

THE LIGHTHOUSE

A Journal of Undergraduate Literary Research

Volume 2 • 2026

Editor

Ross Barnes

Faculty Advisor

Dr. Joe Shapiro

Thanks to all who contributed to this issue of *The Lighthouse*, especially all of the students who submitted papers, their faculty mentors, the Printing and Duplicating staff at SIU, and Dr. Mark Amos, Professor and Director of the School of Literature, Writing, and Digital Humanities. Special thanks to Terri Bowen, for the use of her original photography featured on the cover.

A publication of

The College of Liberal Arts

& The School of Literature, Writing, and Digital Humanities

at Southern Illinois University Carbondale

THE LIGHTHOUSE

A Journal of Undergraduate Literary Research

Table of Contents

Opposite Ends of the Spectrum: Opposing Views of Queer Love in Early Texts Madison Murphy	5
The Psychological Effect of Captivity in <i>Pamela</i> Makenna Mumbower	14
Pamela and Power for the Self Katrina Stanley	22
Race and Colonization in <i>The Island of Dr. Moreau</i> Mary Schellenberg	29
<i>Frankenstein</i> : Loss of Innocence as Consequence of Social Exclusion Kirsten White	35
The Myth of the Robinsonade Sarah Allen	42
Faith in Captivity: The Function of Scripture in Mary Rowlandson's Narrative Kaelin Natland	49

Madison Murphy

Opposite Ends of the Spectrum: Opposing Views of Queer Love in Early Texts

Early literary texts hold opposing views of queer love. This view is presented through subtext and is often disguised through magic. Magic allows two texts to explore similar themes in opposing ways. This is demonstrated in two specific texts: *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and "Bisclavret." In both stories, magic is used to highlight opposing views of queer characters. The texts explore queer relationships and put forth differing views on opposite ends of the spectrum of acceptance. Each text examines a viewpoint of queerness in a different direction but through the guise of magic. *A Midsummer Night's Dream* discreetly explores a queer relationship and then apologizes because that constitutes an offense to the audience. The play implies that queerness should be hidden within society and not openly explored. "Bisclavret," on the other hand, offers a view of how queerness should be accepted into society and that queer people are not monstrous like previously thought according to the rules of the story.

Helena and Hermia's relationship within the world of the play highlights the way that the play comments on its ideology, which includes the need to hide and apologize for queerness. Helena and Hermia's relationship is well hidden within the text and is only drawn out through careful interpretation. The queerness of their relationship is so well hidden that some scholars call it a platonic friendship, but the way that Helena speaks about Hermia supports other interpretations of their connection. Helena speaks of Hermia as if she is in love with her:

Your eyes are lodestars and your tongue's sweet air

More tunable than lark to shepherd's ear

When wheat is green, when hawthorn buds appear.

Sickness is catching. O, were favor so!

Yours would I catch, fair Hermia, ere I go.

My ear should catch your tongue's sweet melody. (1.1.184-193)

Helena's speech in act one, scene one is typically read as jealousy over Hermia's looks because she wants Demetrius to love her. In a queer reading of the play, it is understood that compulsory heterosexuality limits the sexual expression of women. With that knowledge, this scene can be read as Helena's first love confession to Hermia. This speech follows the rules of the play and hides the queer undertones within a longing to be like an object of desire. On a surface level read, this speech is a lamentation about not being beautiful enough to be an object of sexual desire. When examining between the lines to understand the queer relationship between Helena and Hermia, this becomes a confession of love. Furthermore, Helena spends a large chunk of her speaking lines not only in this scene, but also the rest of the play, talking about Hermia and how much she loves her.

The above referenced set of lines is not the only instance of hidden queer undertones within act one. Additionally, in the speech from act one Helena states, "O teach me how you look and with what art / You sway the motion of Demetrius' heart!" (1.1 196-197). These lines also have a double meaning. They can be read as heterosexual jealousy over a man, or it can be read as queer jealousy over a woman. The more convincing read of this speech states that Helena wants Hermia to teach her how she wooed Demetrius because she wants to woo Hermia. The last two lines are essentially Helena begging to know Hermia's love and her confession that she wants to love her.

While the evidence so far presents the queer love as the hopes of Helena solely, other evidence in the play gives suggestions to a past queer relationship between Helena and Hermia. Hermia responds to Helena later in the above described scene with evidence of her having loved Helena in the past, where Hermia states, "And in the wood where often you and I / Upon faint primrose beds were wont to lie, / Emptying our bosoms of their counsel sweet, / There my Lysander and myself shall meet (1.1.219-222). These lines are extremely telling about the relationship between the two. Hermia is taking the current person she is in a romantic relationship with, Lysander, to the same place that she used to meet Helena, a past love. The bed of primrose symbolizes a place where Hermia feels safe to openly be with a lover. The bed of primrose also happens to be in the woods which are symbolic of wild uncharted, even socially unacceptable territory. This speech is spoken about the sanctity that the woods have to offer for lovers which adds an additional layer of queerness. Eva Dalmaijer, a Literary Studies student at Utrecht University, explains the significance of the woods in the play:

The night and the general atmosphere of the wood allow for a contrast with lawful Athens: as soon as the lovers (Hermia and Lysander, as well as Helena and Demetrius who followed them) enter the wood, all laws and rationality disappear. This allows for the lovers' desires and passions to run free." (Dalmaijer 7)

Dalmaijer explains that the woods are part of the magic of the play. The woods allow for the lovers to truly express their feelings.

The specific use of the primrose flower also adds another layer to the relationship between the two girls. The word primrose is derived from the "Latin word 'primus', which means 'first.' So, many believe that it has a meaning of youth, renewal and optimism" ("Our Guide to the Meaning and Colour Symbolism of Primroses"). This is significant because the bed of primrose is where Hermia and Helena developed their first love. This is fitting because the relationship from Helena's perspective is read as an optimism to return to their love from their youthful years.

While the play tries to hide the relationship between Helena and Hermia in their youthful years, the play hides Helena's current love for Helena in analogies. Helena details how their love feels in act three, scene two:

Have with our needles created both one flower,
Both on one sampler, sitting on one cushion,
Both warbling of one song, both in one key,
As if our hands, our sides, voices, and minds
Had been incorporated. So we grew together
Like double cherry, seeming parted,
But yet in union in partition,
Two lovely berries molded on one stem;
So with two seeming bodies but one heart. (3.2.209-217)

This speech is typically thought of as Helena fighting for their friendship by reminding Hermia of their past friendship. This past friendship was actually a past romantic relationship as discovered in the above analysis. While that may be the surface read, the close reading of the speech reveals that there is a hidden subtext that hints at a queer connection between the two. Helena states that the two were

one in voices and minds. This is a strong description of a connection between two women. It hints at the deeper connections of the two girls that expand past a typical friendship. This alone is not strong enough to support a critical reading of this text, but the rest of the speech strengthens the argument. The next line in the speech refers to the lovers as double cherries. More specifically, double cherries that are separated by a stem. Not only is there sexual meaning in comparing a woman to a cherry, but the analogy becomes representative of the girls being held back by the boys when she describes the cherries as being “separated by the split stem.” Lysander and Demetrius are the split stem: They are the thing that stop the cherries from being one. It is fitting to describe the boys as one stem that split because the two characters become easily confused for one another and almost interchangeable within the play. Furthermore, this speech is bolder because it is set within the safety of the woods. Helena does not have to be as careful with her words in the woods: “The heteronormative patriarchy can potentially be challenged in the wood, which creates space that allows for queer, transgressive passions” (Dalmaijer 8). The woods allow Helena to be bolder in her speeches and confessions to Hermia because the rules and conventions of society are not as rigid under the magic of the woods. In addition to describing Helena and Hermia’s love in increasingly sexualized analogies, Helena tends to use vague language to hint at their love.

While the analogy of double cherries reveals a depth to Helena’s feelings towards Hermia, the specific use of vague language also lends ambiguity to keep the queer relationship from being explicit to the audience. Helena’s language in act three leans into the idea of queerness as an undertone: Helena states, “He followed you; for love, I followed him” (3.2.327). This line when broken down does not reveal from whom the love is given. We know that Demetrius follows Hermia, Helena searches for love, and that Helena follows Demetrius from this sentence. The comma implies that the two ideas are closely linked, but they are not the same idea. This leaves room for the audience to speculate that Helena is confessing that she yearns after Demetrius so the love between Helena and Hermia is not discovered. It was not accepted in this time for women to love other women. Therefore, Helena and Hermia’s love had to stay a secret. This quote highlights the power dynamics at play within the play.

While there are many instances throughout the play that establish the queer love story between Helena and Hermia, all of that is lost in the last scene of the play. Act five, scene one falls victim to the idea presented throughout the play that there is a need to hide queer love. For instance, the two girls are coupled off to the two boys. This double heterosexual, supernaturally blessed

coupling diminishes the sexual expressions of the two girls and emphasizes the importance of offspring carrying on the power of the patriarchy. Melissa E. Sanchez, a professor at the University of Pennsylvania, further solidifies this analysis in her paper on Helena and Hermia's relationship: "Helena's exchanges with Demetrius and Hermia reveal that women's unapologetically perverse desires--whether for women or for men--can threaten ideals of proper, 'normal' sexuality" (Sanchez 506). This threat must be squashed or apologized for before the audience is allowed to return to their lives. The play recognizes this and solidifies the idea that queerness is something that needs to be apologized for with Puck's soliloquy at the end of act five, scene one. Puck apologizes for the potential offense of the audience. The word "if" is thrown into the apology because the play never explicitly states that the two girls were in a relationship (5.1.440). The idea of queerness as a typical part of society is so unacceptable that the play never explicitly claims the two as queer characters, or states what it is apologizing for. Dalmaijer further comments on the ability of the play to stretch the idea of what is acceptable within the confines of a dream: "The play's magical character allows for an escapist 'dream' in which anything can happen without judgment, in which sexuality can be explored safely and without consequences" (Dalmaijer 6). There are no consequences because Puck's apology positions the entire play as a dream that needs to be apologized for. This reality is crushed when the audience is lifted from the dream and returned to reality.

While *A Midsummer Night's Dream* spends five acts explaining that queer relationships need to be hidden, "Bisclavret" only takes six pages to fully illustrate that queer relationships do not have to be hidden in society. Though, similarly to *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, this is explained solely through subtext. While queerness was not openly acceptable, the story of "Bisclavret" provides an argument in favor of acceptance.

"Bisclavret" starts by commenting on the general consensus of the people within the story and introduces the queer character in an analogous generalization. The story paints the species of Bisclavret as dangerous. The equivalent ideology is that queer people are dangerous to the traditional way of life. The text explains that the Bisclavret attack people: "It hasn't happened lately, but then every once in a while some men were transformed into werewolves and went into the forests where they spent their lives doing mischief. They would eat anybody they happened to meet" (Slavitt 47). The woods, as established earlier in this essay, are a place where magical things happen. The transformation of a man into a Bisclavret is a magical instance. The transformation and magic, as established, position Bisclavret as a queer character who is threatening to the

people's way of life. It is also important to note that this dangerous sentiment is not entirely supported by the text over the course of the story. Bisclavret does not attack anyone in the story outside of his cheating wife and her adulterous partner: "There must be some reason for what he has just done. He has to have some kind of grudge against her and her husband. Judge his case as you would that of a man. Question the lady and see if you can find some reason for his rage" (53). The idea was a false pretense under which the story originally started, but through knowing Bisclavret within the king's court, the citizens discover that he is not violent without good reason. This false pretense that the citizens of the story were under help to highlight the story's central message that queer characters, like Bisclavret, deserve to reside within the society because they are not dangerous to the society's way of life.

