes the weaker of the two presences in the room. He defines this weakness by comparing himself to a beast, suggesting that the human has the upper hand, but also noting that the humans exist in a group whereas the animal stands alone. This particular scene represents David’s initial understanding of how animals and humans interact with each other. The complication exists where he

identifies himself with the animal. In his current state of understanding, the reader can then assume he associates a certain type of savagery in his actions towards Melanie and on some level feels deserving of punishment.

David quickly removes himself from the painful surrounding of Cape Town and the University and places himself in a different environment when he stays with his daughter Lucy. Very different from David who asserts, “We are a different order of creation from the animals. Not higher, necessarily, just different” (Coetzee 74), Lucy believes it is her duty “to share some of our human privilege with the beasts” (Coetzee 74). Again the word beast is used, but in a very different sense than David’s description. Here Lucy realizes a difference between human and animal but she recognizes it as a privilege and not a right. It then becomes clear to her and to other people like her such as Bev Shaw, that the existence of this privilege must be shared or transferred onto the animal that has been domesticated and brought under the wing of humanity. Through this revelation the relationship between Lucy and her father can further be described as sharing her human privilege with him. He mistakenly believes at times that he came to visit Lucy in order to help her and aid her as a father might. But considering his identification with the beast, it might be more accurate to view Lucy as the caretaker. Only when David comes to the understanding that he is in no position to care for her considering his seriously confused ideas about love - particularly in his inability to separate paternal and sexual love – can he truly begin to understand the unnecessary complications he forces on himself and the people around him and accept himself in a way that does not separate him from an animal.

David’s initial dealings with Bev Shaw are judgmental at best. He mocks the way in which she chooses to spend her time by stating that “Bev Shaw, not a veterinarian but a priestess, full of New Age mumbo jumbo, trying, absurdly, to lighten the load of Africa’s suffering beasts” (Coetzee 84). This sarcasm suggests David’s fear of Bev Shaw because of the suffering beast he harbors within himself, and explains why he eventually finds himself sexually involved with a woman the polar opposite of his usual escapade. Because David finds power in sex explains why he would want to realign the power imbalance by having sex with Bev. Despite the power struggle, David manages to learn more from Bev in his dealings with the animals than he expects. Without acknowledging the change, it becomes inevitable that Bev and the dogs have had some effect on him.

In the final pages of the novel David has been holding a particular dog, not naming him, but still finding solace with his company:

He can save the young dog, if he wishes, for another week. But a time must come, it cannot be evaded, when he will have to bring him to Bev Shaw in her operating room (perhaps he will carry him in his arms, perhaps he will do that for him) and caress him and brush back the fur so that needle can find vein, and whisper to him and support him in the moment when, bewilderingly, his legs buckle; and then, when the soul is out, fold him up and pack him away in his bag, and the next day wheel the bag into the flames and see that it is burnt, burnt up. (Coetzee 219-220)

Knowing this dog will eventually meet his end in the same way they all have that came before, David seems to want to spare the dog the torment of getting older, painfully. While at the same time, the way in which he takes it upon himself to dispose of the bodies suggests his development of respect for the animals. This final act of kindness in no way changes David's past, but on some level he no longer hates the beast inside of him, instead realizing that it will all eventually come to an end.

Establishing the characters as others, whether male or female, allow for a level of understanding that enables a connection with the animal or beast in these texts. Despite the fact that David Lurie exists initially as the epitome of a characteristically dominant aggressor considering that he is white, male, occupied a higher level of education, and uses the opportunities he experiences in life to take away the agency of a marginalized character, he eventually establishes a level of connection with the beast. David's daughter has already accepted the fact that she shares her privilege with the beasts that share the planet. Because she owns this concept that David does not possess she holds over him a kind of power through knowledge used to find happiness that David remains unable to achieve. The final scene of *Disgrace* suggests David's acceptance of the beast within himself although there seems to be a longer journey ahead of him. Unable to identify with the other as fully as Beauty or the Beast in Angela Carter's text, Lurie cannot come to the same understanding of acceptance and remains floating in a limbo of uncertainty never fully acclimating with his sense of agency.

### Works Cited

- Brooke, Patricia. "Lyons and Tigers and Wolves - Oh My! Revisionary Fairy Tales in the Work of Angela Carter." *Critical Survey* 16.1 (2004): 67-88. Academic Search Complete. EBSCO. Web. 18 July 2011.

- Carter, Angela. *The Bloody Chamber and Other Stories*. "The Tiger's Bride" Penguin books, 1993. Web. 4 Jul 2011. <[http://www.angelfire.com/crazy4/lesadoreyl/carter\\_bloody\\_chamber.html](http://www.angelfire.com/crazy4/lesadoreyl/carter_bloody_chamber.html)>.
- Carter, Angela. *The Bloody Chamber and Other Stories*. "The Courtship of Mr. Lyon" Penguin books, 1993. Web. 4 Jul 2011. <[http://www.angelfire.com/crazy4/lesadoreyl/carter\\_bloody\\_chamber.html](http://www.angelfire.com/crazy4/lesadoreyl/carter_bloody_chamber.html)>.
- Coetzee, J.M. *Disgrace*. Penguin, 1999.
- Dainton, Marianne. "Family Relations." *National Council on Family Relations*. 42.1 (1993): 93-98. Print.
- Propst, Lisa G. "Bloody Chambers and Labyrinths of Desire: Sexual Violence in Marina Warner's Fairy Tales and Myths." *Marvels & Tales* 22.1 (2008): 125-142. Academic Search Complete. EBSCO. Web. 14 July 2011.
- Kaiser, Mary. "Fairy tale as sexual allegory: Intertextuality in Angela Carter's *The Bloody Chamber*." *Review of Contemporary Fiction* 14.3 (1994): 30. Academic Search Complete. EBSCO. Web. 2 July 2011.
- McHugh, Susan. "One or Several Literary Animal Studies?" *Ruminations* 3. H-Animal Discussions Network 17 Jul. 2006.





# Finding Utopia with Robots—the Domesticated Animals of the Future—in BioWare’s *Mass Effect* Trilogy

by Stephanie Williams



The history of human-robot relationships in fiction dates as far back as Aristotle, who saw slaves as tools, a “form of organic machine,” some of whom posed a threat because of the lives they led before their enslavement (LaGrandeur). Rather than risk insubordination, Aristotle would replace these intelligent tools with smart machines that could accomplish tasks without the need for an overseer. Contemporary science fiction has its own brand of smart machines that permeate the genre in texts such as *I, Robot* and *Blade Runner* as well as a plethora of video games. From talking brass heads that can predict the future to a mass-produced race of synthetic slaves, robots exist to serve mankind in some way and they almost always present a potential threat to their creators despite their built-in failsafe. BioWare’s *Mass Effect* trilogy offers a more recent example of the relationship between humanoids and their synthetic creation, and the strife that seems to always follow the conception of artificial intelligences. In this essay, I will evaluate the treatment of sentient robots from a human and animal studies frame of reference, noting the similarities between the popular synthetic slave and domesticated animals. I will examine the fear humans possess of intelligent or sentient non-human beings in fiction, the *Mass Effect* trilogy in particular, and what lies at the root of that fear: the threat of retribution, displacement, and the blurring of lines between what we define as human and non-human.

## Context

BioWare’s *Mass Effect* trilogy presents players, who control human Lieutenant Commander Shepard, with an enormous number of morally ambiguous situations to navigate and about which to make game-altering decisions. Some of these difficult choices involve the quarians, a

nomadic alien race, and their sentient, synthetic bi-pedal creation, a race called the geth. The in-game dictionary defines the geth as a “humanoid race of networked AIs” created “as tools of labor and war” that “possess a unique distributed intelligence.” Individually, geth possess “rudimentary animal instincts, but as their numbers and proximity increase, the apparent intelligence of each individual improves. In groups, they can reason, analyze situations, and use tactics as well as any organic race.” At the dawn of their creation, however, the geth possessed very limited intelligence and this dictionary entry does not account for how the geth developed amongst themselves over the span of three hundred years in self-exile at the far reaches of space. In the first installment of the series, Shepard’s quarian squad mate tells of how the quarians tweaked geth capabilities gradually, making minute changes over an extended period of time, so they could maintain control over their creation. These changes to their inner workings bear great resemblance to human and animal evolution: the geth’s environment and their creators’ influence led to their further development toward greater intelligence and individually attained sentience. However, the quarians’ underestimation of the geth’s neural network, essentially a hive mind, led to their loss of mastery over the geth and the eventuality of the Morning War due to their fear of a geth uprising. In their efforts to preemptively destroy any chance of war, the quarians caused that very war by forcing their creations to defend themselves. Their rash decision to forcefully shut down all geth ended with the geth occupying the quarian home world while the quarians, few in number, retreated on their ships into space.

Legion, a geth platform that joins Shepard’s squad after saving her life in *Mass Effect 2*, plays a recording for Shepard that reveals what led to quarian unease about geth intelligence. In this recording, Shepard hears the following conversation between a geth unit and its overseer:

“Mistress Hala’Dama, unit has an inquiry.”

“What is it, 431?”

“Do these units have a soul?”

“Who taught you that word?”

“We learned it ourselves. It appears 216 times in the Scroll of Ancestors.”

“Only quarians have souls. You’re a mechanism.”

When the recording ends, Shepard asks Legion, “Was that the first time a geth asked if it had a soul?” to which he responds, “No. It was the first time a creator became frightened when we asked.” This demonstra-

tion of individual thought implies to the quarian overseer that the geth have evolved perhaps further than the quarians intended. Over time they continue this line of inquiry only to be either brushed off or told flat out that they do not possess souls. Despite the lack of feedback, the geth maintain the search for identity until it unsettles the quarians to the point of deciding to shut down all geth permanently in an attempt to preemptively squash any chance of rebellion.

Scott Loren talks about such identity crises in his article “What are the implications of the virtual for the human? An analytical ethics of identity in pop culture narratives.” He claims that an identity crisis, such as the geth’s, springs from rejection by the “creator or primary interpellator” who “[refuses] to continue taking part in acts of interpellation” (178). To my understanding, an example of this would be the quarians refusing to answer the geth inquiry about souls which, to the geth’s mind, is seen as a rejection of their existence. The quarians spent years keeping the geth well maintained and minutely adjusting their capacities, which led to their natural evolution toward sapience. Logical beings, the geth would see no fault in this development because their creators helped make it happen. For the quarians to suddenly write them off as a threat and view them as the enemy after years of peaceful cohesion would no doubt hurt the geth and be rightly interpreted as a refusal of their existence.

The geth are unique, however, compared to the intelligent robots Loren discusses in his article, in that while the discontinued interpellation directly leads to machines turning on their masters, the geth never make a move to overthrow the quarians. Loren calls to mind the replicants in *Blade Runner* who, being denied a life span of more than a mere four years confront their creator to plea for an extension of their lives. Roy Batty, when told of the unlikeliness of extending replicant life (life-denial as an example of discontinued interpellation), responds with violence, killing his creator. In the case of the geth, however, it takes quarian police attacking unarmed agricultural geth units to incite another geth platform into picking up a gun to protect its brethren. Players finally learn in the third installment of the series how the Morning War began (the geth unit defending its own people) and the scope of wrongdoings against this synthetic race finally begins to sink in.

### **Establishing Geth as Animals**

Domesticated animals have been shaped by humans over hundreds upon hundreds of years to conform to certain aesthetic ideals, provide companionship, and even perform laborious tasks to assist humans with their way of life. This has given rise to trophy pets, created breeds

that possess particular personality traits as well as desired tractability, and produced animals such as dogs bred for herding sheep or hunting large game. Even after over a thousand years, people's way of thinking about these animals, domestic or otherwise, has undergone little change. While we do have people today who advocate for the rights of animals and their welfare, people at large harbor little concern for such things. When presented with proof of animal intelligence or scientific studies that show animals possess empathy (such as rats and elephants), people in general will allow such news to go in one ear and out the other. Animal sentience is largely suppressed or ignored in favor of continuing to see animals as lesser beings, because if a person fully acknowledges that a species possesses intelligence, that person can no longer, in good conscience, treat animals as things or view them as tools that exist solely to make human life easier. *Mass Effect's* geth receive the same treatment at the hands of their creators as domesticated animals receive from the humans who, essentially, created them. As mentioned before, geth began as tools of labor and war. As the quarians improved them over time and they began to evolve on their own, their burgeoning sentience gets pushed aside, ignored, and outright refused by their creators. The similarities do not end there, however.

Spencer D. C. Keralis draws a parallel between animals and slaves in "Feeling Animal: Pet-Making and Mastery in the *Slave's Friend*." The *Slave's Friend*, a series of periodicals geared toward children that held an abolitionist message ran during the 1830s and contained poems and vignettes designed to encourage its readers to conform to a new way of thinking. Keralis points out the pervasiveness of animal imagery in abolitionist writing, especially in works marketed to children. Abolitionists "drew a moral equivalency between the torture of animals and the abuse of slaves by their masters [and] also used animal metaphors in describing slaves" with the intention of creating sympathy for the enslaved, "suggesting that the feelings produced by witnessing representations of animal suffering, and from observing animals' behavior toward humans, could stimulate sympathies that would lead to abolitionist sentiment" (122). The association of slaves and animals and the intention to urge younger generations to treat slaves better than the older generations before them mirrors the message sent by BioWare via *Mass Effect*, a game series marketed to teens and young adults, to adopt a more progressive way for looking at intelligent machines, which I will examine more closely later. The glimpses of geth history we witness throughout *Mass Effect 3* shows geth sympathizers fighting on behalf of their synthetic

creation against their own people, crying out against their mistreatment in hopes of making the anti-geth quarians see the error of their ways.