While the hidden transformation of Bisclavret does not solely mark Bisclavret as a queer character, his disregard for revenge on his wife and his relationship with the king positions their relationship as potentially queer. After Bisclavret becomes stuck in his transformed state, he does not care about getting back to his wife. She betrays him and he did not try to seek revenge before this according to the information presented in the story: "A year came and went" (51). He did not go back to his house to kill his wife. He simply lived in the woods in his transformed body. Furthermore, he did not try to fight back when the king and his people tried to hunt him:

The hounds picked up his distinctive scent and followed him wherever he went. They were about to leap and tear him to bits but arriving there was the king, whom Bisclavret espied. The werewolf ran up to his side, took hold of his stirrup, and kissed his shoe, which beasts in the woods don't often do. (51).

Instead, he begged the King for mercy because he was the King's previous companion: "He was noble and handsome, too. He advised his lord and was one of the few to whom he listened with great attention" (47). Bisclavret was calling on a friend, or previous lover, for help in his time of need. He and the King were not strangers; they were close enough friends for people to recognize Bisclavret as a person who the King paid attention to. Furthermore, once he was the King's companion again, he could have led the King to the wife, but he did not. Bisclavret only wanted to be the King's companion during this time. He has completely thrown out all regard for his adulterous wife.

Bisclavret is not just a companion to the King, but he is arguably the closest person to the King after his transformation. Bisclavret even sleeps within

the same room as the King: “It kept watch at night while his majesty slept” (52-53). This crosses the boundary of just being close companions. Dr. Emily McLemore, a Lecturer with the Foundation Year Programme, specializes in Old and Middle English language and literature as well as gender and sexuality studies. McLemore further comments on the deeper meaning of Bisclavret sleeping by the king: “Notably, he sleeps close by the king, seemingly closer than the knights because he is the king’s beloved companion, which allows him additional and more intimate access to the king’s body in his bed, a space connected with sexual intimacy through the recollection of Bisclavret’s marriage bed” (McLemore 19). Additionally, their intimate companionship does not stop solely at the sleeping arrangements. The people think that they are close as well: “the king enjoyed it although he tended toward those who excused what his animal friend did” (Slavitt 52). It is important that the text specifies that the town only perceived them as friends. That does not mean that they are friends in reality. Taking into consideration that the two slept in the same room, it is plausible that they were closer than friends.

This fictional account of a king sleeping in the same room as a close male companion is not out of the ordinary for the time period. Roger of Howden documented the same thing in his diaries during 1853 and 1869: “Richard, count of Poitou, remained with the king of France, against the will of his father [Henry II], and the king of France held him in such high esteem that every day they ate at the same table and from the same dish, and at night the bed did not separate them” (Rhodes 3). This is from a journal written about Richard the Lionheart in the late 1100s. While this may not be written about the same king as the King in “Bisclavret,” the parallels are strikingly similar. It is particularly important to note that the journal was not written in a negative light. This makes it outside the norm of writings of the time because the journal itself supports the idea that queerness at the time did not have to be hidden as strictly for royalty. While Bisclavret may not be based on the actual account of Richard and the king of France, both of their stories cover the same topic and suggest a queer relationship between the respective couples. Some scholars have made this distinction explicit: “My intent is not to claim beyond all doubt that the relationship was sexual, but to demonstrate that it was suggestively framed as such by chroniclers favourable to Richard and his family” (4). “Bisclavret” is trying to do the same thing. The text is not explicitly saying that Bisclavret is queer or in love with the King, it is just trying to suggest in a positive light and a suggestive frame that explores a world

in which queer people do not have to hide behind a crown to love freely.

Not only does Bisclavret share a bed with the King, but he undergoes his transformation hidden within the King's private bed chambers. What is already depicted as a vulnerable moment occurs within the King's bed chambers, and it is suggested by a citizen to give Bisclavret time during this private and vulnerable moment: "Put him in your room with this bundle and we shall learn what is the matter. If he has privacy, that may be enough. We'll see." The king took this advice and put the wolf in his bedroom" (Slavitt 54). After Bisclavret's vulnerable transformation in the bed chambers of the person he shares a bedroom with, he ends up in the King's bed as if it is normal for him to do: "Two hours later two barons and he entered the chamber quietly to find Bisclavret on the bed, asleep" (Slavitt 54). This suggests that Bisclavret was not out of place in the bed. He had no problem crawling into the King's bed without permission. Furthermore, when the King entered the room, he "embraces him. They weep together in their joy" (54). Crying for men in this time is very personal and intimate. Essentially, Bisclavret is accepted by not only the King, but the King's court. The story uses the magic transformation as an allegory for queerness. The story paints an argument that queer people should be accepted into society without hiding them away in the forest.

While each play has elements of magic that coincide with queerness, the presentation of queerness highlights the opposing ways the texts feel about the topic. *A Midsummer Night's Dream's* magic system apologizes for even suggesting that queerness could be an acceptable form of love. "Bisclavret," on the other hand, makes the argument that queerness is an acceptable form of love. These two stories use magic in similar ways to illustrate differing viewpoints on the same topic thread. Magic is an indicator of things that are not acceptable to directly talk about in societies. That is why the queerness is a subtext that must be carefully examined within each story. While it takes careful reading to extract, the underlying story is clear once examined. The same can be said about the two stories opposing views of queerness: they are clear cut.

Works Cited

- Dalmai, Eva. *A Queer Reading of William Shakespeare's A Midsummer Night's Dream*. June 2019, pp. 7–14 (Bachelors Thesis).
- McLemore, Emily. "Queer Bodies, Sexual Possibility, and Violent Misogyny in Bisclavret." *Le Cygne (Richmond, Va.)*, vol. 7, 2020, pp. 9–32.
- Rhodes, Hilary. "Richard the Lionheart, Contested Queerness, and Crusading Memory." *Open Library of Humanities*, vol. 9, no. 1, Jan. 2023, pp. 1–20.
- Sanchez, Melissa E. "'Use Me But as Your Spaniel': Feminism, Queer Theory, and Early Modern Sexualities." *PMLA: Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, vol. 127, no. 3, 2012, pp. 493–511.
- Shakespeare, William. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Edited by Barbara A Mowat and Paul Westine, August 2004 ed., New York, Washington Square Press, 1993.
- Slavitt, David R. *The Lays of Marie de France*. 1st ed., Athabasca University Press, 2013.

Makenna Mumbower

The Psychological Effect of Captivity in Pamela

Samuel Richardson's *Pamela* was renowned as one of the most popular books of the eighteenth century; the epistolary novel elucidates the shortcomings of the British class system while also speaking on bigger issues of oppression. Captivity is not the only example of mistreatment in the novel *Pamela*, but it is a pertinent matter worth discussing. The act of captivity is inhumane and a form of abuse no matter the degree. Since the seventeenth century, captivity narratives infiltrated America and Europe and continued to be of popular relevance until late into the nineteenth century. The titular Pamela, a mere child from a lower-class family, endures moments of sexual propositioning, harassment, violation, and other behaviors that occur while in Mr. B's service. This novel showcases not only the physical abuse of a lower-class woman but also the internal struggles associated with the immoral treatment she was subjected to at the hands of a high-class man. Pamela's journey and situation express the internal and external thoughts and feelings of isolation, loss of autonomy, and the reactions to stress that are evoked by captivity. I argue that Pamela was psychologically affected during her time in captivity, which was detrimental to her being, and caused her to ultimately transform into an unrecognizable character in the end.

Pamela's initial situation reveals the importance of social class standings to her self-conception. Pamela embodies the qualities that were the standard for women in the eighteenth century; these are made evident at the novel's start when Pamela writes home to her parents. As mentioned, Pamela is a staggeringly beautiful fifteen-year-old girl who works in the service of a kind Lady. The first letter written by Pamela, addressed to her parents, details the sadness that has recently overcome her due to her Lady passing away. Mr. B, the son of the recently deceased Lady, takes over the household and not only takes an interest in Pamela, but quickly develops an obsession with her. This attraction places Pamela in a lose-lose situation, but through these moments she demonstrates her personal values and traits. Adrian Brunello and Florina-Elena Borşan articulate the belief that characters, such as Pamela, are influenced by two factors that make up behavior: inner private beliefs, and the response to societal pressures (324). Pamela's inner beliefs stem from the standards of society which are reiterated and maintained by the words of her parents. The

importance of virtue is a central belief in Samuel Richardson's novel *Pamela; or, Virtue Rewarded*, as the subtitle emphasizes, and is an ongoing strain that troubles Pamela throughout the novel.

For Pamela's characterization change to be examined and established, her core "make-up" must be discussed to lay the foundation of the argument. Pamela's belief regarding virtue has been alluded to previously, but many other elements make up this complex yet realistic character. Nijia Zhang and Yanhong Fan discuss the mold women of Pamela's time were supposed to fit into. They examine the evident qualities of Pamela such as her humble nature, her faithfulness to her religion, and her unwavering respect for her family. These qualities form the concept of virtue which was highly enforced on women at this time (Zhang and Fan 453). The expectation of maintaining virtue was a crucial factor concerning the institution of marriage. Women, especially those of the lower class, were conditioned to preserve their virtue to be considered of value. This is evident when Pamela's parents write "Arm yourself, my dear Child, for the worst; and resolve to lose your Life sooner than your Virtue" (Richardson 20). Pamela's mother warns her about the importance of maintaining virtue and believes she should lose her life before losing her virtue. These words demonstrate the drastic extent women would take to meet society's expectations. Pamela is portrayed to be intelligent, as shown by her letters, which detail her life and the turmoil she feels every step of the way. Pamela connects internal thoughts to the situations she encounters, which gives the audience a strong sense of her being and morals (LaPorta 11). These qualities mixed with Pamela's beauty draw Mr. B to her; this begins the deterioration process of Pamela's character and more so her psychological state.

Mr. B's character initially occupies the antagonist's position, but his role completely shifts by the end of the novel. Mr. B is the key factor to inspect when looking at the psychological effects of captivity. Pamela perceives her first few interactions with her new Master as genuine kindness, but she soon finds this not to be the case. The first instance of mental manipulation by Mr. B is when his sister, Lady Davers, visits the estate and takes an interest in Pamela (Richardson 16). Lady Davers wishes for Pamela to work in her service, and Mr. B "grants" this idea. When the time comes for this exchange to happen, Mr. B snaps and refuses to let Pamela leave. This is the moment that reveals the underlying intentions of Mr. B, which are progressively made more clear throughout the text (Pan 84). Mr. B's actions begin as subtle flirtations and

manipulations, but they escalate into verbal, physical, and psychological abuse that Pamela is forced to endure.

Examining the first instances of abuse in *Pamela* is effective for this argument because it introduces the internal change that Pamela undergoes throughout her captivity. This development evokes many emotions in Pamela, including feelings of anxiety, stress, and other reactions relating to her unfortunate situation. This is first illustrated when Mr. B follows Pamela into the garden at the summer house. During this interaction, Mr. B forcefully kisses Pamela multiple times and when she tries to run, he traps her. The dominating energy of Mr. B is concerning for many reasons, but mainly because of the reaction Pamela has towards it. When asked if Mr. B has ever caused her harm, Pamela says, “You have taught me to forget myself” (Richardson 23). Looking at these words with a psychological lens, the quotation’s initial meaning is transformed into something more introspective. Pamela expresses clearly that Mr. B causes her to stray from herself and her beliefs. The excerpt indicates Pamela’s reliance on virtue, and that without it she would not be herself. This response is triggered not only by this specific event, but the compiled abuse and manipulation Pamela has experienced during her time in Mr. B’s service. Mr. B does not let this interaction slow his motives--if anything, they grow stronger.

The early treatment of Mr. B is significant when comparing it to his demeanor towards the middle of the book when he takes on the role of a physical capturer. The abuse exerted by Mr. B takes on a more aggressive and dominating form the longer Pamela stays in his service. After the disturbing interactions Pamela has had with Mr. B, Pamela’s perceptions of the estate begin to feel unsafe and torturous. John Leach concludes that torture can only occur when the cruel act is deliberately intended and carried out with a purpose (2). Mr. B’s abuse is intended to weaken Pamela and her strong hold on her virtue. Mr. B’s intentions are clear, and his actions can be seen as a form of torture, particularly when he takes Pamela into captivity. This occurs when Pamela plans to leave Mr. B’s service and return home to her parents. Mr. B is willing to let Pamela leave and offers her his carriage, which is going to take her home. Pamela is unassuming of any ill intent at this moment. Similar to Mr. B’s inability to let Pamela leave to work for his sister, he tricks Pamela and has her taken to his country house where she is completely cut off from the outside world.

Pamela's psychological state is significantly altered during the extreme captivity that Mr. B has forced her into. Mr. B has the ultimate power in this situation because he is now in seclusion with Pamela and does not feel the constraints of his title as he did before. Knowing Mr. B's manner is becoming more forceful and outwardly perceived, Pamela is placed in an even more harmful environment than before. Pamela had access to her parents and was able to confide in Mrs. Jervis while initially experiencing Mr. B's abuse. Now, she is forced to rely on her harasser to meet her basic needs such as food and sleep, giving Mr. B absolute control (Jukić et al. 1). The decision to move Pamela into physical confinement is made to demoralize Pamela and her virtue, which is now more accessible in this setting. Leach examines the effects of confinement and remarks that this psychological assault can destroy the captive's personality and cognitive functions (4). This could be due to stress which is evident in Pamela because she is constantly worried about the control she does not have in this situation (O'Mara 74). Pamela's personality is not completely destroyed but rather altered and broken down while experiencing Mr. B's coercion.

Isolation is a major factor in Pamela's psychological strain while in captivity. She is isolated physically, mentally, religiously, and emotionally. When Pamela arrives at the Lincolnshire estate, she is introduced to Mrs. Jewkes, the housekeeper. Mrs. Jewkes follows all of Mr. B's commands and functions as his ally. Mrs. Jewkes imposes isolation on Pamela by keeping her closely restricted at all times. This is taken to an extreme extent, which can be seen when Pamela is locked in a room and forced to share a bed with Mrs. Jewkes every night. Pamela is not allowed to walk through the house without Mrs. Jewkes by her side and is not permitted to speak to the servants in the house. This situation makes Pamela so miserable that she wishes for death. Pamela says, "let the Maids carry me up to my Prison; and there let me die decently, and in Peace!" (Richardson 177). Pamela's isolation affects her well-being and drives her to desire death rather than prevent it. Although Pamela is never physically alone, she is isolated from talking to her family, which exacerbates her feeling of loneliness due to the fact she has no access to anyone she can trust. Pamela's past experiences make it extremely hard for her to develop connections and trust with new characters (Jukić et al. 2). This isolation conditions Pamela to rely solely on her morals when making decisions which waver at times. Pamela's loss of autonomy is also another developed factor during her isolation which furthers the change in Pamela's character.

Pamela's loss of autonomy is significant to this argument because it develops the idea of identity loss within her character. Pamela has already expressed the feelings of "losing herself" during her first physical altercation with Mr. B. This feeling occurred because Pamela felt powerless. Pamela tries to regain her power by escaping the confinement. This turns into a physically painful journey and has effects on her mental state. Pamela expresses that she feels defeated and says, "[My] Mind just broken, and a Heart sensible to nothing but the extreme Woe and Dejection" (Richardson 175). While these words do not explicitly state that Pamela is giving up, it can be inferred that she is now feeling hopeless and straying from her core values. Peter LaPorta discusses the power struggle between Pamela and Mr. B and believes this occurs in Richardson's writing to voice the effects that male dominance has on the female mentality (15). This is evident throughout *Pamela* because the actions committed by Mr. B are used to subject Pamela to his authority. Pamela's time in captivity changes her thought process. She states that she feels she is now her "worst enemy" (Richardson 175). This idea of Pamela being her own enemy is not her own, Mr. B tells her early on that "you are your own enemy" (31). This moment shows Pamela's power slipping away from her and how Mr. B's tactics are affecting her mindset. Mr. B causes Pamela to rethink her values, manipulates her into feeling like the "bad guy," and ultimately transforms her into someone unrecognizable.

The most notable difference seen in Pamela at the end of the novel is her reaction to Mr. B's advances. In the beginning, Pamela resists Mr. B on all accounts which is propelled by her strong ideology pertaining to virtue and morals. Pamela is always terrified of Mr. B and refers to him by using unappealing names such as "his Wickedness" (23). When Mr. B makes physical advances toward Pamela while at the original estate, she has a bodily reaction that exemplifies the extreme feelings towards her circumstances. One example is when Pamela goes unconscious in a "Fit with my Frights and Terror" when Mr. B attempts to possibly rape her (32). This disturbing moment solidifies Pamela's early feelings towards Mr. B. While these early pieces of evidence do not take place while Pamela is in physical captivity, it is clear there was mental captivity occurring. Jukić and others explore the act of captivity and consider what this term actually means. Captivity possesses one trait that differentiates it from being considered a traumatic event which is the fact that captivity is repeated traumatization that lasts for months and possibly years (Jukić et al. 3). Pamela remains in physical captivity for many weeks, but she does eventually get to be

“free.” While she is technically considered physically unrestrained in the end, it can be argued that she never escapes the psychological enslavement of Mr. B. Pamela’s mind experiences a lot of trauma and it is quickly noticed how she is changing, especially her reactions to Mr. B’s coercions.

Pamela persists in upholding her morals, which becomes her priority throughout the novel. This resilience is Pamela’s most prominent quality and is a clear indication of her character. It has been established that Pamela endured abusive treatment which negatively impacted her physically and mentally. It has also been made known that Pamela reacted troublingly to the repeated advances of Mr. B and claimed to have feared him. Now, Pamela’s change in attitude and belief will be discussed to make the argument that she has become an unrecognizable character. There is a moment where Pamela is terrified to get undressed for bed because she is worried her Master will come in and undo her. What she says during this interaction is more the focus; Pamela says, “No Husband in the World, said I, shall make me do an unjust or based thing” (Richardson 194). The way Pamela speaks in this moment is clear, and she is making it known that she would never marry someone like Mr. B, which is interesting to read knowing that Pamela accepts Mr. B’s proposal not long after this encounter.

Pamela’s feelings towards her abuser change only when he states he feels completely different about her after she rejects him a final time. Mr. B seems to completely change, and the love he has for Pamela turns into hate. Some readers attribute Pamela’s changes in character to be a response to Mr. B’s “development.” With a different take, LaPorta argues that there was no moral development in Mr. B, making this another possible manipulation tactic (23). This theory fits with the argument being made because Pamela’s justification for changing her mind about Mr. B does not make sense. Mr. B allows Pamela to leave but when she is about to go, she begins to feel an unexpected emotion towards the thought of parting from her Master. The phenomenon, that occurs when the victim falls in love with the captor, is called Stockholm Syndrome and which Pamela could have developed. Pradeep Kumar examines the symptoms of this condition which include: positive feelings towards the captor, supporting the captor’s behavior and justifying it, and the belief in the goodness of the abuser (3-4). Pamela exhibits all the symptoms that lead to the idea she has developed Stockholm Syndrome. Yefei Pan believes this unconventional acceptance is a psychological strategy that Pamela used to find stability, an uncommon feeling to her (85). It is possible that Pamela was in captivity for so long that she could not imagine being free.

She may have rejected her freedom because it brought more uncertainty than her isolation. Not only do Pamela's emotions change, but so do her beliefs and morals which she so strongly upheld while in captivity.

Once again, Pamela's unwillingness to give into temptation and lose her virtue makes her character so renowned and powerful. This quality shifts when she accepts Mr. B's marriage proposal. While this choice does not technically disregard her virtue, Pamela seems to ignore all moments of the past and marry the one person who has caused her the most pain. Her views and focus are then changed by this union. Pan argues that Pamela's writing transitions to a voice that caters to Mr. B's expectations and demands (86). In the journal, after Mr. B and Pamela are married, there is a lack of quality that was present in Pamela's letters. She is like a shell of a person. Angelina Dulong argues that this sudden change is due to Pamela growing up (30). That may be a small portion of the reason for this change, but it lacks any investigation into Pamela's psychic state which is crucial. It has been interesting to analyze the shift in this unlikely relationship and the most plausible reason would be that Pamela endured so much abuse that she became psychologically affected and ultimately an unrecognizable character.

Pamela's journey and situation express the internal and external thoughts and feelings of isolation, loss of autonomy, and the reactions to stress that are evoked by captivity. I argue that Pamela was psychologically affected during her time in captivity, which was detrimental to her being, and caused her to ultimately transform into an unrecognizable character in the end. Throughout the novel, her resistance is slowly dismantled by sustained emotional manipulation, forced isolation, and repeated trauma. Her values, once firm and central to her identity, become distorted as she adapts to survive under Mr. B's control. Rather than a tale of "virtue rewarded," Pamela's story becomes a haunting exploration of how abuse can alter the mind and rewrite a person's sense of self. By the end of the novel, Pamela accepts her role as Mr. B's wife, but this conclusion reveals the lasting impact of her captivity and psychological manipulation, highlighting the extent to which her identity has been altered.

Works Cited

- Dulong, Angelina. "'I am Pamela, her own self!': Psychosocial and Moral Development in Samuel Richardson's Pamela." *BYU Scholars Archive*, 6 April 2020.
- Jukić, Melita, et al. "Long-Term Consequences of War Captivity in Military Veterans." *NCBI*, 10 July 2023.
- Kumar, Pradeep. "Stockholm Syndrome: An Understanding." *Journal of Psychosocial Wellbeing*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2022, pp. 1-4.
- LaPorta, Peter J. "The Psychological Effects of Patriarchy and Courtship: Eighteenth Century Women's Mentalities in Pamela and Clarissa." Digital Commons at Buffalo State, May 2020.
- Leach, John. "Psychological factors in exceptional, extreme and torturous environments." *Extreme Physiology & Medicine* vol. 5, no. 7, 1 June 2016, pp. 1-15.
- O'Mara, Shane. "The Captive Brain: Torture and the Neuroscience of Humane Interrogation." *QJM: An International Journal of Medicine*, vol. 111, no. 2, February 2018, pp. 73-78.
- Pan, Yefei. "From Imprisonment to Reconciliation — The Stockholm Syndrome of Pamela." *Studies in Art and Architecture*, vol. 3, no. 2, 2024, pp. 83-86. *Pioneer Publisher*.
- Samuel Richardson, *Pamela*, Ed Keymer, Oxford World's Classics, 978-0199536498.
- Zhang, Nijia, and Yanhong Fan. "An Analysis on the Psyche of Richardson's Pamela." *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, vol. 5, no. 2, February 2015, pp. 452-456.

Katrina Stanley

Pamela and Power for the Self

In Samuel Richardson's 1740 epistolary novel, *Pamela; or, Virtue Rewarded*, Pamela's life is controlled by people around her, so her only real resolution for her freedom is to write through her feelings. In every area of her life, including the important domains of self-discipline, empowerment of the self, and actualized power, she is able to gain ground over Mr. B when her physical autonomy is denied. While I disagree with critics' sentiments that Pamela is trying to seduce Mr. B with her writings and personality in a sort of "hard to get" way, I do agree that this is what ultimately draws her to him and gives Mr. B feelings of empathy towards Pamela in the first place (Berg 118). Her actualized power over Mr. B does not come until he actually reads what she has written; beforehand, it serves only her personal purposes and as a threat to Mr. B's reputation. In that sense her voice is a direct threat to Mr. B's power over her, and is the direct reason for her being able to marry Mr. B. Her virtue isn't taken and she can finally return home, and makes her own decision to return, leading to her rise in society. Her writings also serve to reinforce her own beliefs in her "virtue" and in her religious teachings. Despite the fact that Pamela's writing is the reason for Mr. B's taking notice of her and in turn her troubles in the first place (Conboy 82) it shows her perseverance and the need to have her voice heard to the correct recipients. Pamela eventually gained what she wanted, and in a twist ending she realizes she loves him, and is able to get everything she wanted, owed all to her ability to put together a narrative.