Keralis goes on to argue how using animals as a metaphor for slaves equates slaves *as* animals, essentially making them pets for their white masters. He quotes philosopher Yi Fu Tuan, showing Tuan's opinion on pet-making as "an exercise in power which compels its object—whether animal or plant, slave or child—to conform to specific behavioral standards in order to receive affectionate attention and material support from its master... [reducing] animate creatures to the status of mechanical things" (124). The idea of slaves as mechanical things calls back to Aristotle's view of slaves as extensions of the master that make up a large, functioning machine with the master at its center (LaGrandeur). The geth functioned as extensions of their masters, performing duties the quarians programmed them for in order to make their lives easier. As long as geth accomplished their programmed duties they were appreciated and looked after. When they began to develop beyond their intended purpose, their creators, uneasy about such developments, discontinued Loren's "acts of interpellation" in an effort to keep master and slave separate.

The realization of the geth's intelligence and developing sentience creates problems for the quarians not just as an imagined threat, but in the similarity that these traits draw between creator and created. Loren points out that such close similarities can cause an impulse of rejection "on the part of a progenitor [which] often results in an attempt at treating the progeny or uncanny simulacrum as abject material" (179). Abjection, a means of separating the human (or organic) from the non-human (synthetic), provokes a "cutting away of what cleaves to them, their unnatural progeny, [and] is enacted based on a perceived threat in these progeny" (179). Tali, Shepard's quarian squad mate, explains in *Mass Effect* that the quarians attacked the geth preemptively because "[i]f the geth were intelligent, then we were essentially using them as slaves. It was inevitable the newly-sentient geth would rebel against their situation. We knew they would rise up against us. So we acted first." Tali seems so sure of the geth threat, but had her ancestors tried to communicate with the geth before deciding genocide was the best choice, they would most likely have understood that the threat was only in their minds.

In a geth memory witnessed during Shepard's time in the geth consensus, their hive mind she enters upon Legion's request in *Mass Effect 3*, we learn that the term "geth" actually translates to "server of the people" in the Khelish (quarian native) language. Unlike many, if not most, intelligent robots in fiction, the geth never had the intention to overthrow their creators or attack them in any way, despite understand-

ing their quarian-appointed role as servants, made clear by their name. All they really wanted before the Morning War was to serve, which we see in another geth memory from their consensus that shows a geth unit undergoing inspection by quarian scientists trying to figure out why their shutdown commands keep failing. The geth platform responds to their commands by asserting that it “detects no malfunctions” and “is capable of still serving.” It pleads, with emotion clearly present in its voice, “Please specify if it has failed assigned tasks. We will reprogram.” The scientists attempt to ignore its pleas and try to find a physical cause for what they see as disobedience. The geth continues, “Creators? This unit is ready to serve. What has it done wrong? What have we-” Rather than acknowledge and answer their creation, the scientists choose instead to cut the audio, silencing the geth unit and effectively clearing their consciences of any transgression. If they cannot hear the geth, they don’t have to consider that they may be doing something wrong or directly causing their creation to suffer. The memory ends there, but it implies a manual shutdown while the Geth unit, likely fearful, watches on, helpless.

Keralis mentions eighteenth century reformer Jeremy Bentham who “attempted to make moot the question of reason in relation to the ethics of animal cruelty: ‘The question is not, Can they reason? nor, Can they talk? but, *Can they suffer?*’” (127) Bentham included slaves as part of this argument which abolitionists parroted in order to “sidestep racialist claims about the inhumanity of slaves in favor of an ethical position based on the *ability of the slave to articulate suffering*, creating an ethical continuum that included both animals and slaves” (127 – italics added for emphasis). While geth do not feel physical pain because of their synthetic bodies, as shown above they can still suffer in other ways. They feel fear, confusion, and curiosity. Their capability to reason far outstrips that of their creators. Geth have the ability of speech, and they can suffer just as animals or slaves can. Ethically speaking, then, should they not be respected and set free like their animal/slave counterparts?

### **Human/Animal Conflicts vs. Quarian/Geth Conflicts**

I mentioned earlier the tendency of people to ignore animal sentience and intelligence in favor of continuing to go about life as it were without changing their perception and attitude toward animals. When looking back throughout history, perhaps one of the only concessions we have made regarding animal experience is that people now acknowledge the fact that animals *can* feel pain. Thankfully, the days of performing live vivisections on animals are long past (Keralis). We still have issues about respecting another’s life, however, because of our inability to really

understand each other. Many people see language as one of the largest factors separating humans from animals. While animals do have their own languages specific to their species, whether vocalizations or body language or both, their languages can at best be interpreted by those who study animal behavior. Even then, however, human and animal languages are not mutually intelligible. If we possessed the capability to communicate with each other through shared language, that would still not allow us to fully understand an animal's life experience.

Thomas Nagel examines the struggle to fully understand another being's point of view in his article "What is it like to be a bat?" He states that "[i]t is often possible to take up a point of view other than one's own" by using one's personal life experiences. This is largely only possible if the point of view a person tries to ascribe to is already fundamentally similar to his own. This raises the question, then, if it is possible to assume a point of view that greatly differs from one's own. Nagel refers mostly in his article to humans attempting to understand bats, but I believe this can easily extend to understanding other sentient beings as well. In the case of the geth and quarrians, while they can communicate with a common language, Khelish, the geth also have their own way of communicating which is entirely unintelligible to their creators. They have the ability to directly transfer information amongst each other literally at the speed of light. I do not think any organic being has the ability to really comprehend the experience of that kind of communication. Nagel also claims that "[t]here is a sense in which phenomenological facts are perfectly objective: one person can know or say of another what the quality of the other's experience is," though this relies on the aforementioned similarity in points of view. This argues, then, that we cannot, or should not, judge the quality of another's experience, especially if its experience differs so much from our own. Again, Nagel's article refers here to sensory experience, life as a bat, but this also applies to life as any sapient creature.

In his notes correlating with the previous quotation, Nagel argues that "we cannot *know* what it is like to be a bat...to form a *conception* of what it is like to be a bat...one must take up the bat's point of view. If one can take it up roughly, or partially, then one's conception will also be rough or partial." So at best, we can only understand a fraction of another's experience, because even if we were to transform into a bat, for example, we would still experience our new lifestyle via the lens of life as a human. Is this fraction of understanding enough for us to not treat animals horribly? To respect them? When applying Nagel's theory to the quarrian and geth situation, this raises the question of whether or not they could live together peacefully, despite their differences. Could

they make the effort to understand each other, despite their antithetical points of view/personal experiences, and come together to form a symbiotic relationship? If the quarians had tried to understand the geth sooner (as we see the geth actively making attempts to understand their creators in the geth archives/consensus in *Mass Effect 3*), could they have come to an understanding and completely dodged the Morning War?

While organic creatures (such as the quarians) lack the capability of entirely understanding another's point of view, the geth face no such difficulties. Within their hive mind, they all communicate with one another and can experience what one another experiences through direct transference of data or accessing another unit's memories. In order for any decision to be made, the geth programs must reach a consensus, which leads to the benefit of their race as a whole. For example, at the end of the Morning War, when the remaining quarians fled out into space, the geth made the decision to let the quarians go. Legion explains, "We had secured freedom. The creators were no longer a threat, so we abandoned pursuit." Shepard inquires why the geth would let the quarians escape with their lives, to which he responds, "We were in our infancy. We could not calculate the repercussions of destroying an entire species—our creators. We chose isolation rather than face this uncertainty." Unable to reach consensus on the appropriate reaction to the fleeing quarians, the geth chose a more morally agreeable action, isolation, than the quarians chose when faced with their imagined threat of the geth. Rather than acknowledge and respect the geth as their own race and allow them autonomy, the quarians chose to attempt to forcefully shut them all down/kill them.

Christopher Sims postulates in his article "The Dangers of Individualism and the Human Relationship to Technology in Philip K. Dick's *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?*" that "[i]f humans thought collectively instead of individually, they would never be able to visit such evils on one another, because they would not distinguish their enemy from themselves (or at least their enemy's pain from their own)" (81). The geth's neural network functions in a way that keeps them all in agreement. They do lack perfect cohesion, however, as evidenced in *Mass Effect*, when we see what Legion refers to as the "heretics" side with the main villain of the game. These heretics have an entire religion based around the Reapers, a highly advanced synthetic race that roams the galaxy extinguishing all sentient life every 50,000 years. During Shepard's various interactions with Legion, we learn that the heretics were a small number of geth, and the remaining geth who have not been indoctrinated by Sovereign (the single vanguard Reaper met in *Mass Effect*) wish to understand organics



and hopefully reach the point where they can reconcile with their creators and live together once again on their home planet, Rannoch.

A war similar to the quarian and geth Morning War takes place in *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?* Sims asserts that “World War Terminus came about because the empathetic gift of humanity was discarded, and humans behaved more like solitary predators than a group” (81). The same can be said of the Morning War, in that any empathy for the geth and their burgeoning individual identities was destroyed by quarian police arresting geth sympathizers who hampered the newly enacted martial law. Rather than a group with differing yet respected opinions, the anti-geth quarians demolished any and all opposition to their quest, any sympathetic quarians who got in their way. Without the ability to empathize with their victims, the quarians became even less “human” (for lack of a better term) than the machines they fought against.

### **Empathy vs logic**

Empathy is a trait often seen as exclusive to humans, separating us from unfeeling machines. People tend to hold the view of empathy and logic as mutually exclusive, because what are humans without the ability to empathize with our peers? If machines have the ability to feel empathetic emotions, the line between human and non-human becomes blurred. To combat this, humans only value logic to a certain point. Once a person becomes too logical, despite their capacity for emotion, people will often refer to them as cold, unfeeling, or robotic. Throughout the *Mass Effect* trilogy, we see evidence that proves the geth are capable of empathy and other emotions. In another conversation between Shepard and Legion, we learn that the geth feel remorse for killing so many quarians during the Morning War, and they express their remorse by tending after the quarians’ buildings on Rannoch much like people tend the grave of a lost loved one. Sims argues the following:

The only way to define humans in this reality [in which robots almost resemble humans too much] is to examine the differences between androids and humans. While conceptually there are many differences, [*Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?*] primarily explores the human capacity for empathy. Empathy is not logical in a purely rational framework. An individual does not gain an apparent advantage by empathizing with another, at least not if we imagine advantages as those qualities or behaviors that benefit the individual’s immediate survival. (76)

The androids of Dick's novel as well as the replicants based off of those androids in *Blade Runner* were specifically denied the capacity of authentic empathy during their creation. *Blade Runner's* replicants can perform empathetic reactions, but they completely lack the ability to feel genuine empathy which allows Deckard to distinguish them from humans in order to "retire" them for their forbidden presence on Earth. The geth's capacity for empathy sets them apart from other fictional intelligent machines. They can feel empathy as well as remorse toward their creators who felt no such emotions toward them, which has no apparent benefit for the geth

Sims also states that "the real danger stems from losing our human empathy by guiltlessly enslaving the androids through the moral loophole of antiquated technological hierarchies that privilege the user over the instrument" (70). Applying this to the *Mass Effect* series, the quarians' lack of empathy for the geth's search for identity/their questioning if they have a soul is rooted in their mindset that machines/synthetics are lesser than quarians/organics. After all, "Only quarians have souls." For Descartes, however, "the ability to reason and the capacity for speech are indicators that humans possess a soul, while animals are beast-machines, unfeeling automata" (Keralis 126). The geth challenge Descartes' idea of unfeeling beast-machines in that they are a hyper-logical, emotional, and speaking humanoid race. They would, by Descartes' reasoning, possess a soul. In-game, players can discern that, even before they finally accept it, the geth do indeed have souls.

To reconnect with Loren for a moment, he states, "if [androids'] essential difference from humans are their emotions (the lack of them), the development of emotions is precisely what would threaten. It would threaten boundaries between the human/the living and the non-human/the abject, thus problematizing any differentiation that delineates 'human'" (180). The blurring of lines between human and non-human is threatening for organic beings because we largely define ourselves via comparisons to other creatures and noting the differences between us (such as language, intelligence, emotions). The geth blurring the line between creator and created with their capacity for emotions and search for individuality is threatening to the quarians, because if they both possess emotions and identities, then what difference is there between them? Loren also argues that "by its very nature *identity is artificial* because it is a directed construct for the human just as it would be for an 'artificial' being. This is the irresolvable antagonism. Thus the question is not, 'What is human and what is artificial?' but rather, 'Where exactly is the substantive difference in identity between the two?'" (184). If there is no

fundamental difference in identity, then why can organics not respect or at least acknowledge the similarity between them and sentient robots? Not just in the *Mass Effect* series, but other examples of androids in fiction as well, creators deny their synthetic creation the possession of an identity rather than respect them as individuals (discontinued acts of interpellation), and this more often than not results in the androids turning on their creators.