Pamela's writing serves as the conduit for her realizing her own self and communicating this to her parents. The primary reason for the letters being sent is to communicate this information to them, but her letters eventually turn into a journal in which she records her own thoughts, not knowing if they would reach her intended recipients (her parents) or not (Chung 1055). Pamela does continue writing after her letters become one journal and even expresses interest in her story being entertaining enough to become a novel someday: "Well, my story surely would furnish out a surprising kind of novel, if it was to be well told" (Richardson 246). This wording is used by the author to reference the fact that the story did in fact become a novel, as well as used by Pamela to convey the power of her writing (Conboy 82; Blanchard 97). Pamela acknowledges the fact that her story is captivating and is able to see that in action later when

Mr. B reads it and changes his mind about her, letting her go and make her own choices. She is also able to absorb and process these moments and allow herself time to go over the details. I believe it is best put by Dell Belew when they said that “Pamela protects herself, not by virtuous refusals but by her pen, the same device which created her need for self-preservation in the first place (174).” I do believe that she is attempting to protect herself by refusing Mr. B, but the writing is far better at it. She is able to have actual ownership over her work, so much so that it is seen as a threat to the people around her, namely, Mr. B. Would Pamela’s life have been easier and far less complicated without the addition of her writing to it? Yes, then Mr. B would not have gone to the lengths he had in order to make sure she had no outlet in order to write.

However, it would have lost Pamela her only avenue towards her self-expression and one of the only things she can truly call her own besides her belongings on her person. Before Pamela’s wedding day, she contemplates the situation around her marriage: “To be sure, poor Gentleman, he must have some concern, as well as I; for here he is going to marry a poor foolish unworthy girl, brought up on the Charity, as one may say, of his worthy family!” (Richardson 339). Pamela starts off this entry by being self-aware of her circumstances and acknowledging the hardships that the couple may experience by being from two different social classes, and she wallows a bit in her self-doubt. Later on, Pamela resolves to help him: “I can only do the best I can, and pray to God to reward him, and to resolve to love him with a pure heart...” (339). She is able to absorb the information, feel the emotions she is feeling, write a compelling story about what may happen to Mr. B when he marries Pamela, and resolve herself to become the best companion to Mr. B that she can be.

Her self-discipline within the novel is to be admired, no matter what her ends were. The novel starts and ends as addressed to her parents, in an effort to keep them up to date on what is happening in her life. As previously mentioned, her letters transitioned to her own purposes, and this includes references to her virtuous nature and her need to keep it and not allow Mr. B to take advantage of her. Certain interpretations suggest that Pamela’s social rise is due to her consciously manipulating her narrative in order to convince Mr. B that he should want her. However, it’s more probable that Pamela wrote for herself, and that it is a coincidence that Mr. B found that she writes letters in the first place. Pamela writes for her own benefit, and is able to write a captivating story that helps her process her feelings. Evidence for her own story being written for her own purposes include: putting in so much effort to interact with an outside contact,

keeping all of her letters buried in the garden and away from anyone else, and fainting several times, all seem to support Pamela's writings being her own. One example used to further the idea that Pamela is actually trying to lure Mr. B into reading her writing is the first letter scene in Mrs. B's closet. Temma Berg's argument that Pamela would have wanted Mr. B to stumble upon her writing the letters doesn't entirely convince me, and could just as easily be attributed to her own attachment to her former Mistress. Pamela is simply waiting in the closet, which she is using to get privacy to write in, and even tries to hide the letter before Mr. B himself could see it. Since the narrative is from Pamela's point of view, we only see the parts of the narrative that Pamela wants us to know. Therefore, the only conclusion that can be made is that Pamela wanted the readers to know that she tried to hide the notes from Mr. B, and considering that she does so on many other occasions, why wouldn't this be the case now? Berg notes that Pamela must have waited in the Lady's former dressing room in order to allow Mr. B to stumble upon her writing them (Berg 119); however, it is known that Pamela was highly favored by Mrs. B and would have had access to these rooms to begin with. There is no evidence for her scheming to have been for the purposes of entrapping him. Therefore, it would serve as evidence for her own writings to be for herself, and the fact that she continues writing even after she is discovered is a testament to her own need for freedom and a means to communicate, as well as the self-discipline required to continue trying to do so while the people with power around her are trying to take that right away.

Pamela's actual power in the novel stems from her ability to stay steadfast in her values and beliefs, including in her own religion and her belief systems, which do not change, despite Mr. B's increasingly frightening attempts to rape Pamela. Instances in the novel where she claims that she isn't meant to be owned by anyone, and cannot be forced to give in to him, because he doesn't have any real claims over her can be attributed to her writing giving her that sense of self and a form of expression to say such things (Chung 1066). This steadfastness also allows her to gain power from Mr. B at the end of the novel by his reading of her writings, and her power over him is generally attached to his being able to "gain access to another's consciousness" (Roussel 384). His reading of her writings gives him access to her side of the story, which paints him as someone who is cruel, terrible, and causing a crisis in Pamela's psyche. He sees that he is the villain in her story and that she wasn't faking it the entire time, and therefore is more inclined to listen to Pamela and set her free. He also decides to give her a choice when she leaves his estate as to whether she would like to come back or not, and Pamela uses her decision-making power to return. Roy Roussel suggests that the act of writing "closets [the writer] from

the world” (375). Pamela creates an area of separation between her and Mr. B in the act of writing. If Mr. B’s attacks are his way of increasing their closeness not only in terms of physicality and make her an object (Roussell 384), then her writing is done to reverse those effects. She re-personifies these incidents under her own narrative, and thus takes them back into the horrifying lens that they should have been viewed under by the rest of the household. Even in one of her earliest letters, letter eleven, she has sections that are more than simply reporting the harassment to her parents. Pamela notes: “O how poor and mean these Actions must be, and how little must they make the best of Gentlemen look, when they offer such things as are unworthy of themselves...” (Richardson 24). Pamela directly condemns and gives context for the attack in her own words, giving Mr. B the fault of the situation. This early in the novel, it is also revealed that Pamela still has hope for Mr. B’s redemption, as she refers to him as “the best of Gentlemen” (Richardson 24).

Pamela has almost no rights of her own, and almost no possessions besides her letters and her journal, which indicates her socio-economic status is very low (Park 12). The idea that she does have some form of portable item is very important, as that is the secret of her mind and her “interior space” is located there (17). The items being her property and the real thoughts of her mind encourage Mr. B’s exploits in kidnapping her and attempting to prevent her from writing in the first place. However, property and the ownership of ideas are important for the development of the self, having something to call your own and have complete and total control over is extremely significant, especially to someone who currently does not have anything or anyone in which she can confide in. For example, after Pamela no longer has the avenue to send letters, she still converts her letters to a journal that she keeps throughout her captivity. Pamela openly admits that she is using her journal to let out her emotions since she has nothing else: “Let me write and bewail my miserable hard Fate....I have now nothing to do but write, and weep, and fear, and pray...” (Richardson 98). I believe that extending the interior space into an actual extension of self is appropriate in Pamela’s situation, since she often has no one else to confide in. The example that Julie Park mentions, the situation where Pamela sews her papers even closer to her body, near the stays, is an example of this. They stay on her person at all times and get even closer to her as the story goes on, and she relies on them more and more.

Pamela starts off having a little bit of power over Mr. B, when her letters can still be used as a vehicle for reporting his behaviors to her parents. Of course, this power is quickly silenced, and her real, lasting power over Mr. B shows

itself when he reads the papers themselves. Pamela begins using her letters out of necessity and uses them for her own personal purposes and benefit. Jane Blanchard suggests that Pamela uses her journal to “conceive of writing as a means of strengthening her resolve to remain virtuous in the present since she anticipates re-reading her own letters in the future...” (Blanchard 97). Pamela openly admits that her writing will be able to show her how her virtue and keeping with religious tenets will be beneficial for her in the future, and the journal would serve as proof. It is also worth noting that her transcribing of many letters that are sent to her is also proof of her using the journal as a way to support herself in the future, and thus also being primarily for herself to reference later on and remind herself of what she has suffered through. Pamela copying the letters that are sent to her also ensures that she has a complete narrative to read through for later. For example, after being kidnapped and finding that she has no avenue in which to send her letters, Pamela copies a letter from Mr. B. In the letter, Mr. B asks that Pamela write a fake letter to Mrs. Jervis, in order to show her parents that she is okay. She then copies her own response to that letter, and her own reflection upon the entire ordeal. Pamela confides that she hoped “would give [her] credit with [Mrs. Jervis], who profess’d in every thing to serve him right or wrong” (Richardson 118). She confesses the real intent behind her reply, and what she would stand to gain by going along with Mr. B’s scheme to pretend for her parents. Her copying of the letters provides proof of her trying to put together a cohesive narrative; she directly quotes what the letters say, including her replies and for what reasons. Her further explanation/reflection on the replies reaffirms why she wrote in the first place: to show her good standing with Mrs. Jervis, and to reject Mr. B again. The reflection appears to be written more for Pamela than for her parents, written like a personal justification (no more mentions of mother and father) and reminder to herself of her religious obligations. In addition, she also drops usage of the typical signatures at the end of her letters.

Pamela uses her writing as a vehicle for leveling the field between her and Mr. B, defying some social standards and adhering to her own religious code. It was expected during the time that women in general, especially women of Pamela’s station, be subservient to the men (Hilliard 202). In particular, B would have expected to be able to “exploit the shared assumption that a subordinate, fifteen-year-old dependent, [would] be submissive” (202). Other critics believe that Pamela’s work represents her childish side, specifically in regards to her perception of social roles, including her tendency to look to adults for help. However, it is also possible Pamela is only doing what any other teenage girl would do in her shoes, and that she is defending herself by

writing down what happens in order to report it. Her entire scheme around bringing the letters into the garden to give to Mr. Williams supports this. She has to believe that someone could help her, and using her letters to do so is a very clever use of her resources. Raymond Hilliard notes that Pamela's belief in Williams is misplaced, and that she is childish for believing in his ability to free her. However, Pamela is simply using the only resources and people at her disposal. Pamela gives the best opportunities for her writing to flourish. She gives a thorough explanation of her problems: "You know something, to be sure, of my Story, my native Poverty...my late Lady's Goodness, and my Master's Designs upon me" (Richardson 124). She is also insistent upon Williams' help only if he can afford it, and appeals to his religiousness. These features, when included in her plea for help, make Pamela a very sympathetic figure in her own letter. She then hides the letters out of sight in the predetermined place. Therefore, Pamela is only doing what she must in order to gain the help of a stranger, when she has no one else.

Pamela is able to convey multitudes through her writing. The most significant aspect, though, is that she is able to use her resources to her benefit. She clings to the very last of her belongings and uses it as a way to process her feelings, reach out for help, stay virtuous and self-disciplined, and process the situations as they happen. Mr. B reads through her journals and finds that Pamela is a fully self-actualized person with her own belief system, feelings, and that she was telling the truth this entire time. Mr. B is finally able to read the narrative that the readers have been attuned to for the length of the novel, and respect her decisions.

Works Cited

- Belew, Dell. "That 'Damned Scribbling' Girl in Pamela; or, Virtue Rewarded." *Journal of the Georgia Philological Association*, 2008, pp. 169–75.
- Berg, Temma F. "From Pamela to Jane Gray: Or, How Not to Become the Heroine of Your Own Text." *Studies in the Novel*, vol. 17, no. 2, 1985, pp. 115–37.
- Blanchard, Jane. "Composing Purpose in Richardson's Pamela." *South Atlantic Review*, vol. 76, no. 2, 2011, pp. 93–107.
- Chung, Ewha. "The Epistolary Novel and Samuel Richardson's Heroines: Female Writers and Readers of Letters." *The Journal of English Language and Literature*, vol. 56, no. 6, 2010, pp. 1067–90.
- Conboy, Sheila C. "Fabric and Fabrication in Richardson's Pamela." *ELH: English Literary History*, vol. 54, no. 1, 1987, pp. 81–96.
- Hilliard, Raymond F. "Pamela: Autonomy, Subordination, and the 'State of Childhood.'" *Studies in Philology*, vol. 83, no. 2, 1986, pp. 201–17.
- Park, Julie. "Detachable Pockets and Letter Folds: Spatial Formalism and the Portable Interiors of the Eighteenth-Century Novel." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*, vol. 50, no. 1, May 2017, pp. 8–34.
- Richardson, Samuel, *Pamela*, Ed Keymer, Oxford World's Classics, 978-0199536498.
- Roussel, Roy. "Reflections on the Letter: The Reconciliation of Distance and Presence in Pamela." *ELH: English Literary History*, vol. 41, no.3, 1974, pp. 375–99. EBSCOhost, <https://doiorg.proxy.lib.siu.edu/10.2307/2872592>.

Mary Schellenberg

Race and Colonization in *The Island of Dr. Moreau*

In a grotesque rendering of Charles Darwin's landmark assertion that animals slowly evolved into humans as outlined in *On the Origin of Species*, Dr. Moreau in H.G. Wells' *The Island of Dr. Moreau* scientifically alters animals into humans. Wells's novel and its film adaptation, *The Island of Lost Souls*, each then explores the outcome of what happens when these animals-turned-humans revert to their animal instincts and behaviors. In both novel and film, this regression back to animals proves deadly for Moreau--the white master figure. In both novel and film, this regression back to animals proves deadly for Moreau, who has positioned himself in both texts at the apex of the social hierarchy. Therefore, in *The Island of Dr. Moreau* and its first film adaptation, one can see the issues of race and colonization in the light of Dr. Moreau's usurping of Darwin's theories. This is through themes of slavery and subversion, imprinting a fear of primal regression onto Wells' characters, and possibly, his modern reader. Although Wells's text would seem to serve as a cautionary tale, I seek to further illustrate how these dynamics reflect the horrors of the Holocaust in the twentieth century.

Wells' novel *The Island of Dr. Moreau* paints both scientists, though particularly Dr. Moreau, as slave masters, paralleling their behavior with colonial masters. Captain Davies institutes control from the beginning of the novel by offloading Montgomery, Prendick, and the animals from his ship. But, before this, he names Prendick "Mister Shut-up" (Wells 14). The lower classes are a silenced and disposable people to the upper classes, which is reflected in this title given to Prendick. This is relevant to Moreau's character, as he is also the captain of a ship; he controls his ship, and in turn, controls where it goes. Similar imagery of control is reflected when the captain says, "I'm king here" (Wells 15). Moreau is king of his island like Captain Davies. They are in control.

Reflecting Moreau's lack of regard for ethics, sympathy, and empathy, he is seen wielding superior arms and firepower, including a whip. He acts like a white, colonial master throwing away his feelings for his slaves and a mad scientist disregarding feelings for his subjects. Additionally, Moreau--in the role of colonial master--understands he is outnumbered by his subjects, reinforcing his need for control. This installs a fear of revolt in Moreau, which could compromise his God-like status. Since he has not yet bled in front of the

“natives,” he is held as the superior being. So, though Moreau is the master and seems to obtain control of the island and its creatures, the novel’s theme of scientific advancement trickles into Moreau’s lack of restraint. More particularly, his scientific manipulations reflect “The Moreau horrors,” which Prendick had heard of in England (Wells 21).

While Dr. Moreau specifically parallels a slave master, the oppression of the slaves in Wells’ novel and its film adaptation foreshadow a future reversal in roles. The black faced monster M’ling becomes a symbol of slavery because of the color of his skin, his role as a servant to the white master, and his treatment on Captain Davies’ boat. The latter involved the carrying of animals to Dr. Moreau for future experimentation or as sources of food, seeming to mirror the immigration of slaves. Furthermore, the “COVENA,” as Davies’ ship is named in the film, is a “trading ship” (Kenton). Bringing in new animals to Moreau’s island—who are enslaved/caged, establishes these animals as the island’s natives. Soon these animals, but particularly the puma, will be subject to colonization and control by Moreau and Montgomery as “natives” of the island.

The animals are removed from Captain Davies’ ship in Wells’ novel and its film adaptation. When Parker is *also* kicked off the boat, he is likened to these animals. Furthering this attribution of animal characteristics to humans, Parker is caged like an animal in the room of Moreau’s house. The slamming of metal barred doors reinforces this entrapment and Moreau’s control of the island’s inhabitants (Kenton). Because Parker is put in the position of an animal, his character begins to highlight the threat of human society reverting to animals. Additionally, Parker’s physical entrapment emphasizes the thread of slavery in the novel, which the natives relate in *The Island of Dr. Moreau*. They chant “none escape” (Wells 37). Because of the natives’ bondage expressed in this excerpt, as well as the white man’s lack of shed blood, the appearance of Parker and Captain Donahue’s blood in *Island of Lost Souls* addresses subversion (Kenton). This is because the bleeding puts the supposedly upper-middle class Parker in a lower-class situation of vulnerability and bleeding. His race or class cannot help him now.

In Wells’ novel *The Island of Dr. Moreau*, as well as the film *Island of Lost Souls*, a subversion of the white colonial master occurs, acting as a sort of karma towards the gruesome control of Moreau. This was foreshadowed on the title screen of the film *Island of Lost Souls*: It flips between the image of a human hand and an animal’s hand. Then they come together and create one Frankenstein hand. Similarly, a human skull crosses with an ape-like skull. Eventually, the Frankenstein human/animal hand, previously separated by

a black horizontal line, turns and becomes oriented vertically. Therefore, the horizontal line no longer separates the two (Kenton). The separation between animal and human is blurred through this image. This foreshadows the theme of humans regressing to animals, playing back to Darwin's ideas of evolution in *The Origin of Species*.

Within Wells' novel, subversion is seen when the hunter finds himself the prey. The white man becomes the hunted or the fugitive slave, which makes sense, as the novel critiques British colonization. Subversion is portrayed very explicitly at the end of *The Island of Lost Souls* when Moreau becomes the victim of his own operating table. The audience hears his screams like the animal operated on in the film, but also like the Puma's screams reiterated throughout the novel (Kenton). With his power overturned, Moreau's character addresses a fear of slave revolt and human regression to animals. Additionally, it relieves Prendick/the slave of his concern regarding the white master. Previously imprisoned by barred doors in Moreau's house, Prendick wondered if he would fall victim to Moreau's experiments also. He wondered, would he too be turned into an animal? These questions address extrapolation presented in the novel, especially of the mass experimentation on humans performed by Dr. Mengele in World War II. By seeing Moreau through Mengele's lens--a controlling slave master and mad scientist, one can see the dark fate humanity can fall into.

Nazi genocide performed by Dr. Mengele amid World War II was extrapolated by Wells in his novel *The Island of Dr. Moreau*. According to Elana Gomel in the article "The Biological Sublime," the Nazism and Western European fascism that impacted individuals like Adolf Hitler and Josef Mengele evolved from several late-nineteenth-century discourses of the body: "eugenics, social Darwinism, and hereditarianism" (Gomel 7). Quoting Robert Proctor, Gomel argues that Nazism was not based on mindless, antiscientific ideals, but rather "sound biology and medicine" (7). This places Dr. Mengele in the realm of science like Dr. Moreau – although the two are separated by almost five decades, as they both utilize their scientific knowledge for the control and harm of humankind. Additionally, Dr. Mengele held the false belief of biological racism, believing Germans were biologically superior to members of other races (Holocaust). Adolf Hitler went so far as to relate the Germans as a "colonizing people" (Dirk). Therefore, Dr. Mengele replicates the master figure of Dr. Moreau, participating in the eradication of Jews through genocide to maintain his master race.

Wells establishes imagery of the slave and his master to highlight themes of race and colonization, though he poses this question in the novel:

what happens when the law is broken? When the master bleeds? I believe this subversion of the white colonial master leads to revolt. When the puma escapes in Wells' novel, Moreau is bleeding from his forehead (Wells 59). In the Bible, Jesus bleeds on the cross during his crucifixion, and his forehead – where Moreau bleeds in the novel, is where the crown of thorns was placed. This both reinforces Moreau's image of a Christ-like figure, while undermining his control; he is dying, and the natives now know he can bleed.

Prendick continues this Biblical imagery when he reminds the natives that "The Master and the House of Pain will come again" (73). The idea of a second coming reflects the second coming of Jesus Christ after his crucifixion. Interestingly, even in death, Moreau is the godly figure. Prendick continues this imagery in order to maintain control and order. Although true, the Hyena-swine – or Moreau's slave, becomes a sort of Satan/Anti-Christ figure. The novel depicts a battle of masters. Since Prendick has become the new master yielding the whip, reminding the natives of the always-watching Moreau/master, he becomes the God-like figure battling Satan: the Hyena-Swine. This is also an instance of extrapolation, reminding the audience of the Kapo in German concentration camps during the Holocaust. These prison functionaries acted against inhabitants of these camps for their own protection, just like Prendick. Prendick was forced in this position out of fear of the regressing animals who turned more and more uncivilized.

The process and fear of regression instilled in the characters of the film *Island of Lost Souls* reflect concepts in Darwin's *The Origin of Species*. In the film, Captain Donohue says "day by day it creeps back. It creeps back" (Kenton). He indirectly refers to the process of the animals turning back into humans. This is a reverse evolution. Instead of apes turning to humans, humans revert to their animal nature. Roger Bowen emphasizes this thread of Darwinism in Wells' work by writing, "The mythopoeic quality of Wells's scientific fantasies is, of course, grounded in his fascination with the theories of Darwinism" (Bowen 319). This regression occurs because of the law being broken, explicitly related to Moreau by the Sayer of the Law in the film. Once they realize "he [Moreau] can die," or rather bleed, they charge after him in revolt (Kenton). Even M'ling, the most passive of the beast men/natives, regresses. This begins to pose the question, if society came from Apes and they host this aggression and regress, what will happen to ordinary human society?

The nightmare extends from the novel to a larger scale, especially when Prendick wonders if this regression will extend to London (Wells 78). Again, this also calls back to the Holocaust during World War II, where the seemingly

inhumane and impossible came true through Dr. Mengele. Audiences of the 1890's never believed this sort of scientific gruesomeness could ever occur, but it does in the 1940's. Moreau's attempt at developing a "master race" shows the harm of specific scientific advancements and sheds light on mass atrocities of world history. In a disastrous moment at the end of the film, Montgomery, Ruth, and Parker escape the island by boat. Montgomery, the only person facing the island, tells the couple, "Don't look back," as it goes up in flames (Kenton). The island is encompassed in fire like the house at the end of the film *House of Usher*, directed by Roger Corman. This emphasizes the gothic elements in *Island of Lost Souls*, but also the deathly consequences of scientific experimentation - and in turn, of subverting the role of the master.

In Wells' novel *The Island of Dr. Moreau*, alongside its film adaptation *Island of Lost Souls*, an abuse of science turns into an abuse of animals. This installs imagery of the colonial white master's exploitative control, the construct of slavery, and a fear of regression. This eventual regression, expressed in both the novel and film adaptation, ends in death. These two works also express a temptation of dominance, specifically expressed through Prendick in the novel. When he assumes temporary control over the beast people, it shows how dangerous the desire to maintain control can be. Mike Duran explains it best in his book *Christian Horror*, when he writes: "Beware that, when fighting monsters, you yourself do not become a monster. And when you gaze long into an abyss, the abyss also gazes into you" (Duran, 201). Like Dr. Moreau and Dr. Mengele, control can reach beyond beliefs of colonial mastery, going so far as the scientific mutilations and experimentations on animals and humans.