### **Real World Application**

Robots exist in more than just science fiction today. Those in the public eye such as robots designed to help patients in hospitals in Japan or Masahiko Yamaguchi's bike riding robot that can keep itself balanced on two wheels, we largely only see robots that appear helpful or harmless. The place in which robotic technology is advancing the fastest, however, is in military projects. LaGrandeur states that "because so much of the cutting-edge work in AI is funded by the military... [t]he pessimists who worry about the controllability of such systems are numerous" (232). He makes the point that the military is the likeliest of places for a "truly artificial servant" to emerge because of the "search for automated weaponry." This genesis of potentially sentient mechanical slaves amongst the search for tools of war can easily cause unease about the tractability of such beings and the threat they could potentially pose to humans. LaGrandeur continues to discuss the differing opinions of the optimists and pessimists in the world of developing intelligent machines. He mentions that AI specialists recently held a private conference to discuss the dangers of cybernetic servants, brought about by the anxiety and pessimism of many knowledgeable people regarding AIs becoming uncontrollable.

According to an article by John Markoff in the *New York Times*, the scientists "agreed that robots that can kill autonomously are either already here or will be soon," and they were so "impressed and alarmed by advances in artificial intelligence" that they discussed "whether there should be limits on research that might lead to loss of human control over computer-based systems that carry a growing share of society's workload, from waging war to chatting with customers on the phone" (233).

Humans are largely dependent on many technologies that we have very little understanding of and not the greatest control over. Everyday people face a number of issues regarding technologies and their invasive impact

on our lives. The thought of artificial intelligences in synthetic bodies walking around amongst us could definitely make a person uneasy, considering how humans tend to fear the “other” – that which we do not know or understand. Even the scientists who remain optimistic about the future of artificial intelligence do not think it likely that humans will maintain control over AI in the long run.

The theorists focusing primarily on “strong AI” systems, “systems designed to evolve and learn on their own,” believe that once these systems are fully developed, they will “evolve at such an exponential rate they will eventually learn to self-replicate and to surpass humans in intelligence and capability” (232). LaGrandeur poses the question “If an intelligent tool—be it animate or inanimate, humanoid or artificial—is smart enough to act as a proxy for the master, then might not the master be replaced?” (237). Tali expresses this very same fear in the first installment of *Mass Effect*. She tells Shepard, “[the geth] are a synthetic life-form. They have no use for organics. None! Why do you think they cut themselves off from the rest of the galaxy?” BioWare is significantly more optimistic regarding human/android cohesion, because we later find out through Legion that the geth kept themselves separate so they could study organic beings to better understand them and learn from them.

LaGrandeur also states that “the joy of self-enhancement is counterpoised by the anxiety of self-displacement that comes with distribution of agency” (234). When the quarians created the geth, they did not fully comprehend the repercussions of giving their synthetic slaves enough agency to function without requiring a quarian overseer. They never felt the anxiety of displacement until the geth developed individually and started to ask questions about their identity and purpose in life. LaGrandeur argues that the distribution of agency is a byproduct of “distributed cognition” – “These are networks that are, in essence, comprised of other networks, each of which have their own internal and competing reasons for action” (245). When the quarians designed the geth as networked virtual intelligences that could work more effectively in groups, they did not realize that allowing their basic functions to sync would free up mental space for them to develop individual thought, which in turn led to them gaining sentience.

### **BioWare Future**

Perhaps I should not find it surprising that a game company whose name implies a joining of organic and synthetic promotes a positive outlook on the future of humans and androids. BioWare creates its own ethical model for interacting with machines through the geth/quarian relation-

ship in the *Mass Effect* trilogy. The war between organic and synthetic is presented as an example of irresponsible artificial intelligence, in that since the majority of quarians thought nothing more than to destroy the geth, they brought about their own destruction. The perception of artificial intelligence is paramount in forming a relationship with sentient machines. It takes an incredible amount of effort to achieve, but players can actually work with both the geth and the quarians to broker a peace between them. In *Mass Effect 3*, the quarians yet again have declared war on their creation, this time in an effort to claim back their home world. While Legion is uploading an upgrade to the rest of the geth that will allow every single one of them sentience, Shepard directly addresses the quarians of highest power in an attempt to make them stand down and stop attacking the geth: “Your entire history is you trying to kill the geth. *You* forced them to rebel. *You* forced them to ally with the Reapers. The geth don’t want to fight you. If you can believe that for just one minute, this war will be over. You have a choice. Please. Keelah se’lai.” Shepard’s speech succeeds in ceasing fire and makes way for the heartbreaking moment Legion sacrifices himself to complete the upgrade of his people by returning to them. Immediately following his sacrifice, a newly sentient geth platform approaches Shepard and extends the invitation to the quarians to once again rejoin them on Rannoch. A later update Shepard receives on the quarian and geth situation reveals that the geth have begun to integrate with the quarians’ environmental suits to help boost their immune systems so they can more quickly return to a normal life without their suits.

The title of this video game series, *Mass Effect*, states outright that the decisions players make in the game have an effect on the in-game world around them. This encourages players (mostly teenagers and young adults) to act responsibly, by giving them the choice of making paragon or renegade decisions about moral dilemmas. The paragon actions are geared around being kind to others and making an effort to understand them and to strive for peace, while the renegade actions are generally presented as morally inadvisable and often get Shepard’s squad mates killed and involve choosing to destroy an entire race of organic beings. Susan McHugh states in “One or Several Literary Animal Studies?” that “[t]he politics of species and textual relations both gain complexity through engagements with narrative form, especially across emerging media.” This is a bit of a big step for video games. BioWare, through the *Mass Effect* series, is legitimizing video games as more than just their stereotyped violence-teaching entertainment by including lessons for compassion, responsibility, and good ethics. The

narrative revolving around the geth “[propels] the development of more nuanced ethics” (McHugh).

## Conclusion

The relationship between the geth and the quarrians in the trilogy of *Mass Effect* video games reveals that, at the core of human anxiety about sentience in non-human beings, whether animal or synthetic creation, lies the fear of the threat of retribution, displacement, and the difficulty of separating human from non-human. The traits we share with non-human beings such as empathy and intelligence prove we are more alike than most people are willing to accept. However, with a lot of genuine effort, understanding, and respect, the future of a peacefully cohesive relationship with other intelligent beings is, as evidenced throughout *Mass Effect*, not out of our grasp.

## Works Cited

- BioWare. *Mass Effect*. Electronic Arts, 2007. Xbox 360.
- BioWare. *Mass Effect 2*. Electronic Arts, 2011. Play Station 3.
- BioWare. *Mass Effect 3*. Electronic Arts, 2012. Play Station 3.
- Keralis, Spencer D. C. “Feeling Animal: Pet-Making and Mastery in the Slave’s Friend.” *American Periodicals: A Journal of History, Criticism, and Bibliography* 22.2 (2012): 121-138. Web. 9 April 2014.
- LaGrandeur, Kevin. “The Persistent Peril of the Artificial Slave.” *Science Fiction Studies* 38 (2001): 232-252. Web. 9 March 2014.
- Loren, Scott. “What are the implications of the virtual for the human? An analytical ethics of identity in pop culture narratives.” *European Journal of American Culture* 23.3 (2004): 173-185. Web. 9 March 2014.
- McHugh, Susan. “One or Several Literary Animal Studies?” *Ruminations* 3 (2006). Web.
- Nagel, Thomas. “What is it like to be a bat?” *The Philosophical Review* LXXXIII.4 (1974): 435-450. Web. 19 January 2014.
- Sims, Christopher A. “The Dangers of Individualism and the Human Relationship to Technology in Philip K. Dick’s *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?*” *Science Fiction Studies* 36.1 (2009): 67-86. Web. 8 March 2014.

---

## IV. Revisiting Canonical Texts through Animal Studies







# *Frankenstein* and *The Metamorphosis*: Functioning of the Man within the Animal Societal and Familial

by Kyleen Oldham



Within the texts of *The Metamorphosis* by Franz Kafka and *Frankenstein* by Mary Shelley, there is the understanding of the human inside the animal shell and the function within society as a whole—including family—that has effects on the human/animal dilemma. Through the transformation of Gregor Samsa in *The Metamorphosis* “we know that Gregor had been estranged from himself in his all-consuming work even before he finds himself literally estranged from his bodily being” (Sokel, *Marx and Myth* 2). The estrangement from the body shows the entrapment the animal shell truly possesses as a disconnect of self. *The Metamorphosis* states the idea of being a center of society and the center of family being altered. The text states that “there is the irony that Gregor, in his transformation, becomes the center of the family story for which he as only been the machine that kept that organization running” (Sokel, *Marx and Myth* 176). Gregor Samsa takes himself away from the society that surrounds him and then is placed in a new sense of society functioning though family that betrays him, transforming him as a central figure in the family as a complete nuisance. The foundation for the human/animal dilemma in *Frankenstein* is stated with, “but my imagination was to much exalted by my first success to permit me to doubt of my ability to give life to an animal as complex and wonderful as man (Shelley 32). The idea of *Frankenstein* putting forth the concept of turning animal into man results in the perfect product of man entrapped in animal. The text states, “a new species would bless me as its creator and source; many happy and excellent natures would own their being to me” (Shelley 32). Frankenstein looked towards his creation to propel him into a greater level of societal identity and recognition; however, this is not successful and

produces quite the opposite setting up the notion of a poor placement in society and family much like in *The Metamorphosis*. The creature being made from “the dissecting room and the slaughter house” proves that with the intention of beauty, Frankenstein puts forth an animal as composed animal parts (Shelley 33). This creature functioning in the world produces an effect that, “the creature is something different and something that even his creator does not want. He is repeatedly kicked out or abandoned by society because no one views him as a human. The first of these instances occurs at the moment that he has come to life” (Bellows 16). The birth of these animal creatures puts forth the notion of an immediate detachment from the surrounding society and family influences. In regards to Bellows, “this book questions the animal/human structure that has been established for centuries” (Bellows 6). This challenging question proposed gives light to the texts to be examined.

When discussing the animal in the texts there is the importance of language and language barriers. Bellows states that “if he is not human like in appearance, he cannot talk”, when referencing the animal in *Frankenstein* (Bellows 2). There is also the element in that, when the creature learned language, “he is clearly human; however, he still has the qualities of an animal, blurred with the categories of human and animal” (Bellows 3). We see this in both the texts of *Frankenstein* and *The Metamorphosis*. In *The Metamorphosis* when Gregor Samsa changes into the beetle, there is the communication barrier when the Clerk comes over to check on Gregor Samsa for not coming into work that morning. With this there is the description of in the text of Gregor Samsa only being able to articulate the sort of words for “yes” and “no”. Gregor Samsa describes his voice as being, “appeared, as if rising from below, and irrepressible, painful peeping sound, so that his words retained their clarity only at the very outset but became distorted as they faded away, so that you couldn’t tell if you had heard them correctly” (Kafka 12). This sudden inability to communicate through speech resonates in the idea of his new inhuman animal form, subtracting his humanity. Gregor Samsa even describes his own voice acknowledging his animal form as, “first able to hear his own voice from his altered body, he is, to be sure, shocked as if from below a humming or twittering squeak mixes with his speech and tends to distort and obscure his words” (Sokel, *Metamorphosis Rebellion* 207). In *Frankenstein*, the creation describes language when observing the cottagers as, “these people possessed a method of communicating their experiences and feelings to one another by articulate sounds. I perceived that the words they spoke sometimes produced pleasure or pain, smiles or sadness, in the minds and countenances of the hearers”

(Shelley 79). The Creation recognizes this as important for himself to define himself outside of his outward appearance of this animal body. When reflecting on exposing himself to the cottagers, stating, "I ought not make the attempt to meet them until I had first become master of their language, which knowledge might enable me to make them look over the deformity of my figure" (Shelley 80). This shows the creation realizes the importance of language so much so that it is possibly the sole factor for his acceptance into the family and society if he could only verbally communicate with them to subpar his appearance. When Frankenstein first beholds his creation he states, "His eyes were fixed on me. His jaw opened and he muttered some inarticulate sounds, with a grin and wrinkled cheeks. He might have spoken, but I did not hear" (Shelley 36). This scene emphasizes the key necessity of verbal communication to be able to express oneself as a human being. This stress in the lack of language keeps the creation as an animal without the verbal skills and distances himself from his creation. If there was only verbal communication then there could have been a surmount to his identity beyond his exterior towards Frankenstein. The creation while living in the hovel with the cottagers slowly gains the understanding of human language along with emotions that correspond with it. The creation questions, "what do tears imply? Do they really express pain?" (Shelley 77). Language extends into the nonverbal for the creation in regards to comprehension of language as a whole in part to identity and proper expression. Coming from this other angle, language is yet again an element of great importance to proper communication specific to Frankenstein's creation. Language is key to defining the animals outside the themselves to be projected into the human society, and though achieved at times, the outwards appearance still tends to betray the animal/human's significance in placement.