Works Cited

- Bowen, Roger. "Science, Myth, and Fiction in H. G. Wells's 'Island of Dr. Moreau.'" *Studies in the Novel*, vol. 8, no. 3, 1976, pp. 318–35.
- Dirk, Moses A. "Colonialism," in Peter Hayes and John K. Roth (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Holocaust Studies*, 2011, pp. 68-80.
- Duran, Mike. *Christian Horror; On the Compatibility of a Biblical Worldview and the Horror Genre*, Second Ed. Blue Crescent Press, 2023.
- Gomel, Elana. "From Dr. Moreau to Dr. Mengele: The Biological Sublime." *Poetics Today* Vol. 21, Issue 2, 2000, pp. 393-421.
- Holocaust Encyclopedia. "Josef Mengele." *United States Holocaust Memorial Museum*, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 15 Nov. 2024.
- Kenton, Erle C, director. *Island of Lost Souls*, 1932.
- Wells, Herbert George. "The Island of Doctor Moreau." *The Project Gutenberg eBook of The Island of Doctor Moreau, by H. G. Wells*, 1 Feb. 2025.

Kirsten White

Frankenstein: Loss of Innocence as Consequence of Social Exclusion

In Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, the Creature initially embodies innocence, curiosity, and an inherent potential for goodness. His journey from naïve wonder to profound despair, however, illustrates the tragic erosion of innocence that occurs when he is exposed to a world of rejection and violence. Shelley powerfully conveys this transformation through the Creature's experiences, highlighting how the denial of compassion and belonging can dehumanize an individual. Upon his creation, Victor Frankenstein abandons his monstrous creation, leaving the Creature to navigate a hostile world alone. Released from the confines of his maker's laboratory, the Creature embarks on a journey of self-discovery, but soon finds himself ostracized by society due to his grotesque appearance and lack of a place in human culture. As he seeks companionship and understanding, his experiences with rejection push him further into isolation, highlighting the painful consequences of a society that refuses to recognize his autonomy. The Creature's descent into bitterness and violence raises fundamental questions about whether his actions are the result of his inherent nature or of Victor Frankenstein's abandonment and society's treatment of him. The text suggests that while the Creature begins life with an innocent and empathetic nature, he is ultimately shaped by the rejection he faces from both his creator and society.

The Creature's first encounters with the world are marked by an innocence reminiscent of a child's early development. When he is first released from Victor's laboratory, his curiosity mirrors the innocence of a newborn exploring its surroundings. Shelley describes the Creature's initial awe of nature, noting that "delight and ecstasy" fill him as he gazes at the beauty of the woods and the warmth of the sun. This moment exemplifies the Creature's untainted perspective, untouched by human prejudice. At this stage, he sees the world as a place of potential connection and wonder, unconcerned by the societal divisions he will soon face. His observation of the De Lacy family further exemplifies his innocent curiosity. Watching their interactions from afar, he is fascinated by their kindness and emotional bonds, learning rudimentary language and culture. At this point, the Creature is unaware that his appearance will provoke fear and hostility. Shelley uses this early portrayal of the Creature to highlight the theme of innocence as a blank slate—an individual born without

malice or prejudice, capable of empathy if given the opportunity.

Eileen Hunt Botting's interpretation of *Frankenstein* within the context of "the rights of the child" reinforces the idea that the Creature's initial innocence mirrors the notion that children, as they develop, are blank slates untainted by society's prejudices (Botting 2018). The Creature's early experiences demonstrate that, much like children, his potential for goodness and moral development is shaped by external factors. The Creature acknowledges that he was born with virtuous qualities but was corrupted by suffering and rejection, reinforcing the idea that his initial innocence could have led to meaningful connections had he been nurtured and accepted, which is evident in the text with assertion: "I was benevolent and good; misery made me a fiend. Make me happy, and I shall again be virtuous" (Shelley 89). Shelley emphasizes that, if society and his creator had provided love and acceptance, the Creature's initial empathy could have developed into meaningful connections rather than alienation and bitterness. This commentary on the societal treatment of the "other" emphasizes how prejudice shapes one's identity, specifically by rejecting those who appear different, as the Creature will soon learn.

The loss of the Creature's innocence begins when he is rejected by society, which happens almost immediately after his first attempts at social interaction. The pivotal moment of rejection occurs when the Creature reveals himself to the De Lacey family, who had initially shown compassion through their ignorance of his appearance. One such moment occurs when the Creature reveals himself to Felix, and he is rejected for his appearance: "Who can describe their horror and consternation on beholding me? ... overcome by pain and anguish, I quitted the cottage, and in the general tumult escaped unperceived to my hovel" (Shelley 93). His good deeds—such as gathering firewood for them—are met with terror, and Felix violently drives him away. This moment marks the first realization that society will never accept him, regardless of his good intentions. Shelley's depiction of the Creature's rejection is not just a narrative event, but a moment that underscores the destructive effects of societal exclusion. The Creature's isolation, symbolized by his physical expulsion, highlights the deep psychological harm caused by the denial of compassion and recognition.

The psychological toll of social rejection is a central theme in *Frankenstein*, particularly in how it shapes the Creature's identity and sense of self-worth. Thomas Schmid's analysis of isolation in *Frankenstein* sheds light on the profound psychological effects of such rejection. Schmid argues that as the Creature becomes increasingly aware of his alienation, his self-perception

changes, and he begins to question his very identity and worth (Schmid 2009). After his rejection by the De Lacy family, he begins to question his own worth and existence, saying, “I am malicious because I am miserable. Am I not shunned and hated by all mankind?... Yet mine shall not be the submission of abject slavery. I will revenge my injuries; if I cannot inspire love, I will cause fear...” (Shelley 140). As the Creature grapples with the realization that society will never accept him due to his appearance, he spirals into despair. Shelley presents this transformation as a tragic consequence of social rejection—one that erodes the Creature’s sense of self and autonomy. No longer does the Creature see himself as a being capable of connection, but as a permanent outsider, unworthy of love or belonging.

The Creature’s fall from innocence is further reinforced by the theoretical lens of “Creaturely right” proposed by Su-Reen Han. Han contends that the denial of the Creature’s recognition as a social being traps him in a cycle of exclusion, where he is never afforded the opportunity to fully express his humanity (Han 2020). This denial is not just an emotional or psychological injury; it is a moral one, as it strips him of the most basic rights—a recognition of his value as a living being. The most basic right to many humans and living creatures in general is the right to a mate. The Creature recognizes this and explains to Victor, pleading that he “must create a female for [him] with whom [he] can live in the interchange of those sympathies necessary for [his] being. This alone [Victor] can do for [the Creature], and [he] demand[s] it of [Victor] as a right which [Victor] must not refuse to concede” (Shelley 147). The Creature’s awareness of his lack of “Creaturely right” becomes a driving force in his bitterness and desire for vengeance against those who refuse to see him as human. In this way, Shelley critiques a society that denies recognition to the marginalized and the “other,” reflecting a broader commentary on the way society dehumanizes those who fall outside its norms.

Looking through the lens of “otherness” expands the understanding of the Creature’s alienation, linking it to broader cultural patterns of marginalization. Joseph W. Lew’s analysis of *Frankenstein* through the lens of Orientalism provides a broader cultural context to the Creature’s alienation. Lew argues that Shelley critiques the European imagination’s tendency to dehumanize the “other,” aligning the Creature with figures typically subjected to colonial or racialized marginalization (Lew 2020). Shelley’s portrayal of the Creature highlights the dangers of constructing the “other” as a monolithic, monstrous figure. As the Creature faces rejection for his appearance, he mirrors the racialized or colonial “other” who is feared and misunderstood by a society

that views them as inherently foreign or inferior, stating, “I had never yet seen a being resembling me, or who claimed any intercourse with me. What was I?” (Shelley 81). This idea further reinforces Shelley’s critique of societal rejection and marginalization, positioning the Creature as a figure who, like those oppressed by colonial forces, is deprived of his humanity by societal structures.

Connecting his alienation to the broader racial and social dynamics of 19th-century Britain provides a critical perspective on the Creature’s quest for recognition. H. L. Malchow’s analysis of racial discourse in *Frankenstein* offers a valuable insight into the Creature’s quest for recognition. Malchow draws parallels between the Creature’s alienation and the racialized “other” in 19th-century Britain, arguing that the Creature’s struggle reflects the societal discrimination faced by marginalized groups (Malchow 1993). The Creature’s demand for autonomy is not simply a desire for personal freedom, but for recognition as a full, human individual, which becomes clear when he says, “I was the slave, not the master of an impulse” (Shelley 195). His violence, then, is not an inherent trait but the result of the systematic denial of his right to live and love as a human being. Shelley critiques this denial, highlighting the consequences of a society that refuses to extend basic human dignity to those who are different. These frequent references to slavery - though typically metaphorical - highlight the extent to which the rhetoric of control and submission influenced Shelley’s literary context. They underscore the necessity of examining the themes of race and slavery in the text, in order to explore how *Frankenstein* relates to contemporary discussions on race, slavery, and abolition.

Similarly, Allan Lloyd Smith’s “‘This Thing of Darkness’: Racial Discourse in Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*,” provides a critical framework for understanding the racial implications of the Creature’s treatment and societal rejection. Smith argues that the Creature’s monstrosity is not just physical but is also racialized, positioning him as a symbol of the racial “other” in 19th-century Britain. Through the Creature’s experiences, Shelley critiques how racial and cultural prejudices inform societal perceptions of identity and humanity. The Creature has been “othered” because of his physical appearance and begins to acknowledge his “otherness” when he begs his master for a companion. The Creature, fully aware that he is perceived on the basis of his appearance, demands “a creature of another sex, but as hideous as myself; the gratification is small, but it is all that I can receive, and it shall content me. It is true, we shall be monsters, cut off from all the world; but on that account we shall be more attached to one another. Our lives will not be happy, but they will be harmless

and free from the misery I now feel” (Shelley 139). Smith highlights how the Creature, despite his innate potential for goodness, is continuously othered and dehumanized based on his appearance, much like marginalized racial groups in Victorian society. This racialized perspective of the Creature reinforces the novel’s broader critique of exclusion, showing how societal structures and racial ideologies contribute to the alienation and eventual violence of the “other.” Shelley, through the lens of racial discourse, underscores the destructive effects of discrimination, portraying the Creature’s transformation as a direct consequence of the prejudices he faces. Smith’s analysis deepens our understanding of the Creature’s fall from innocence, demonstrating that his eventual bitterness and violence are not inherent traits but reactions to the systemic racial and social rejection he encounters.

As the Creature’s isolation deepens, his desire for autonomy and belonging becomes central to his sense of self. Shelley illustrates this shift in the Creature’s character through his demand that Victor Frankenstein create a companion for him. The Creature’s anger and bitterness toward his creator become palpable when he accuses Victor of abandoning him and refuses to grant him the “right” to live a life of loneliness. His plea for a companion, however, is not simply a request for a partner but an existential cry for recognition, autonomy, and a chance to live a meaningful life. When Victor refuses to create the companion and destroys the female creature, the Creature’s sense of betrayal drives him to violence. This moment marks the Creature’s final descent from innocence into vengeance, and Shelley uses it to emphasize the destructive consequences of neglecting the needs of the alienated.

Looking through more of a contemporary lens, scholars can view Shelley’s critique of social rejection with clarity when drawing parallels between the Creature and marginalized figures in post-conflict societies. Karzan Aziz Mahmood’s analysis in “The Appropriation of Innocence: From Shelley’s *Frankenstein* to Ahmed Saadawi’s *Frankenstein in Baghdad*” offers a contemporary parallel to Shelley’s critique of social rejection and alienation. Mahmood draws connections between Shelley’s Creature and modern-day figures who experience similar marginalization, particularly in post-conflict societies. He argues that both Shelley’s *Frankenstein* and Saadawi’s *Frankenstein in Baghdad* explore the consequences of innocence corrupted by violence and societal neglect. Mahmood highlights how the Creature’s descent into vengeance reflects the impact of a society that fails to recognize the humanity of the “other,” a theme that transcends time and location. In this light, Mahmood’s work emphasizes the enduring relevance of Shelley’s novel

in understanding how innocence, when exposed to cruelty and isolation, can be appropriated and ultimately distorted. The Creature's transformation, then, becomes a broader metaphor for the cycles of violence and alienation in the world today, particularly in regions affected by war and division.

In his confrontation with Victor Frankenstein, the Creature's transformation from an innocent, curious being to a vengeful figure is complete. His descent into violence serves as a commentary on the destructive effects of isolation and the absence of empathy. The Creature comes to more of this realization after reading Milton's *Paradise Lost*, claiming that, "Satan had his companions, fellow-devils, to admire and encourage him; but I am solitary and abhorred" (Shelley 144). The Creature's violent actions are a direct result of the emotional deprivation he suffers, not the result of his intrinsic nature. Noelle Webster's analysis of the Creature's internal turmoil underscores this idea, arguing that the Creature's violence is a reaction to the continuous rejection he faces from society (Webster 2024). Shelley's portrayal of the Creature challenges the reader to reconsider the relationship between inherent nature and the impact of societal treatment. The Creature's actions are not a consequence of his monstrous form but of his dehumanizing experience in a society that refuses to accept him.

Ultimately, *Frankenstein* uses the Creature's journey—from innocence to despair—to critique society's treatment of the marginalized. Shelley's portrayal of the Creature as a being capable of empathy but denied compassion demonstrates the tragic consequences of social exclusion. The Creature's story serves as a cautionary tale about the importance of empathy, compassion, and the recognition of autonomy for all individuals. In a world that continues to struggle with issues of inequality and discrimination, Shelley's novel offers a timeless reflection on the need to extend basic human rights to those who are deemed "other." As such, *Frankenstein* not only speaks to the past but also serves as a call to action, urging people to confront the prejudices that continue to shape societies across the globe.

Works Cited

- Botting, Eileen Hunt. *Mary Shelley and the Rights of the Child: Political Philosophy in Frankenstein*. Philadelphia, Pa., University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018.
- Han, Suh-Reen. "Creaturely Right in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*." *Journal of English Studies in Korea*, vol. 38, 15 June 2020, pp. 179–198.
- Lew, Joseph W. "The deceptive other: Mary Shelley's critique of orientalism in *Frankenstein*." *Studies in Romanticism*, vol. 30, no. 2, 1991, p. 255.
- Mahmood, Karzan Aziz. "The Appropriation of Innocence: From Shelley's *Frankenstein* to Ahmed Saadawi's *Frankenstein in Baghdad*." *Arab World English Journal for Translation and Literary Studies*, vol. 5, no. 2, May 2021, pp. 126-138.
- Malchow, H. L.. "Frankenstein's Monster and Images of Race in Nineteenth-Century Britain." *Past & Present*, no. 139 (1993): 90–130.
- Schmid, Thomas. "Addiction and isolation in Frankenstein: A case of terminal uniqueness." *Gothic Studies*, vol. 11, no. 2, Nov. 2009, pp. 19–29.
- Shelley, Mary. *Frankenstein*. Edited by J. Paul Hunter, 2nd ed., W.W. Norton & Company, 2012.
- Smith, Allan Lloyd. "'This Thing of Darkness': Racial Discourse in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*." *Gothic Studies* 6, no. 2 (2004): 208–22.
- Webster, Noelle. "Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*: The Creature's Attempt At ..." *University at Albany, State University of New York Scholars Archive*, University at Albany.

The Myth of the Robinsonade

Throughout *Robinson Crusoe* there is an antagonistic relationship that exists between Crusoe, property, and nature. In a world where material wealth and money hold immense power, it is ironic that the idea of property comes from man: This relationship was birthed from an ignorance or denial of colonial oppression by the Europeans. It is important to elaborate and explore this argument by asking: How does the representation of Robinson Crusoe's power over nature and indigenous populations obscure the truth of colonial ignorance towards labor, production, and property in the eighteenth century? Answering this question is important so that we can explore the ways colonial ideas shape *Robinson Crusoe* and the legacy of the "Robinsonade" genre. It is a concrete example of the ambiguities of what was considered fair in both property and labor.

Crusoe is distanced from the colonial context that is unavoidably still occurring along with his adventures. Within the "Robinsonade" genre, the focus on adventure, strength, and solitude starkly contrasts with the reality of the message. While Crusoe is isolated from society, he nevertheless creates a sub-type of the colonial impulses that were occurring in England at the time. However, while this new genre is describing a place that is new, wild, and exotic, it is strictly meant to be consumed safely in one's home alongside a cup of tea and a warm fire. There are important passages within *Robinson Crusoe* that support the character's overt denial of colonial oppression (Pepperell). Defoe's denial upholds the argument that these ideals strengthened colonial oppression in the eighteenth century. Defoe uses several scenarios to position guilt over oppression to obscure the truth. First, the sharp contrasts between Xury versus Friday should be noted. He invites Xury to escape with him, threatens to drown him if he doesn't comply, then ends up selling him into slavery. Crusoe exploits Xury, and this is an uncomfortable exhibit of overt colonial oppression that warped the European's minds throughout this time. Had he chosen to treat Xury as an equal human being with his own agency and autonomy rather than as an object that exists for transactions and personal gain, an argument could be made that initiates this unequal relationship of servitude by putting Crusoe's foot on his head after Crusoe rescues him. He strips Friday from his heritage and culture by baptizing him into Christianity and calling him "Friday" rather

than asking him his true name. Crusoe's treatment of both Xury and Friday are among many examples of how Defoe ignored instances of Colonial oppression.

The relationship between Friday and Crusoe can also be seen as an example of capital and labor, and a translucent example of colonialism. Crusoe doesn't seem interested in understanding exactly how he is becoming profitable. There's no mention of guilt over the exploitation of his slaves, and neither does he acknowledge that his wealth results from their labors. In fact, when Crusoe owns the plantation, all his slaves are unnamed and lack any presence within his story. Furthermore, the slaves he does get acquainted with are renamed. He also teaches Friday English, teaches him about Christianity, makes him live and work on his plantation, and teaches him how to shoot a firearm (Hulme 202). Defoe could have narrated this in an alternate way, which would be Crusoe learning Friday's native name, Crusoe learning Friday's native language, Crusoe converting to Friday's language, Friday teaching Crusoe how to fight his way, and making Friday an equal by not making him work and letting him stay in his abode? Alternatively, the narrative and message of the story would be much more palatable if Crusoe had shown curiosity and understanding towards a new culture, rather than forcing his European values on those he encounters.

There was a pervasive xenophobia within the British towards cultures that lived differently than themselves. This is evident within *Robinson Crusoe* when we see a common theme of contempt towards travelling and immigrating, especially within Crusoe's father. Scholar Dennis Todd argues that Crusoe's "fault" for his wanderlust and his decision to civilize the island aligns with British Imperial thought, because they believed that wandering in the wild makes you savage. They believed that civilized cultures ultimately settled, built permanent homes, domesticated animals, and planted crops, rather than living a nomadic lifestyle (Todd 150). This is why there is so much emphasis and focus on Crusoe's methodical and intricate process of cultivating the island—he is showing the audience that he is making the island better by introducing the colonial way. He is not adapting to the land according to the native way, and although this may simply be his own mode of survival and making the most out of a terrible situation, this theme cannot be ignored, because it supports the idea of colonialism. This further supports the idea that if Crusoe can change a foreign land into a more familiar space, then maybe a native, like Friday, can become "civilized."

The Lockean obsession with property is plainly aligned with Defoe's obsession with property and dominion over the land. Crusoe's power through cultivation of the land on the island he inhabits is an example of how colonialism

impacted views towards property. Critics have discussed at length the idea of the “imperial view of nature,” which views nature and all living things as property for the benefit and use of man (Bowers 729). Crusoe does not see himself as a foreigner to this new island; instead, he refers to himself as he encounters another living soul, and when he notices the actual natives to the land minding their own business he becomes enraged. He fantasizes about killing the entire tribe in a maddened and jealous state. This is a confusing situation, because Crusoe is the foreigner, so don’t the natives have every right to be the ones enraged? Before he arrives, Crusoe says that the island has had no human or shape on it before. However ironic his statement turns out to be, his statement outlines an ignorance towards the overt colonial oppression that existed during Defoe’s time.

As discussed in the previous paragraph, Defoe celebrates colonialism in the greatest sense by making Crusoe cultivate the island into his own kingdom, and when he encounters another living soul, he decides to use European hierarchal system to impose dominion over the natives (Todd). As an Englishman, Crusoe is well acquainted with the idea of “finders’ keepers” in terms of land. To him, this land is empty, and he is the first to discover it, so it’s his. It does not occur to him that he should be cautious, because he is an immigrant. Crusoe has an immediate imperial impulse to exert dominion over the land without any objection. He plants crops, and they flourish. He keeps animals, and they multiply. He creates a shelter and expands it into a tiny village. Crusoe is an innovator and a jack of all trades. Although Crusoe does at times fail (his dirt cave roof caving in, multiplying too many wild cats), we mostly see him triumph in his efforts. This aligns with the narrative of the time which basically says that the European way is the right way, so it’s the only way that will work. We now know how flawed this notion is, but these individuals were on a different wavelength and understanding which doesn’t justify their actions, but rather explains some of it.

Defoe describes Crusoe’s process of surviving on the island in great length and detail, which shows a colonial obsession with property, labor, and production. We are given intense descriptions on the process of how Crusoe makes things, from kitchenware to clothes. A large chunk of Crusoe’s time on the island is recorded as a journal, and it is lengthy and extremely descriptive. He decides to make something, he collects his materials, and he becomes successful in his endeavors. He is obsessed with making things beautiful, and he is very resourceful. It is confusing that Defoe spends a great amount of time on the description of making things and with lists but spends almost no time

explaining the labor and production of the slaves. Their labor would be just as important to discuss with detail as anything else. Like many Europeans and colonists, Defoe was not interested in discussing this process simply because slavery was widely recognized and accepted. Most saw no problems with slavery morally, which is why it wasn't elaborated on.

Analyzing the text through a Marxist lens, many scholars have discussed how *Robinson Crusoe* aligns with Marx's discussion of commodity fetishism. It's a concept that states that the value of a commodity comes from the object itself, rather than the value it has by the labor that was put into it (Schmidgen 20). In other words, the actual product is treated with much more worth than the human production behind it. This in turn spurs a fascination with products which ultimately keeps them from seeing the truth. This is capitalism. This relates to *Robinson Crusoe* because Crusoe's continual obsession with lists and objects further supports the colonial lens the story is told through. Crusoe views his slaves as having the least amount of value, and this can be seen through the way he emotionlessly sells Xury off, considering it a huge success and financial gain. He doesn't shed a tear. He moves along in his journey without confronting the ugliness and exploitation that is occurring before his eyes. His own position as a slave fails to ignite any ounce of sympathy for the social situation at the time—he simply accepts slavery as it is. He doesn't become an abolitionist, but rather a slave owner himself. Friday is another one of Crusoe's objects, and he never considers his suffering or his freedom. He sees him as an object—and as his property.