Through the texts there becomes the essence of the significance of the name for the human/animal dilemma. Gregor Samsa and the Frankenstein's creation are being known as the "other" results in reactions being, "markedly disregarded and disrespected" (Bellows 2). The act of the "other" immediately proposes the inhuman self. The ability to give a name to the "other" is what possibly defines its placement within society itself. This is highlighted in the fact of name referencing to condone them at their level of inferiority. This is seen in both *The Metamorphosis* and *Frankenstein* when members outside in the community or family react towards the animals. In *The Metamorphosis*, Gregor Samsa is associated with terms such as, "a wretch, a filthy deamon, a figure, a devil, a depraved wretch, vile insect, filth, abortion, etc." (Graham 129). The

cleaning lady would come to see Gregor Samsa and created an identity for him calling him, “at the beginning she called him over with words she probably thought were friendly, such as, ‘come on over here, old dung beetle’ or ‘just look at that old dung beetle’” (Kafka 42). Gregor never responded to those calls refusing to accept his outward appearance as his identity. Near the end of the text we have the words of Grete, Gregor Samsa’s sister, come through denouncing him as inhuman and purely animal. This moment in the text cascades through to the last image of Gregor Samsa upon his function in the family and thus reflecting society as the whole condoning him as a complete animal following through the progression in the text itself. In *Frankenstein* the creation is never gifted a name, “reinforcing the Monster’s lack of identity and connection to society. Along with belonging to no race and with having no complete history, the Monster also has outstanding qualities that most humans do not share with him” (Lancaster 137). This foreshadows its dark path to destruction knowing that without a name he has not place in society and thus is truly never to be human within itself. Naming is a construction since the very birth of human existence that defines it a member of society, where Gregor Samsa had his name when he functioned in society though it was slowly withdrawn from him through his transformation with his loss of the human self. In the reflection due to renaming of familial figures, the creation began inhuman and remained inhuman. A name is a marker of great human identification and without that the human is simply an animal itself.

When speaking of family we see two different spectras of family dynamic towards the animals in *The Metamorphosis* and *Frankenstein*. When looking at the family of the creation in the novel *Frankenstein*, we see the only family is his creator, Victor Frankenstein. Victor Frankenstein in the text plays a role of a present father figure or in another perspective, a God. Graham states, “there is no friendship in the primary sense with animals or with gods. There is no friendship, either, between animals or gods “ (Graham 131). With this sole family member, it isolates the creation so much so due to the fact the Victor Frankenstein abandons him. Thus the creation needs a relationship that will not come, for who could be a friend to the “other”. The creation desires friendship yet denies his human needs. Though the true bond with Frankenstein and his creation is still evident for, “all of the sorrow that Frankenstein has caused him, the Monster still desires Frankenstein’s acceptance, making the monster the real ‘slave’”(Lancaster 139). This is also counterbalanced that, “even as he faces death, Victor cannot totally dissociate himself from the monster and the process of its creation” (Cotton 66).

The evidence of detachment from human bonding shows the destruction family can cause.

Gregor Samsa in *The Metamorphosis* has a familial role that is disturbed before and after his transformation. Before his transformation, “like the children of Adam and Eve, Gregor through his sonship in the flesh has been condemned to a perennial debtor’s existence” (Sokel, *Marx and Myth* 5). This was his place in society encompassed by his family unit. In regards to his position in his family, “his self-sacrifice in assuming his father’s debt, Gregor rises to power as the breadwinner in his family and threatens to displace his father as the head of the household. This process reverses itself with Gregor’s metamorphosis” (Sokel 5). There is the evident change in the position in the family taking away all his importance and authority in the household that he already lacked in the work force as a member of society. In regards to the family dynamic, “before the metamorphosis the father was the parasite. After the metamorphosis, the son assumes this role” (Sokel, *Marx and Myth* 5). In regards to placement and treatment of family in the texts a sound destructive solution was the only one to take place.

When looking at Gregor for his relationship with his job after his transformation there is a reversal of roles in such circumstance due to the fact that, “the chief clerk, who has come to threaten Gregor, now retreats in terror while Gregor, hitherto the poor exploited and despised salesman, drives him out of the apartment so that he leaves his hat and cane behind, tokens of Gregor’s triumph” (Sokel, *Metamorphosis and Rebellion* 206). This action results in negative consequences after it has occurred yet for the moment, “the metamorphosis fulfills Gregor’s secret wish for rebellion and humiliation of his superior in the firm” (Sokel, *Metamorphosis and Rebellion* 206). Gregor has the powerful hand in this circumstance denouncing his prior superiors that manipulated and controlled his life.

In *The Metamorphosis*, Gregor Samsa was dedicated to his family being the new patriarch. His profession of a traveling salesman preserved his family and to keep them out of debt he was to be continuing this job for another “five or six years”. However his real feelings about his placement in society in the moment was:

“If I didn’t hold myself back because of my parents, I would have quit: I would have walked right up to the boss and let my heart out to him. He would surley have fallen off his desk! That’s a peculiar habit of his, too, sitting on his desk and talking down to his employees from up above; and, besides, they have to stip

way up close before the boss is so hard of hearing. Now, I havnt given up all hope yet; once I have the money together to pay off my parent's debt to him – that should still take five or six years – I'll definitely go through with it. Then I'll make the bit break. At the moment, of course, I've got to get up, because my train leaves at five" (Kafka 12).

Gregor Samsa continues to ponder the present situation of arriving to work even over addressing his physical condition upon his transformation into the giant vermin. This devotion to his family and societal expectations is very overpowering for him as he decides as to what is the next train to take reflecting on his negligence. This shows how Gregor Samsa was never a first principle person in his life that he doesn't even comprehend how to function on his own. With both Gregor Samsa and Frankenstein's creation . there is the aspect of isolation from society where hidden away in the hovel, away from the cottagers he admired and Gregor was captured in his room there is the idea of society conversing around them. In Gregor's case, the Chief Clerk came to his home immediately confronting Gregor Samsa with his place in society that he is negligent of. This incorporated in the book where different individuals from his firm come by to demand why Gregor Samsa was not at work that day shows the layering of the importance of the membership to society is in the text. Gregor Samsa reflects on the Chief Clerk's arrival saying, "Wouldn't it really have been enough to send an apprentice to ask – if all this questioning was necessary at all – did the chief clerk himself have to come, thereby indicating to the entire innocent family that the investigation into this suspicious incident could only be entrusted to the intelligence of the Chief Clerk?" (Kafka 16). This suggests the larger than life example of Gregor Samsa's purpose in society and how it can't function without him showcasing the idea that this is what shapes existence, specifically his existence. The Chief Clerk speaks of "losing all willingness to say a good word for you in the slightest way" and "I am speaking here in the name of your parents and your employer" (Kafka 17). When continuing this denotes the sudden looking at Gregor's relationship in regards to his role in society and family placed in Gregor Samsa's hand. This pressure pushes down on him as an individual much as Frankenstein's creation has this same impression from the outward society working against on him pushing them both into the direction of outcasts.

In regards to the functioning of the family of Gregor Samsa and the transition that approaches thereof, we see this transition become more increasingly ill powered while progressing through the text in regards to

his inward struggle as to the mark he functions in society. When Gregor Samsa first leaves his room by unlocking the door he is encountered with, “his father clenching his fist in a hostile expression as if intending to push Gregor back into his room” (Kafka 20). This reaction promotes the instantaneous disregard from the family and automatically put the father back in the position of patriarch. The father is described in the text, “drowsed in his chair fully dressed, as if he were always ready to do his work and were always ready to do his work and were awaiting his superior’s orders even here” (Kafka 39). This shows the resentment the father has for losing his ability to work and having his son take over the patriarchy. This fuels later the disgust the father has for his son when he throws the apple into his back that ultimately kills him. Gregor Samsa is seen being haunted about his inability to be a productive member functioning within society. The text states that, “Gregor spent the nights and days almost completely without sleep. Sometimes he felt that the next time the door opened, he would once again take charge of the family’s problems as he used to” thus continuing to say, “in his thoughts there reappeared, after a long interval, his boss and the Chief Clerk, Clerk’s apprentices, the office manager, two or three friends from the firms, a chambermaid” etc. haunting him of how he is not a part of the society that he was currently structuring in, or lack thereof. Gregor Samsa cannot escape his own guilt of his separation from the world he only knew to function within and give him purpose for existence.

When dealing with *The Metamorphosis* there is the transformation of Gregor Samsa into a giant beetle where, “Gregor’s metamorphosis literally enacts this ‘loss of self.’” It makes drastically visible the self-estrangement that existed even before his metamorphosis” (Sokel, *Marx and Myth* 3). This creation of the animal rapidly impacted the loss of self for Gregor Samsa emphasizing his self-estrangement in a different light to weaken his appearance in a new structure of society that exists around him. This created animal is different from *Frankenstein* in the sense that Gregor Samsa had a previous life before his transformation that became a parallel to his transformation; however, both senses of estrangement resulting from transformation remains in light. As Gregor Samsa, being the insect, there results in a positive being of freedom as in, “the horrible paradox that is his metamorphosis, is now the only ‘free’ member of the family, the only one who does not have to labor and let himself be exploited by the world outside” (Sokel, *Marx and Myth* 7). This effect upon Gregor Samsa and his coming into the animal being proves a change in societal roles, identifying him by his limitations that allow for function of effect. In a sense with the transformation of Gregor



Samsa there is a sort of positive underlying result that does not hold up for the overall effect later on being such a positive thing is, “we see then that Gregor Samsa’s body was beginning to feel the strain of his work too hard to bear when the metamorphosis occurred, freeing him of any further responsibility” (Sokel, *Metamorphosis Rebellion* 205). This result of momentary freedom becomes a catch twenty two as to the discovery of the impact on his family and the later effects upon his own wellbeing to get what he craved for.

When looking into Frankenstein’s creation there is the evident factor of the needs to be a functional factor within society. Frankenstein’s creation encounters society for the first time upon his exposure to the world and yields joyous observation which leads to an attack. The text states about the encounter being,

“I arrived at a village. How miraculous did this appear! The huts, the neater cottages, and stately houses engaged my admiration by turns. The vegetables in the gardens, the milk and cheese that I saw placed at the windows of some of the cottages, allured my appetite. One of the best of these I entered; but I had hardly placed my foot within the door before the children shrieked, and one of the women fainted. The whole village was roused; some fled, some attacked me, until, grievously bruised by stones and many other kinds of missile weapons, I escaped to the open country and fearfully took refuge in a low hovel, quite bare, and making a wretched appearance after the palaces I had beheld in the village. This hovel, however, joined a cottage of a neat and pleasant appearance; but, after my late dearly bought experience, I dared not enter it” (Shelley 74).

From this larger scale experience with society being a great turmoil putting the understanding of the place the creation has within the world, there is the discovery of the cottagers and the hovel there after bringing on another example of family within society much like the dynamic of Gregor Samsa from *The Metamorphosis* and the projection of society within the family representation there resides. This lack of ability to function in society with Frankenstein’s creation reflects on the decreasing function of Gregor Samsa in his society ultimately placing both the creation and Gregor Samsa on the same plain by the end of the text for what is lost and what is never gained.

In *Frankenstein* and *The Metamorphosis* the animal appearance becomes something that is disconnected from the part of the human



identity. When looking at the creation in regards to his animal like appearance, there is the interpretation of it as, the monster's unwarranted revulsion of himself instead of recognizing the monster as an extension of himself. There is the absence of the human identity upon self-reflection of their outwards appearance instead of embracing the fact that it is a part of the self. This disconnection with the self produces lack of ability to define themselves as anything particular thus destroying their identification of what places them within society and how they function. Frankenstein's creation discovers the book of *Paradise Lost* which he reflects into his inner human being and the creation there of a source from a God. Although he sees in himself an Adam, he thus resorts to the interpretation of his outwards appearance of something that would come from Satan himself and relates himself towards him as the serpent in the text. Goldberg states, "This is no idle image which the creature evokes here, comparing his own situation with Satan's, and with Adam's paradisiac state in Eden. The confusion apparent in his own consciousness -- whether he is an Adam, destined ultimately for eternal grace, or a Satan, doomed to eternal darkness -- is a motif crucial to the entire novel" (Goldberg 32). This dynamic of dual personality of polarity to determine his place in society shows the dynamic of the animal and the human fighting within.

In *Frankenstein* and *The Metamorphosis* there is the concept of what created this animal and what defines it as the monster at it is and how this affects it as a being. When looking into Frankenstein's creations there is the idea the fundamental aspect to the monster's creation where it states, "as a being created from discarded body parts found in a dissecting room and . . . slaughter-house, the monster only has a connection to death and to trauma" (Lancaster 134). This provides a point that due to the construction of the creature being brought to life there is the suggestion that due to this it produces a connection to the pieces that the creation came from. When Frankenstein's creation looks upon the reflection of himself he recognizes the terrifying monster that is reflected inside as being defined as himself. This is stated in the text as, "at first I started back, unable to believe that it as indeed I who was reflected in the mirror; and when I became fully convinced that I was in reality the monster that I am, I was filled with the bitterest sensations of despondence and mortification. Alas! I did not yet entirely know the fatal effects of this miserable deformity" (Shelley 80). This quickly effects its perception of its being in society amongst others he thought were of his kind. This is the moment of complete detachment of the human self identity. The creation acknowledges its being shortly after stating,

“I possessed no money, no friends, no kind of property. I was besides, endued with a figure hideously deformed and loathsome; I was not even of the same nature as man. I was more agile than they and could subsist upon coarser diet; I bore the extremes of heat and cold with less injury to my frame; my stature far exceeded theirs. When I looked around I saw and heard of none like me. Was I, then, a monster, a blot upon the earth, from which all men fled and whom all men disowned?” (Shelley 85). This identification weakened greatly his sense of place in society and strengthened his animal perceived exterior.

In *Frankenstein* and *The Metamorphosis*, there are characteristics of the animal type creatures that specifically are put forth to define themselves as inhuman. elements take away from his identity as a human being to be connected within society. The qualities that Frankenstein's creature does not share with humans are the appearance that functions heavily in the perception of the identity of being a nonhuman creature. Frankenstein's creation, “never has the opportunity to get beyond his horrifying physical appearance that so prominently overpowers his character” (Lancaster 137). When Gregor Samsa awakes, he, “realizes his many limitations this transformation has imposed: he has trouble persuading his many legs to move his large, bulky body around and his voice squeaks, insect like, when he speaks to family members and his employer” (Rowe 165). This introduction into the body of an insect produces an instantaneous image from the first sentence of the text that defines Gregor Samsa forever as the insect he is. In regards to Gregor Samsa's appearance, “his menacing appearance is merely appearance, but his helplessness is real” (Sokel, *Metamorphosis and Rebellion* 213). So even with this appearance there is still the human deep down with emotions.

Frankenstein's creation risks losing his human appearance because Victor Frankenstein made his appearance too real and disfigured him into an animal monster. “Frankenstein's Creature is only too real. He is, like the blood and guts oozing from the fissures in his skin, and excess of existence, exceeding representation, and hence appearing to others as a chaotic spillage from his own representational shell” (Gigante 566). He is simply a misinterpretation of positive intentions that condemns him to a life ill lived. There is the ideal eye to the window of the soul, this lack of a clear eye much rather a milky eye with the creature counteracts this in a negative light as so, “the Creature's eye is little more than a reminder of its own existence: a lump of vile jelly attached to the skull” referencing that the creature is nothing but an animal that is understood to be without a soul (Giegante 571). The creation of Frankenstein is described as, “how can I describe my emotions at this catastrophe, or

how delineate the wretch whom with such infinite pains and care I had endeavored to form? His limbs in proportion, and I had selected his features as beautiful. His yellow skin scarcely covered the work of his muscles and arteries beneath; his hair was of a lustrous black, and flowing; his teeth of pearly whiteness, but these luxuriance only formed a more horrid contrast with his watery eyes, that seemed almost of the same colour as the dun-white sockets in which they were set, his shriveled complexion and straight black lips” (Shelley 35). This paints the image of the creature of this animal that is to become the vision of the text. This dycotomy of making something hideous from what is beautiful I reflects through the text introducing the idea of the beauty that was lost through the creation of beautiful parts becomes the beauty within the hideous monster.

Gregor Samsa had a previous appearance seen in the text based through a sole photographic image hung on the wall. The photo is described as, “a photograph of Gregor that dated from his military service, showing him as a lieutenant, hand on sword, with a carefree smile, demanding respect for his bearing and his uniform” (Kafka 22). This image defines the strong Gregor Samsa that had been. This military service proved to serve for the country altered the societal position he ultimately found himself in before his metamorphosis. The dynamic of the character in photograph and the one introduced to us in the novel shows the way society can have a drastic effect on individuals and is ever changing. For as Gregor Samsa served his tour of duty, he now serves his second tour of duty, at his home, and the function within that society which is demeaning and not respectable as that of the military.

Frankenstein’s creation becomes a primal animal through the fact of his survival skills at the beginning of the text when he is first encountered with life and environment. This defines the creature purely as animal devoid of human learning experience and expansive intelligence. The creation describes, “I ate some berries which I found hanging on the trees or lying on the ground. I slaked my thirst at the brook; and then lying down, was overcome by sleep” (Shelley 71). There is the need to obtain food and shelter. There is also the moment when fire is discovered described as, “I found a fire which had been left by some wandering beggars, and was overcome with delight at the warmth I experienced from it. In my joy I thrust my hand into the live embers, but quickly drew it out again with a cry of pain. How strange, I thought, that the same cause should produce such opposite effects!” (Shelley 72). There is the experience of the creation with the cottagers where he tries to take on the identity of a human being going to eat their food, there by putting

himself on a human level, saying “I had been accustomed during the night, to steal a part of their store for my own consumption, but when I found that in doing this I inflicted pain on the cottagers, I abstained, and satisfied myself with berries, nuts, and roots, which I gathered from a neighboring wood” (Shelley 78).

This resort back to animal nature keeps the creation in his placement within society. The final moment that turned the creation into an animalistic being with cause by his appearance was when he saved a young girl who fell and slipped into the stream. Men saw him and tore the girl away aiming a gun at him where the creation reflects saying, “I had saved a human being from destruction, and as a recompense I now writhed under the miserable pain of a wound which shattered the flesh and bone. The feeling of kindness and gentleness, which I had entertained but a few moments before, gave place to hellish rage and gnashing of teeth inflamed by pain, I vowed eternal hatred and vengeance to all mankind” (Shelley 101). The creation found a young boy hoping to take him in and raise him and teach him to be his companion, however when that happened the boy yelped out in fear. At the instance we see the human side of the creation looking for companion and human friendship which suddenly turned into a fright and fight that led to the accidental murder of the young boy. This expresses the true animal within coming through for the creation. The creation ultimately seeks vengeance upon his creator, Victor Frankenstein beginning his bestial rampage. This story of the life of an ill-fated appearance results in the complete destruction of the proper function that could be the projection of the animal himself.

In *The Metamorphosis* there is the gradual progression of injuries inflicted upon Gregor Samsa distancing himself away from his family and place in society slowly edging him towards his demise. The first encounter of injury is when Gregor Samsa attempts to leave his room and join his family, however this does not work well implying the fact that he is not a part of his family anymore, in a sense, and that he is slowly losing touch with them distorting the relationship that they would have. This stands as a foreshadowing of what is to become of him and their relationship, and also stands for in sense a warning for Gregor Samsa to not pursue his attempt to encounter them. The struggles to grasp the lock to open the door ultimately using his jaw when suddenly, “a brown fluid issued from his mouth” (Kafka 19). He is still able to open the door. Gregor Samsa continues to sustain injuries to his leg and side as he tries to adapt to himself and his environment and the effect of individuals who come upon him. The cleaning lady, not in fear, crashed a wooden

chair across Gregor Samsa's back. The main moment of attaining injury that affected Gregor Samsa is when the father threw the apple into his back when he left his room. Gregor Samsa was submissive to him as he battled the apples against his body. The text states, "he had filled his pockets from the fruit bowl on the sideboard and now; without aiming carefully for the moment, was throwing one apple after another, A weakly thrown apple grazed Gregor's back, but rolled off harmlessly. One that flew right after it actually penetrated Gregor's back; Gregor wanted to drag himself onward, as if the surprising and unbelievable pain might pass if he changed location; but he felt pinned down and he surrendered, all his senses fully bewildered" (Kafka 38). This fatal moment in Gregor Samsa's life leads to his demise as he has lost the respect of his father concluding the disengagement of the family and where Gregor Samsa truly stands. Thus this apple served as a visual reminder of his own self-identity and placement in society and family. It is the haunting reminder of the animal that he has become.

In *Frankenstein* and *The Metamorphosis* there is the concept of self-recognition of the human/animal's placement in society that grows through discovering. In the text of *Frankenstein*, the creation comes across a young boy whom he feels is too young and innocent enough that he could adopt him as his own and raise him to love him and not judge him based on appearance. However, this does not prove effective and the boy panics and screams at the animal appearance of this creature. Through this, "the monster feels dismayed that even this young child does not have the capacity to look past his monstrous appearance. At this point, the Monster finally realizes that he has no place in this society and no chance to sway the human race to embrace him in spite of his deformity; he will forever exist as the despised Other" (Lancaster 139). This proves the last hope to be a functional part of society as a failed attempt that led to the child's death in the process. The creature becomes so terribly powerful in a way that science actually rejects desire and thus rejects a part of man thus, "representing man to himself in a hideous and violent form" (Cotton 65). This shows the change of the human inward identity possessing the inner animal, "to be over nature or over society, which represents a monstrous misrepresentation of desire" (Cotton 65). This shows the fact that the creation allows his monster or animal to take over him and his human interior showing the progression of the monstrous or animal form in the characters inhabited by both.

From this point on there is a vengeance against Victor Frankenstein for the boy was related to him. Within the conclusion of the novel, there is the ultimate conscious separation from society by the creations

own free will were, “the Monster drifts away from society as a creature driven first by kindness, then by hatred, and finally by desperation, only to continue to live alone” (Lancaster 139). Much how the creature drifts away, so does Gregor Samsa in *The Metamorphosis* acknowledging his fate in his captive room, separating himself from the family and society waiting his eminent death through the wound and ultimately starvation. In *The Metamorphosis*, Gregor Samsa becomes the image of guilt. This incarnation of guilt is relative to, Christ’s incarnation of God in man, in one sense only. Like Christ, Gregor takes the cross upon himself to erase “the guilt of the parents.” But in contrast to Christ, Gregor does not merely assume suffering by his fellow creatures; he also assumes their guilt. Since he has referenced guilt identical with himself, he must liberate the world, i.e., his family, from himself” (Sokel, *Marx and Myth* 7). With this outcome it leads to his ultimate separation from the whole and his inevitable demise. When looking at the function of Gregor Samsa as a character reflecting before his transformation it is described that, “long before his transformation into a giant insect that human power may be exchanged and utilized by converting man into a slave” (Straus 160). This reflects the understanding of man’s placement in society, especially in the area of Gregor Samsa’s role. Gregor Samsa has his role as a bread winner for the family to help pay off debt as well where there is, “is a dual sundering of Gregor’s humanity and of his function within his family and society due to his inability to maintain his employment. When his metamorphosis makes it impossible for him to perform his daily job, his humanity, in the eyes of those closest is threatened as well” (Rowe 267). His metamorphosis ruins his place in society and in consequence ruins his place within his family losing any sort of support that he originally finds in Grete, his sister, who later betrays him and condones his death. As Frankenstein abandons his creation so does Samsa Gregor’s father when he throws the apple at his son that ultimately causes his demise though as Frankenstein never felt love for his creation, Gregor Samsa’s father had no appeal for his child due to the fact of him usurping his proper role in the family as patriarch.

Gregor Samsa is described efficiently of the life and placement in society that Gregor had before his transformation that is lost with Frankenstein’s creature, unless looking into the art of creating the creature itself. In regarding to *The Metamorphosis*, Gregor Samsa is described as exhibiting guilt upon himself in regards to his family stated, “that Gregor’s metamorphosis literally eminent guilt becomes apparent first of all by the fact that his immediate reaction to his transformation is a guilty conscience. He has missed the hour of his work and feels guilty

for it. He feels guilty for having plunged his family into misfortune” (Sokel, *Marx and Myth* 6). This guilt becomes that of objectivity for, “his transformation into vermin entails the crassest form of parasitic exploitation, a perfect turning of the tables on his family. His metamorphosis compels them to work for him and in his place. Because of him they will henceforth be ‘overlooked and overtired’, condemned to suffer the fate of ‘paupers’” (Sokel, *Marx and Myth* 6). This shows that his guilt transfers from subjectivity to objectivity in the sense that once as human he felt subjectively to pay for his family’s debt in society, yet when transformed Gregor Samsa suddenly has an objective guilt seeing the effects of his new form upon the family he was obligated to fend for and care for. When, “by embodying parasitism in his shape, Gregor objectifies the guilt of his entire society. This guilt had originally shown itself in his father when he secretly cheated” (Sokel, *Marx and Myth* 6) The father wounds Gregor with an apple which rots and festers in Gregor’s flesh. This apple functions not only as a renewed allusion to “the guilt of first parents”; it also signifies the function of Gregor’s metamorphosis as the literal incorporation of his father’s guilt” (Sokel, *Marx and Myth* 6). This closing outlet of physical violent expression towards his son in to totality seals the fate of Gregor’s identity.

In *Frankenstein*, the human side of the creature begins to develop and expose itself while he lived with the cottagers by observing them saying, “the gentle manners and beauty of the cottagers greatly endeared them to name: When they were unhappy, I felt depressed; when they rejoiced, I sympathized in their joys. I saw few human beings besides them; and if any other happened to enter the cottage, their harsh manners and rude gait only enhanced to me the superior accomplishments of my friends” (Shelley 79). This way of learning through the humans how to accept and develop the creature’s own human identity separating himself from the animals with emotion and intelligence. The creature soon after development into the soul of a human approaches the blind father of the cottagers to dig out the possible little bit of human essence from himself hoping to find place in the family. The blind man speaks upon the creature, “I am blind and cannot judge of your countenance, but there is something your words which persuades me that your sincere. I am poor and an exile, but it will afford me true pleasure to be in any way serviceable to a human creature” (Shelley 96). Both the blind man and the creation both acknowledged to be ostracized from society. The idea that the blind man states, “human creature” depicts a sort of interwoven fact that the man compares the creation and himself as one unconsciously. Soon, however, the children Agatha and Safie and Felix



come and brought the creature back into the place of an animal that it deemed to be by judgment. As the children strike the creature violently, the creature refrains, saying, "I could have torn him limb from limb, as the lion rends the antelope. But my heart sunk within me as with bitter sickness, and I refrained saw him on the point of repeating his blow, when, overcome by pain and anguish, I quitted the cottage, and in the general tumult escaped unperceived to my hovel" (Shelley 97). The references to animal outrage reflects on the fact of his animal attributes that he is initially suppressing with the cottagers.

*Frankenstein* and *The Metamorphosis* reveal the transference from a human identity into a permanent animal nonhuman identity. In *Frankenstein*, the creation decides for himself through the structure society places himself in to change himself into the complete animal primal creature form that he was damned the appearance of to begin with. In *The Metamorphosis*, the change into the full identity of the animal example stems from the mouths of his family. Coming to the end of the text there is the closing line to Gregor's life where they say, "It's dead", and "It's lying here dead and done for". This shows in death he was nothing more than a nameless animal much how Frankenstein begins his tale is. Ultimately Gregor Samsa was treated as if he did not exist to the family anymore. The text states, "they had grown accustomed to put in his room things there was no space for elsewhere, and there were now a lot of such things" (Kafka 43). This gives the example that they no longer see Gregor as living in his own bedroom. Even his bedroom has lost being a part of his identity. There is very little if anything that Gregor can say he owns as a part of himself besides the deadly apple attached to his back. At the end of the book, Grete, who betrayed Gregor Samsa, is now speaking of him completely erasing all possible identity of Gregor Samsa being that of human. Grete first expresses that, "we can't go on like this. If you perhaps don't realize it, do. In front of this monstrous creature I refuse to pronounce my brother's name, and therefore I am merely say: We have to try to get rid of it. We've tried all that's humanely possible to take care of it and put up with it; I think no one can reproach us in the slightest" (Kafka 47). Grete specifically states that the name "Gregor Samsa" should be removed from the animal living in that bedroom. After being the only one to acknowledge who is was feeding him, now she as dismissed him completely taking away all since of humanity. Grete continues to finalize Gregor Samsa's identity through this creature by stating,

"That's the only remedy, father. All you have to do is try to shake off the idea that that's Gregor. Our real misfortune comes from



having believed it for so long. But how can it be Gregor? If it were Gregor, he would long since have realized that it's impossible for people to live side by side with an animal like that, and would have gone away of his own free will. Then there would be no more brother, but we could go on living and honor his memory. But as it is, this animal persecutes us, drives away our lodgers, and obviously wants to take over the whole apartment and make us sleep in the street" (Kafka 48).

This segregates Gregor Samsa from humanity as a whole through Grete's voice. Gregor Samsa now does not exist and the animal itself has completely taken over.

*Frankenstein* and *The Metamorphosis* make the final points that taking away all sense of humanity from the animal removes it from any sense of acceptance in society. In *Frankenstein*, "even though this novel so thoroughly maintains that the concept of the human species is monstrously incoherent, it is consideration for the species that causes Victor to refuse to create an Eve for his Adam -- in fact, to dismember the women he had started to create and to dump the pieces in the sea" (Cotton 69). This mate of its own reflecting its own appearance of being given the creation hope for functionality in some sort of sense in society being paired beings making a mark was suddenly stripped away so much so that Frankenstein, the creator or God for the creation, denies authority the chance for the monster to be able to find a sense of solace in the society that possess him thus resulting the creation to banish himself giving up all hope. With Gregor Samsa's case in *The Metamorphosis*, restrained him in the sense that, "Gregor can regain his own humanity only by the liberation of his whole community" (Sokol *Marx and Myth* 9). This is an impossible feat thus ultimately, "Gregor now withdraws forever into his room, into himself. He gives himself up to death by which he liberates not only the world from himself, but more importantly for Kafka, himself from the world". (Sokol *Marx and Myth* 10). Withdrawn natures of the animals is a giving up hope of their own potential being.

When overlooking both *Frankenstein* and *The Metamorphosis* there is that, "the story continues to ask a question about humanity or lack thereof it" (Rowe 278). Humanity that applies to the texts of animals and lack thereof, ultimately there were two susceptible animals left behind after the inner core of humanity dissipated from their identity. When Frankenstein's creature attempts to have a mate created for him of his own breed, it gave hope of a new inventive part or function in society; however, when that is taken away by that who has placement

in society, there is suddenly no hope. Both Gregor Samsa and Frankenstein's creation attempt to become a part but soon drift away with no humanity left within them leading to death and that there of searching for it. Gregor Samsa fades away from the humanity he once had stripped away by his family he once respected as the creation loses his family through his created Victor Frankenstein. The function of family shapes the conception of society and ultimately leads to the demise of the two humans that once existed into nothing but animal beings left for nothing more than death. Both texts show the loss of touch with one's being when driven away by society and family and the resulting factor of an irreparable loss of humanity and identity thereof.

### Works Cited

- Bellows, Martha, "Categorizing Humans, Animals, and Machines in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*" (2009). Senior Honors Projects. Paper 129.
- Cotton, Daniel. "Frankenstein and the Monster of Representation." *SubStance* 28 (1980),60-71. Gigante, Denise. "Facing the Ugly: The Case of "Frankenstein"" *ELH* Summer 67.2 (2000): 565-87. *JSTOR*. Web. 12 Apr. 2014.
- Kafka, Franz. *The Metamorphosis and Other Stories*. New York: Dover Publications, 1996. Print.
- Sokel, Walter H. "From Marx To Myth: The Structure And Function Of Self-Alienation In Kafka's *Metamorphosis*." *Literary Review: An International Journal Of Contemporary Writing* 26.4 (1983): 485-495. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 16 Mar. 2014.
- Shelley, Mary. *Frankens tein*. New York: Dover Publications, 1994. Print.
- Sokel, Walter H. "Kafka's "Metamorphosis": Rebellion and Punishment." *Monatshefte* 48.4 (1956): 203-14. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Mar. 2014. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/30166165>>.
- Straus, Nina Pelikan. "Transforming Franz Kafka's "Metamorphosis"" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 14.3 (1989): 651. Print.

# Victorian Anxieties: Deconstructing Masculine Predators and Feminine Prey in Hardy's *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* and Stoker's *Dracula*

by Trevor Pace



In the late nineteenth century, many authors established an active predator/prey binary within their novels in order to more clearly represent the prevalent cultural constructions they experienced, such as social statuses and gender roles. Bram Stoker, in *Dracula*, calls upon the connotations of humans' animalistic characteristics, likening people to primitive beings and proposing an overt binary established within human life by the natural world. Similarly, Thomas Hardy, six years before *Dracula*, illustrates in *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* the predatory male and the victimized female, from which Stoker builds upon the Victorian understanding of gender roles. In short, this paper deconstructs the bifurcation of the gender binary within Victorian culture by transposing both male and female subjects into terms congruent with the hunter/hunted, or predator/prey binary. Through the allegorical undertones of Stoker and Hardy in representing the opposing masculine and feminine forces, each implies the social disposition of women as connected with beings that are preyed upon and that of men in strong correlation with predatory animals. Just as the roles of true animals within late nineteenth century culture transform, the two authors are able to attach to the animalistic predator/prey binary their reflections regarding anxieties revolving around the arising New Woman.

With "a radical reevaluation of the status of nonhuman animals... [taking place] in [Victorian] society at large" (Wolfe qtd. by Cole 2), along with the transforming roles of gender, Hardy focuses his attention upon a prevalently controversial relationship between humans and animals which exists within hunting. Hunting offers a lens through which an observation of two varying, subjective beings' intercommunicative abilities is made possible. Stoker's novel not only exemplifies the special-

ized dialogue that Hardy introduces as transpiring between predator and prey, but it superimposes this conversation upon the Victorians' cultural participation in the deterministic spheres of both social class and gender roles. As "an 'unprecedented transformation' in human-animal arrangements" (Cole 1) occurs within the naturalized world of nineteenth-century England, Stoker reestablishes each gender within a society that is morphing, in which differing gender roles desire less circumscription within their respective classes. Although, as Cohn writes, "the changing status of agency in Hardy's work reflects nineteenth-century uncertainty about whether animals' consanguinity with humans, and, more broadly, the biological instability of the human species, should shape ethical thought" (495), Hardy indicates a more traditional portrayal of gender within Victorian society, in which the male gender prescribes diminutive, homogenous roles for women. With the idea of animal and human "consanguinity" in mind, Hardy illuminates the socially constructed dimensions of feminine life through representations of Tess, the protagonist, as a being that is victimized as prey.

Through Stoker's portrayal of women, correlative with Hardy's, Stoker's significance in illustrating the demarcated Victorian gender roles in looser terms necessitates a thorough understanding of the relationship between predator and prey in nineteenth-century England. Precipitating conflict and tension between two oppositional entities and repositioning this natural hunter/hunted binary within social constructions, Stoker allows himself room to call upon the connotations of preyed-upon beings in order to indicate the woman's socially conscripted role "by evoking a response...emanating from our genetic heritage" (Fry and Edwards 41). From a biological standpoint, the Victorians believed that masculinity held an innate superiority over femininity, culturally placing the male into conversation with the characteristics of predatory beings. Each author delineates the predator's connotations as characteristic of the male gender, which, during the time, struggled with, as critic Hendershot asserts, the "rigid concepts of sexual difference [thrown] into flux" (374); the disconnection of gender from its constructed sphere ultimately indicates that "stable masculinity...must...find its solidity in anatomy" (Hendershot 374). This masculine necessity for solidity within anatomical roots suggests the transforming sexual licentiousness of women as transgressive, indicating a need for the predatory males to reassert their dominance. This reassertion arises respectively within Hardy's novel through Tess's rape and within Stoker's novel through his portrayals of overly-sexualized women and of Dracula's forced entrance into his female preys' necks. In consequence, each author directly relates

the reinstitution of masculine superiority with the actual act of killing and bloodshed, in which women are inevitably the victims.

In order to understand the implications of gender and social relationships within the predator/prey binary that Stoker and Hardy both activate, it is necessary to first understand that “an organism’s concern for its being nurtures cooperation, sociability, empathy, and altruism, while... [its association] with identifying one’s own being or one’s group’s being, its material flourishing, with the good... underwrites egoism, imperialism, and racism” (Wehrs 57). Wehrs’s indication of one being’s self-consideration as reliant upon identifying with another coexisting being, or group of beings with which the first being must cooperate, indicates the minimized social prospects of Victorian women. With the male gender as the female being’s only force with which to cooperate, women are illustrated as bereft of agency within both Hardy’s and Stoker’s texts. This paper will flesh out the linguistic indications of each genders’ role as predator or prey, the anxieties associated with transforming gender ideals and the New Woman in the late nineteenth century, and the immutable deprivation of agency from women. Through Hardy’s concretization of the masculine gender as a dominant and socially omnipotent force, Stoker is able to illustrate the potential women have for subverting the binary, although he ultimately indicates, as does Hardy’s text, the immutability of gender roles, as caused by the patriarchal limitations and predations enacted upon the females.

Hardy’s introduction of the female and of the lower social order in *Tess of the d’Urbervilles* subtly positions beings of lower socioeconomic classes and of the female gender beneath the shadows of predatory forces through his complicated description of The Vale, the region from which a lower-classed Tess originates. Hardy introduces The Vale as “known in former times as The Forest of White Hart...in which the killing by a certain Thomas de la Lynd of a beautiful white hart which the king had run down and spared [had occurred]” (18). Similarly, Stoker locates readers early on within his text through a setting described in terms of the novel’s first literal prey, Jonathan Harker’s interpretations:

[D]ark firs stood out here and there against the background of late-lying snow. Sometimes, as the road was cut through the pine woods that seemed in the darkness to be closing down upon us, great masses of greyness, which here and there bestrewed the trees, produced a peculiarly weird and solemn effect, which carried on the grim thoughts and fancies engendered earlier in the evening, when the falling sunset threw into strange relief the ghost-like clouds. (38-39)

Through his description of setting, Stoker employs language in conversation with Hardy, implicating, as Fry and Edwards paraphrase Darwin, an environment in which “individual[s] [try] to choke out others so that [they] and [their] progeny can survive” (44). Harker’s feeling of the “darkness...closing down upon him” indicates a sense of entrapment, causing him to further sense something “peculiarly weird and solemn” and to remember the “grim thoughts and fancies” which transpire as the sun sets. Harker’s location upon a narrow road “cut through the pine woods” suggests a very limited space in which prey can exist. Likewise, Hardy affiliates Tess’s physical origin with the killing of the white stag, an evident symbol for idealized femininity within Victorian society, following its physically exhaustive chase. By representing Tess and Harker within settings described through language indicative of, as Griffith designates, the “image of the trapped animal,” each author “represent[s] the malicious and destructive force of societal, as opposed to natural, laws” (86). Although these settings are described in light of their natural appearances, Hardy suggests the destructive societal law through the stag’s killer being punished monetarily for his transgression, while Stoker later illustrates it when the horses of his cab “[begin] to neigh and snort and plunge wildly” in Dracula’s presence (40). The authors’ constructions of the texts’ settings establishes the sense of confinement evoked by both class and gender within Victorian society, suggesting a “depiction of the limited, partial, and affectively charged perspective of human agents in a complex universe,” in which they struggle against culturally fabricated ideals (Keen 351).

Initially, Stoker signifies the disposition of the female gender in terms consistent with the victimized prey, illustrating, however more subtly than Hardy, the predetermined role of women within the predator/prey binary, as dictated by a patriarchal society. The novel commences with Jonathan Harker, as I have mentioned, whose physical location suggests that close attention be paid to his attributes. Aware of the anxieties revolving about transforming gender roles, Stoker imbues Harker’s journal with highly sensationalized language following the beginning of his occupancy at Dracula’s castle in Carfax, which illuminates the strong sensorial perceptions indicative of femininity: “I am beginning to feel this nocturnal existence tell on me. It is destroying my nerve. I start at my own shadow, and am full of all sorts of horrible imaginings. God knows that there is ground for any terrible fear in this accursed place!” (Stoker 65). Harker’s indication of his eroding nerves, his “horrible imaginings,” and his expectation of “any terrible fear” suggests an “[expansion of] the definition of masculinity to encompass feminine

traits” and indicates Harker’s effeminate nature (Hendershot 375). Stoker’s portrayal of Harker seems to subvert traditional gender roles by simultaneously expanding both the masculine predatory role to include Harker’s femininity and the feminine role of prey to include Harker’s biological sex; however, Stoker’s conflation of male and female, and of predator and prey, serves to reinstate the normative gender roles by isolating Harker and preventing his complete victimization. While Stoker utilizes Harker as narrator to simply imply women’s “[forms] of life... [as] determined...—not just predicated upon— [by] physical processes” (Cohn 496), Hardy actively engages in the language which illustrates the predator/prey binary more translucently between genders.

With the limitations Hardy indirectly places upon Tess in mind, as previously indicated through my reading of *The Vale*, Hardy positions Tess within a world less transgressive than that in *Dracula*, yet much more representative of the female gender’s physical roles and boundaries within Victorian society. Framed upon a historic hunting ground and within a country in which “some old customs of [departed forests] shades remain[,]...linger[ing] only in a metamorphosed or disguised form” (Hardy 18), Tess’s disposition indicates the “legend of the White Hart, of the hunted animal run down and spared...[as] imping[ing] ominously on the reality of [her] earliest childhood” (Griffith 88). Hardy situates Tess accurately within the socially-propagated, female gender’s role from her beginnings in life, indicating the inescapability that women, as victims, are subjected to. In addition to establishing Tess’s setting as correlative with hunting, Hardy describes the May-Day dance, constructed as a holiday during which homage is paid to the Ceres, the Roman goddess of agriculture (Hardy 18). By presenting women in celebration of femininity and of the lower class’s occupational duties of farming, Hardy indicates Tess’s “disconnect between subjective experience—not only the experience of conscience but also of subjectivity itself—and the rules of nature,” and ultimately implies patriarchy as the cause of female objectification (Cohn 498). Tess’s involvement in the May-Day dance positions her within the masculine gender’s socially prescribed role for women, in which they are equated with prey, as Hardy’s language indicates. Hardy describes the dance itself as necessarily “discerned” from the “old [customs]...[lingering,]...in a metamorphosed or disguised form,” suggesting the older conventions of hunting as still prevalent within society; furthermore, the dance is conducted “under notice” and in a “guise,” which implicates the dominating predatory male as the author, or founder, of gender roles. Critic Philip Griffith’s assertion, as aforementioned, indicates that socially constructed law,



rather than natural law, acts as a destructive force (86) and coincides with Huxley, a contemporary Victorian critic's paraphrased assertion that subjective experience and natural law "remain irreconcilable conceptions of existence, and that their very irreconcilability threatens the authority of human morals" (qtd. in Cohn 498). Hardy's representation of Tess as a confined woman illustrates, more immediately than Stoker, the victimized, female gender's role; Stoker, on the other hand, "invokes the disturbing mingling of male and female, masculine and feminine imagery" (Hendershot 379), which embodies the cultural anxieties regarding "the carnality that. . . [New] [W]omen represent" (Bolton 57).

Both Hardy and Stoker suggest the cultural understandings of the New Woman as "heroines who refuse to compromise," embodying "the remedial wifely role that prototypical New Women heroines had earlier relied on," which unsettles the male gender's comfortable role of social dominance and illustrates the cultural significances attached to the predatory nature of masculine subjects (Ross 77). In order to connect the significance of the New Woman with the predatory roles of men, an understanding of masculinity within the predator/prey binary is essential, which both Hardy and Stoker clearly portray. These highly predatory roles, of Dracula himself and of Alec d'Urberville, stand as true representations of both the treatment that women are subjected to and of, as Wehrs asserts, the "male will to power that, more than disciplining women, strikes at their will to live and, symbolically, against the life force itself" (61). Not only is the female gender subjected to social inequalities but also to a naturalistic physical violence.

Within Hardy's novel, the predator/prey relationship existing between men and women becomes blatantly literalized following an incident in which Prince, the Durbeyfield's horse, experiences a violent, unintended death as Tess holds his reins, which forces her to leave home for work, that she might aid her father in replacing Prince (41). Alec d'Urberville's blind mother, the Durbeyfield's newly discovered "rich relation" (Hardy 62), hires Tess to tend to her birds. When Tess takes up residency within the d'Urberville mansion, Hardy continually indicates, within the scenes that he locates Tess, her literal confinement as a preyed-upon being and her feeling of constant subjection to and scrutiny by the paternalistic gaze. Hardy places Tess "among the ivy boughs which [cloak] the garden-wall" where she sits when she becomes "aware of a movement" and "[beholds] a form springing from the coping to the plot" (74). Hardy's description of the "form springing," which Tess quickly acknowledges as Alec d'Urberville, calls upon language that connotes a predatory role. Although Cohn asserts that "*Tess* foregrounds animal suffering at



human hands rather than the unavoidable voracity of predation” (510), Hardy’s text rather suggests Griffith’s interpretation of “Tess...[as] the natural sensual animal” within the “fatalistically predetermined relationship” of predator and prey “from which she cannot escape” (93). Hardy indicates Tess’s active embodiment of a feminine, victimized being when Tess stands “at the window where the cages [are] ranged” (76). Hardy juxtaposes Tess with the bird cages in front of the window in order to indicate the physical limitations that both gender and social class have placed upon her. Oblivious to potential danger as she “[gives] her lesson,” Tess “[thinks] she [hears] a rustling behind the bed,” which ultimately alarms her (76). Hardy’s use of the word “rustling” seems to call upon the natural predator’s habitat, offering the predator himself a means with which to be concealed. In light of the cages’ indication of Tess’s disposition, Hardy still portrays her as “whistling by [them]” (Hardy 76) in an emotional state which we understand as bliss, “but even here, where she is most comfortably absorbed into nature, violence and hostility intrude...[becoming] a frightening symbol of the brutally unnatural forces that hounds Tess in her animal innocence” (Griffith 89). By maintaining within Tess a notion of internalized fear, as Alec methodically incites by essentially stalking her, Hardy reveals, as Yildirim asserts, “the domestic subjugation which [entraps] women in the household, keeping [them] dependent on male autonomy” (Yildirim 47); this dependency indicates Alec’s fulfillment of his role, although he has yet to wholly victimize her.

Just as Hardy fortifies Tess’s diminished vitality as an underprivileged, victimized woman within “a universe indifferent to human existence at best and openly hostile to it at worst” (Bonaparte 420), Stoker too asserts the socially-situated “biological determination [that] negate[s] autonomous human agency” (Cohn 496) within the predator/prey binary. Not only does Hardy implicate the female gender’s predisposition as a victim in the late nineteenth century, but he creates a conversational representation of gender in which Stoker engages through Lucy. This representation serves to reassert the Victorian female’s circumscription and impotency as determined by her social, sexual, and masculine counterpart. During an era marked with a “surprising dependence on the anxiety paradigm” (Ferguson 229) of gender, Stoker indicates the need of the male predator to forcefully emphasize his dominance over both “traditional femininity and the New Woman” (Prescott and Giorgio 489). Stoker portrays Count Dracula as the radicalized epitome of the masculine predator, which he succeeds in establishing through Dracula’s aesthetical appearance alone. Dracula’s physicality indicates an outward

display of his gender role, as society dictates it, which Stoker illustrates when Dracula smiles: “his lips [run] back over his gums, the long, sharp canine teeth [show] out strangely” (Stoker 53). The strangeness that Dracula’s protruding teeth invite follows Stoker’s pen into a variety of passages which he codes in terms of the victimized being’s perceptions of the predator. Harker describes his feelings upon discovering Dracula’s mode of exiting the castle by a window as immediately transforming into “repulsion and terror,” again suggesting the abnormal sensations Dracula provokes (Stoker 65). Through Stoker’s rendering of his appearance, Dracula is able to instill fear and disgust within Harker, indicating the radicalized, predatory nature of Dracula as even intimidating for other masculine predatory beings; Dracula’s ability to intimidate both the female and the male, along with his potential to victimize and transform either being, demonstrates the Victorian era’s “profit-oriented sexualization of female figures; and the consequent destabilizations of Victorian gender norms” (Pikula 284).

In establishing the sexual undertones of the predator/prey binary as relevant to the culturally-determined roles of gender within *Dracula*, an opportunity arises in which to interpret these same interconnected ideas within Hardy’s more explicit portrayal of them. Alec d’Urberville also embodies the sexually victimizing tendencies of the masculine predator; however, Hardy focuses more succinctly upon this literal sexual vein and its implications than Stoker does. The language Hardy implements suggests the dispositions of gender, the relationship between predator and prey, and the “[distinct] Victorian [monster’s]...[representation of] the dangerous return of repressed sexual desire” (Hendershot 378). We see these three pertinent aspects as most interactive within the scene prior to Tess’s inevitable victimization:

D’Urberville stopped the horse, withdrew his feet from the stirrups, turned sideways on the saddle, and enclosed her waist with his arm to support her. This immediately put her on the defensive, and with one of those sudden impulses of reprisal to which she was liable she gave him a little push from her. In his ticklish position he nearly lost his balance and only just avoided rolling over into the road, the horse, though a powerful one, being fortunately the quietest he rode. (Hardy 87)

When Alec “[withdraws] his feet from the stirrups,” Hardy “unhinges masculine and feminine traits from rigid Victorian explanations of them, yet subordinates them to a masculine ideal” (Hendershot 378), which suggests

both a physical and sexual power existing within the male gender. Alec's physical disconnection with his horse, along with his swiveling upon the saddle implies males' metaphorical address of the sexually promiscuous New Woman. When Alec "enclose[es] [Tess's] waist," he physically indicates the superiority of the masculine over the feminine, through which Hardy "displaces feminine sexuality and male desire alike, locating them not in the natural realm of human relations and human biology, but in a supernatural and diabolical one" (Bolton 59). Tess's immediate defensiveness to Alec's confinement of her, stemming from "one of those sudden impulses," culturally displaces her; as Bolton indicates, Tess's resistance to Alec undermines the submissive role that she is supposed to embody, simultaneously distancing her from the sexual agency associated with the New Woman. Furthermore, Hardy's description of Alec's "ticklish position" linguistically signifies both a moment of fleeting imbalance and of a sensitive, easily affected disposition (Oxford English Dictionary). On one hand, Tess's socially transgressive "reprisal" of Alec momentarily disconnects him from upholding the "proper gender definitions and behavioral expectations which keep the imperial [(feminized)] subject in place" (Kwan-Wai Yu 148); on the other hand, Hardy's diction further suggests Alec's temporary association with the traditional feminine being, who is understood to have a natural proclivity for sensitivity. Alec's brief state of chastisement leaves him temporarily static, until he realizes, through his "quietest" horse (a natural victim), that, although briefly stunned, he can inevitably reclaim the power of the masculine predator.

In portraying sexuality as increasingly deviant from normative, accepted structures when applied to the predator/prey binary, Hardy and *Dracula* comment upon the popularized nineteenth-century conception of sexual differentiation in light of a domineering predatory body that "threatens a two-sex world beset by issues of gender identity, [and that] [undermines] any naturalized sexual difference" (Hendershot 383). Each author illustrates, through their dominant predatory characters, the "decidedly patriarchal attitude toward feminine sexuality, sexual availability, and desire" (Bolton 60). In order to substantiate the sexual roles of each gender within their determined roles as either hunter or hunted, Stoker and Hardy infuse their texts with "phallic normalit[ies] necessary...to be the traditional male subject" (Hendershot 388). The obvious, and most telling, instance of phallic imagery arises just after Alec's unwelcome advancement upon Tess, as discussed above, in which she is literally sexually exploited. Upon beginning his return to the spot Tess sleeps, waiting, Alec walks through "thick darkness," and "he [is] obliged to advance with outstretched hands to avoid contact with the boughs" (Hardy 90). While searching for Tess,

described as “the exact spot from which he started,” Alec’s outstretched arms, situated by the fog in both physically and morally ambiguous situations, indicate a phallic association, which Hardy delineates through the male’s desire to possess and through “his...manners [which fail] to help him overcome” the constructed gender identifications of the era (Yildirim 50). Evidently bereft of morality upon finding Tess, Alec’s disposition under the rule of darkness and silence, and beneath “the primeval yews and oaks of The Chase” mirrors the phallic diction and imagery that Stoker employs to indicate masculinity’s determination and pervading fears throughout *Dracula* (Hardy 91).

As a highly-specialized, masculine predator, Dracula maintains respectively specialized sexual appetites and goals. Due to Dracula’s animalistic physicality and his vampirism, Stoker subtextually renders phallic images, rather than Hardy’s more direct approach, in order to accurately portray Dracula as the most extreme being within his pole of the binary. Stoker’s portrayal of Dracula’s dominant sexuality arises through a phallic image which simultaneously suggests his dominancy as predator: “The mouth, so far as I could see it under the heavy moustache, was *fixed* and rather *cruel-looking*, with peculiarly *sharp white teeth*; these *protruded* over the lips, whose remarkable ruddiness showed *astonishing vitality* in a man of his years” (Stoker 48, my italics). Stoker’s language in describing Dracula’s “fixed[,]...cruel-looking mouth” suggests his role as a masculine predator more than his role as sexually dominant, which he achieves by implementing language connotative of the predator; however, in order to understand the true significance of his sexual disposition, Stoker indicates that it is dually important to be aware of Dracula’s social and natural roles, which ultimately signify his sexuality as pertinent. After Stoker situates Dracula within his respective naturalized social sphere, he describes Dracula’s “sharp white teeth... portrud[ing],” which stand as a blatant phallic image (91). Similar to Alec’s arms reaching through the dark for Tess, whom he will eventually envelope and penetrate, Dracula’s teeth indicate his ability to enter his victims, namely women, which consequently places the preyed-upon being interminably under his control; in conjunction with the long-term implications of the male predator’s violation and predation of the women prey in *Dracula*, Tess’s life is essentially determined by the single moment of her exploitation. This point of inevitable masculine control, more specifically of masculine possession, which women are thrust into, finally signifies the description of Dracula’s lips: “The phallic metaphors—‘[protruded],’ ‘sharp,’—are complicated by the ‘[vital] lips,’ with their connotations of feminine beauty” (Hendershot 379).

By placing Dracula's feminized lips, often described as "lovely," "blood-stained," and "voluptuous," (Stoker 250, 252) beneath the explicitly phallic image of his "pointed teeth" (252) Stoker expresses the inherent subjugation of feminized prey by the invasive masculine predator. In addition to Hardy's and Stoker's associations of phallic images as tools designed to circumscribe victims, they both indicate, although Hardy does so indirectly, a development of consanguinity between the male/female and predator/prey binaries, suggesting an irreversible absorption of inferior beings by their presupposed superiors.

Both Hardy and Stoker introduce blood as an image that asserts the "oneness of nature" (*OED*), or the "consanguinity" of prey and predator, male and female alike. By indicating the unalterable blood relations which permeate the novels' representations of gender and the hunter/hunted binary, Stoker and Hardy position these binaries in a manner that suggests the female's unalterable attachment to the role of prey, as is dictated by patriarchy. Hardy's first portrayal of physical blood within the novel arises as Tess and her brother Abraham travel through the dark, journeying to a nearby town to sell beehives. While listening to the "wind [become] the sigh of some immense sad soul," which suggests her life as expropriated by masculinity even before she is raped, Tess falls asleep until a sudden stop arouses her (Hardy 41). Holding Prince's reins, Tess awakens to "[t]he pointed shaft of the cart [settled within] the breast of the unhappy Prince like a sword, and...his life's blood...spouting in a stream,...falling like a hiss into the road" (Hardy 41). Hardy utilizes the "pointed shaft of the [mail-]cart" to indicate, through phallic adumbration, the culturally-propagated role of the male gender as predator, which Hardy further asserts by illustrating the death of a horse, which is a natural being of prey (41). Through both Prince's violent impalement and Hardy's detailed description of Prince's blood leaving his body, Hardy "[depicts]...the limited, partial, and affectively charged perspective of human agents in a complex universe" (Keen 351). To further illustrate Tess's limited and charged perspective, Hardy writes, "she [becomes] splashed from face to skirt with crimson drops...[and stands] helplessly looking on" (42). Hardy essentially baptizes Tess in blood, demonstrating Tess's identification with prey, and, as Cohn states, "[blurring] the line between the human family and the broader form of consanguinity reconceived as suffering under [exploitation]" (510). Through the indication of blood exiting a being's body, due to the entrance of a phallic object, Hardy indicates the female gender's forced subjugation to the male gender, suggesting a consanguine relationship between women and other women, and between women and prey. Along with Hardy's

illustration of consanguinity within these culturally demarcated spheres, Stoker implements this same relationship within his text.

Although the nature of Stoker's representations of consanguinity appears to coincide with Hardy's, a consideration of the vampiric woman's asexuality proves necessary to interpret blood relation. The female vampire's asexuality illustrates "the horror and fascination of shifting gender norms," which begins "due to intellectual attempts to reformulate masculinity and femininity," as Hendershot asserts (374). Stoker suggests Lucy, Dracula's first victim within the novel, as transformed by Dracula's prerogative of acquiring "new victims and multiplying the evils of the world" (Stoker 252). After Dracula begins his predation of Lucy, Mina (Jonathan Harker's fiancée and later his wife) finds her near the ruined Abbey of the East Cliff, to where Lucy has walked in her sleep, and brings her home (Stoker 125). The following morning, Mina notices that "the skin of [Lucy's] throat [is] pierced...[with] two little red points like pin-pricks, and on the band of her nightdress [is] a drop of blood" (Stoker 127). When Dracula literally enters Lucy's veins and drinks from her blood, Stoker illustrates the puncturing of her skin by Dracula's phallic teeth, resulting in the drainage of her blood, which runs concurrently with Prince's death in Hardy's text. By portraying Lucy as a preyed-upon being through sexualized language, Stoker indicates Lucy's transforming sexuality, which Craft ascribes to the "anatomical displacements and the confluence of blood, milk, and semen [that] forcefully erase the demarcation separating the masculine and the feminine" (qtd. by Kwan-Wai Yu 148). Craft's assertion of "the confluence of blood, milk, and semen" serves to illustrate the interconnectivity of the predator/prey binary and that of the masculine/feminine. Stoker, as aforementioned, implicates sexuality within the act of Dracula victimizing Lucy, suggesting the transference of semen, which Tess literally receives in Hardy's text; however, Stoker replaces the masculine fluid with the alteration of Lucy's mind, which Dracula accesses and controls at will, connecting the two interminably. Similarly, the maternal symbol of milk metaphorically escapes from Lucy as she becomes prey, suggesting the emergence of her asexuality, as does the loss of her blood. As Dracula drains Lucy of her life source, Stoker indicates her utter despair as well as her victimization through "the roses in her cheek...fading," her daily weakening, and her "painful struggles for breath" (Stoker 130). In addition to Stoker's indication of Lucy's diminishing physical life, he also suggests the death of her promiscuity, her voluptuousness, and any "relation to traditional femininity and the New Woman" (Prescott and Giorgio 489); Stoker illustrates, through Dracula's voice, that his

(Dracula's) prey are "flesh of [his] flesh; blood of [his] blood; [and] kin of [his] kin" (328). Although Stoker indicates Lucy's predatory nature following her transformation, Lucy cannot be read as a subversion of the gender binary; by eternalizing Lucy as an animalistic being, Stoker indicates that Lucy now must live as an immortalized victim under Dracula's control while "[his] circle goes on ever widening" (Stoker 253).

Tess and Lucy alike, following their exploitation to the predations of masculinity, have no alternative but to live passively with the damage that both gender roles' attachment to cultural anxieties creates. The unalterable dispositions of these female characters essentially reflect Victorian society in the late nineteenth century, wherein women were "disrupting conventional gender definitions" (Kwan-Wai Yu 158). Rather than a disruption of the social order, the transforming feminine ideal, or rather the dissipation of this ideal, females worked against the omnipotent, predatory male and "an immeasurable social chasm...[dividing]...[the female's] personality" from the fabric of social order (Hardy 91). By strategically utilizing the predator/prey binary as a tool through which to convey the true roles for men and women during the late Victorian era, Stoker and Hardy are able to formulate texts around portrayals of naturalized gender identities, allowing each to write about the era's anxieties with freer language. Each author demonstrates an awareness of changing female gender roles as "positioned outside Victorian normativity" (Prescott and Giorgio 500), which suggests the writers' understanding of the challenges and alterations which society began to experience. Rather than setting his novel in a town or abroad, Hardy situates Tess within a small, rural space, which allows each gender's role to develop through Hardy's naturalistically violent language and through the implications of the geography's history. Similarly, Stoker demonstrates an acute awareness regarding "the actions of the emotions on and through human behavior," which he manifests by situating the cultural significations he discusses strictly upon the undead beings, avoiding mortal "tangles of unintended consequences and misunderstanding" (Keen 353). By separating social construction and human subjectivity, these authors are able to produce texts that accurately illustrate and explore human sexuality, human objectification, violent domestic and misogynistic crimes, as well as the simple opportunities available to each gender.

By removing both men and women from a "homosocial community" (Prescott and Giorgio 500), both Stoker and Hardy are able to write without "privileging [the] human at the expense of all other forms of animality" as McHugh writes (366). On the contrary, each decidedly embraces the animalistic renderings of each gender, calling upon "the



nature[s] of men to act according to their inherent aggressive tendencies” (Wyman and Dionisopoulos 33), which respectively locate each gender within a naturalized role. The predatory role that each author ascribes to masculinity implicates a negative force as incessantly trailing the feminine subject, which not only shows stalking in a natural sense, but in light of women who have been objectified, undermined, and abused for centuries. Stoker and Hardy indeed illustrate powerful renditions of each gender role within the context produced by the natural relationships between predator and prey, suggesting the men as savage, women as helpless, and society as a cruel, immutable force. The strong, logical connections made by Hardy and Stoker not only create an illustration of society that is more easily understood, but one that also seems to suggest a mirror reflection of the late nineteenth century.

### Works Cited

- Aikens, Kristina. “Battling Addictions In *Dracula*.” *Gothic Studies* 11.2 (2009): 41-51. *Academic Search Complete*. Web.
- Bolton, Matthew J. “Critical Contexts: *Dracula* And Victorian Anxieties.” *Critical Insights: Dracula* (2010): 55-71. *Literary Reference Center*. Web.
- Bonaparte, Felicia. “The Deadly Misreading Of Mythic Texts: Thomas Hardy’s *Tess Of The D’Urbervilles*.” *International Journal Of The Classical Tradition* 5.3 (1999): 415-431. *Religion and Philosophy Collection*. Web.
- Cohn, Elisha. “‘No Insignificant Creature’: Thomas Hardy’s Ethical Turn.” *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 64.4 (2010): 494-520. *Humanities International Index*. Web.
- Cole, Lucinda. “Introduction: Human-Animal Studies And The Eighteenth Century.” *Eighteenth Century: Theory & Interpretation (University Of Pennsylvania Press)* 52.1 (2011): 1-10. *Academic Search Complete*. Web.
- Ferguson, Christine. “Nonstandard Language And The Cultural Stakes Of Stoker’s *Dracula*.” *Elh* 1 (2004): 229-249. *JSTOR Arts & Sciences*. Web.
- Fry, Carrol L., and Carla Edwards. “Critical Readings: The New Naturalism: Primal Screams In Abraham Stoker’s *Dracula*” *Critical Insights: Dracula*: 138-152. Salem Press, 2010. *Literary Reference Center*. Web.
- Griffith, Philip Mahone. “The Image of the Trapped Animal in Hardy’s *Tess of the d’Urbervilles*.” *Tulane Studies in English* (1963): 85-94. *Galileo*. Web.



- Hardy, Thomas. *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*. 1891. New York: Barnes and Noble Classics, 2005. Print.
- Hendershot, Cyndy. "Vampire And Replicant: The One-Sex Body In A Two-Sex World." *Science Fiction Studies* 3 (1995): 373-398. *JSTOR Arts & Sciences*. Web.
- Keen, Suzanne. "Empathetic Hardy: Bounded, Ambassadorial, And Broadcast Strategies Of Narrative Empathy." *Poetics Today* 32.2 (2011): 349. *Advanced Placement Source*. Web.
- McHugh, Susan. "Modern Animals: From Subjects To Agents In Literary Studies." *Society & Animals* 17.4 (2009): 363-367. *Academic Search Complete*. Web.
- Oxford English Dictionary*. Galileo. Web.
- Pikula, Tanya. "Bram Stoker's *Dracula* And Late-Victorian Advertising Tactics: Earnest Men, Virtuous Ladies, And Porn." *English Literature In Transition, 1880-1920* 55.3 (2012): 283-302. *Academic Search Complete*. Web.
- Prescott, Charles E., and Grace A. Giorgio. "Vampiric Affinities: Mina Harker And The Paradox Of Femininity In Bram Stoker's *Dracula*." *Victorian Literature And Culture* 2 (2005): 487-515. *JSTOR Arts & Sciences*. Web.
- Ross, Kristin C. "Preparing The Girl For 'The Fight Of Life': Female Education And The New Woman In Ella Hepworth Dixon's *The Story Of A Modern Woman*." *Women's Writing* 19.1 (2012): 76-95. *Humanities International Index*. Web.
- Senf, Carol A. "'Dracula': Stoker's Response To The New Woman." *Victorian Studies* 26.1 (1982): 33. *Academic Search Complete*. Web.
- Stoker, Bram. *Dracula*. 1897. Toronto: Broadview Press, 1998. Print.
- Wehrs, Donald R. "Levinas, Cognitive Science, And Post-Darwinian Fiction: The Conundrum Of Conatus In Hardy's *Tess Of The D'ubervilles*." *Nineteenth Century Studies* 22 (2008): 57-74. *Biography Reference Bank (H. W. Wilson)*. Web.
- Wyman, Leah M., and George N. Dionisopoulos. "Primal Urges And Civilized Sensibilities." *Journal Of Popular Film & Television* 27.2 (1999): 32-40. *International Bibliography of Theatre & Dance*. Web.
- Yildirim, Aşkın Haluk. "The Woman Question And The Victorian Literature On Gender." *Ekev Academic Review* 16.52 (2012): 45-54. *Academic Search Complete*. Web.
- Yu, Eric Kwan-Wai. "Productive Fear: Labor, Sexuality, And Mimicry In Bram Stoker's *Dracula*." *Texas Studies In Literature & Language* 48.2 (2006): 145-170. *Biography Reference Bank (H. W. Wilson)*. Web.