There exists an interesting pattern of behaviors within *Robinson Crusoe* that indicates a Eurocentric mindset towards the process of completing a goal. One specific example is when he makes a pot to boil goat meat. Instead of roasting the meat, deciding to cook the goat in a state that he is familiar with shows a certain xenophobia through its dismissiveness of the native way. He is attempting to set himself apart from the wild, to maintain his notion of European sophistication. This is a part of what scholar Carolyn Marchant calls the "Recovery Narrative," which is a huge part of Western culture, and embraces the idea that humans have created a myth to relate themselves of the earth. Crusoe is doing this through making the pot and other acts of civilizing the island (Bowers 753). In other words, Crusoe is attempting to "rescue" and "revive" the island by introducing European methods which yield success, rather than sticking with the native ways of cultivating land because they believed that the native way never yielded results. The Eurocentricity which flowed within their veins failed to shed light on other non-European ways of life. This closes off the novel to any chance of outside influence in order to make it more accurate and

realistic, and although that aspect brings about an antique-like fetish of the book, it nevertheless obscures the truth and ugliness of colonialism.

As land plays an important geocentric colonial role in the story of *Robinson Crusoe*, the sea cannot be forgotten in its role in Crusoe's domination over everything he encounters. It is important to consider the ocean in the discussion of colonial practices of the Europeans because it can help us understand how these ideologies are intertwined within Defoe's novel (Fragano). During the time of this novel, the seas were largely controlled by the British Empire, and anything outside of the range is a "savage space," according to Crusoe when he realizes that he has drifted away from the shipwreck and sees no other ships. It is interesting that Crusoe shows such a strong fear in this scene because at this point, he is an experienced seafarer who has seen worse. Crusoe is in fact more afraid of the lack of a European trade-route and lack of a navigation of this area within his understanding. The absence of ships sends Crusoe into a panic, such that he wishes that he should end his life (Defoe 46-47). He experiences deep isolation outside the boundaries of familiar and colonial comfort, which are ships, oceanic trade routes, European companions, and everyday comforts of life as he's known them.

Furthermore, Crusoe's discovery of the European shipwreck and scavenging goods for his own use indicates a strong colonial presence within the novel, as well as showing the emphasis on property and the process of consumerism. He is never truly outside or on the outskirts of a colonial presence. He collects many goods and materials that are familiar to him, which means to him, they are useful. Although he has made most of his own supplies and habitation, he is able to have pleasures such as alcohol, European animals, and sugar. In a way, he is still able to take use of some of the colonial luxuries of life. Furthermore, Crusoe also fails to acknowledge the oceanic skills the natives possess, assuming that they had drifted there by the winds because they lacked a colossal ship such as the Europeans possessed. He fails to understand that there are other ways outside of his own to complete a task. His point is proven wrong when Crusoe observes the natives arriving on shore with their canoes. He assumes that any other interpretation of the sea outside of European discovery and mastery is invalid. His overt denial of native knowledge and value is shown. His blindness and lack of acknowledgement of the sea as an open and free space further strengthens the argument of how colonial ideals negatively shaped the message of this novel.

To summarize, *Robinson Crusoe's* exploitation of Xury and Friday and viewing them as property rather than humans, the European obsession with

dominion over land and sea, and the action of overlooking any detail related to the production of the slaves reveals a chosen ignorance towards colonial oppression which was obscured in this novel. His treatment of Xury and Friday and the unequal power dynamics that exist in the slave versus master relationship, the theme of dominion and civilizing property, and the disregard of slaves as anything other than property has been discussed. Robinson Crusoe is a prototype of the typical English colonizer, creating a false image of a king who domains over a primitive civilization. Why is this important, and how is it relevant to the discussion of colonialism in the twenty-first century?

Literature was and still is a strong medium in which a message can be conveyed to a large group of people. The author's principles, thoughts, and biases seep through the page, whether intentional or not. This influences the audience, and if there is social and political upheaval, art has a potential to be used as propaganda. Defoe influenced generations of adventure writers and introduced the idea of the "Robinsonade," which embraces the idea of a man deserted on an island relying on his own will and expertise to survive. However, we cannot ignore the lasting influence of negative themes of stark imperialism that overshadows the riveting rush of adventure within the prose. Although this theme focuses on the exciting parts of adventure and bravery, choosing to brush aside and lessen the seriousness of slavery within *Robinson Crusoe* is a typical colonist move. It is difficult to ignore the blatant exploitation that is occurring at the hands of Crusoe and other Europeans within the book. Can the contemporary reader be expected to forgive his transgressions because he was once a slave himself, or because he's a trustworthy and a survivor? The nuances that exist around his novel only forces us to remember the drastic differences between now and Defoe's time. Understanding literature from various standpoints helps us to discover ways in which complex social issues can be told.

Works Cited

- Bowers, Terence. "John Locke, Ecological Imperialism, and the Narration of the Land in Robinson Crusoe—A Tale of the Anthropocene." *Studies in Philology*, Volume 120, Number 4, Fall 2023, pp. 728-758.
- Defoe, Daniel. *Robinson Crusoe*. Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Fragano, Stephen. "Colonizing Land by Sea: Oceanic Trade and Travel in Daniel Defoe's Robinson Crusoe." *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Volume 56, Issue 3, Spring 2023, pp. 377-393.
- Hulme, John. *Colonial Encounters*. New York, Methuen & Co., 1986.
- Hutnyk, John. "Robinsonades: Pertaining to Allegories from the East India Company in Ceylon and Other Islands, from Marxism to Post-Structuralism, and in Which, Dear Reader, a 300-Year-Old Adventure Book May Still Have Something to Say." *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, Volume 21, Issue, 2, 25 June 2020, pp. 279-286.
- Pepperell, Nicole. "'To Dream of a Wildness Distant from Ourselves': Capitalism, Colonialism, and the Robinsonade." *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, Volume 59, Issue 4, 6 Sept. 2023, pp. 449-464.
- Reddeman, Claire. "Robinson Crusoe in the Pacific: REFUGIO by Roger Palmer and the Marxian Theory of Economic Character Masks." *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, Volume 59, Issue 4, 8 Aug. 2023, pp. 465-481.
- Schmidgen, Wolfram. "Robinson Crusoe, Enumeration, and the Mercantile Fetish." *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Volume 35, Issue 1, Fall 2001, pp. 19-39.
- Todd, Dennis. "Robinson Crusoe and Colonialism." *The Cambridge Companion to Robinson Crusoe*, edited by John Richetti, Cambridge University Press, 2018, 142-156.

Kaelin Natland

Faith in Captivity: The Function of Scripture in Mary Rowlandson's Narrative

Hope has long been a powerful force that enables people to endure even the darkest of times. Whether it's the unwavering belief that better days are ahead or the quiet assurance that one's suffering has purpose, hope can fuel survival when everything else seems lost. For some, hope is found in the promise of family, for others, in a community's support, and for many, it resides in faith. In "Narrative of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson," Mary Rowlandson's hope was rooted in her deep religious convictions. Throughout her captivity, she continually turned to Scripture, interpreting her traumatic experiences through the lens of biblical teachings. This reliance on faith not only helped her make sense of her suffering but also provided her with the resilience to survive. Rowlandson's incorporation of Scripture serves not only as a means of interpreting her traumatic experiences in captivity but also as a crucial mechanism for coping, grounding her faith, and ultimately fostering resilience in the face of adversity.

In the extended title of Mary Rowlandson's narrative, she begins by reflecting over the Lord's faithfulness in her captivity journey, "The sovereignty and goodness of GOD, together with the faithfulness of his promises displayed, being a narrative of the captivity and restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson, commended by her, to all that desires to know the Lord's doings to, and dealings with her." She begins her narrative by deliberating the sovereignty—supreme power and authority—and goodness of God. If God is sovereign, that means that He allowed Mary's captivity, the death of her family, and the post-traumatic stress that she will face after she is restored. Mary will go on to share the absolute horrors of her captivity journey, yet she is able to start her testimony with confidence that even though she went through deep, gut-wrenching trauma, God is still good. Mary Rowlandson's faith that she survived captivity, and this faith takes center stage through her use of Scripture throughout the narrative.

Although Mary Rowlandson maintains great hope throughout her captivity, she is still human. Mary still has doubts, feels weakness, both physical and mental, and feels hopeless at times. This is the reality of being human, even for a person of faith; there are ebbs and flows to hope and hopelessness, doubt and faith, confidence and feeling unsure. Mary's humanity is on full

display in the first remove when she says, “All was gone, my husband gone..., my children gone, my relations and friends gone, our house and home and all our comforts—within door and without—all was gone (except my life), and I knew not but the next moment that might go too.” Everything...gone. What hopelessness and utter fear to know that all has been stripped away and one’s life could be taken at any moment. In the second remove, Mary analyzed that it is only the Lord that carries her through these feelings: “It is not my tongue, or pen, can express the sorrows of my heart, and bitterness of my spirit that I had at this departure: but God was with me in a wonderful manner, carrying me along, and bearing up my spirit, that it did not quite fail.” Mary cannot even begin to express verbally or typographically the deep sorrows of her soul, and to any person without trust in a sovereign God, these feelings would result in hopelessness. Yet, she knows that it is only by the mere grace of God that she has not failed and given up. Mary Rowlandson’s “but God” changes the entire tone of this sentence, and it is through continued “but God” phrases that she is able to not only maintain hope, but survive.

The concept of the mere grace of God is very present in Johnathan Edwards 1741 sermon “Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God,” which became a catalyst for Puritan beliefs. The concept of God’s mere pleasure and grace that Edwards discusses in “Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God” are very present in and characterize Mary Rowlandson’s narrative, despite the fact that they are written sixty-six years apart, with Rowlandson’s narrative predating Edward’s sermon. Edwards highlights the certainty of sin leading to hell, but also that God is the only reason sinners are not already there. God is holding sinners out of the fiery pits by His “mere pleasure.” Mary even uses the same vivid imagery that Edwards will later use in the third remove: “that it was easy for me to see how righteous it was with God to cut off the thread of my life and cast me out of His presence forever. Yet the Lord still showed mercy to me, and upheld me; and as He wounded me with one hand, so he healed me with the other” (Rowlandson, Third Remove). The mere pleasure of God keeps sinners out of hell, yes, but it is by this same pleasure that God sent his Son to live perfectly, die sacrificially, and rise victoriously from the grave; therefore, conquering all sin and death. Due to this radical movement of love for His creation, God also invites those saved by his blood to view their trials and tribulations through a lens of hope. Romans 5:1-5 in the Christian Standard Bible reads:

1 Therefore, since we have been justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. **2** We have also obtained access through him by faith into this grace in which we stand, and we boast in

the hope of the glory of God. **3** And not only that, but we also boast in our afflictions, because we know that affliction produces endurance, **4** endurance produces proven character, and proven character produces hope. **5** This hope will not disappoint us, because God's love has been poured out in our hearts through the Holy Spirit who was given to us.

In the book of Romans, the apostle Paul is writing that because of the salvation that Jesus purchased on the cross, there is exceeding hope. So much so that it floods into every area of a believer's life, including trials, and the end result is hope that will not disappoint. Mary Rowlandson is a professing woman of faith who has been saved by the blood of Jesus, and because of her faith, God's Word invites her to see every circumstance through the lens of hope, and Mary answers this invitation with a resounding "yes, Lord!"

Puritan theology deeply shaped Rowlandson's approach to suffering, as it is emphasized in the Bible as the ultimate authority for understanding all aspects of life. The Puritans viewed Scripture as a living document, one that provided guidance not only for moral and spiritual matters but also for interpreting extraordinary events like suffering and trauma. A key component of this interpretive framework was typology, which involved identifying parallels between biblical figures and contemporary experiences. By linking personal hardships to divine narratives, individuals could find meaning in their suffering and assurance of eventual restoration.

For Mary Rowlandson, this typological framework was a vital tool for making sense of her captivity. By comparing herself to figures like Job and David, she framed her suffering as part of a divine plan that promised ultimate deliverance. Scholar David Downing notes that nearly a third of the Scripture Rowlandson cites comes from the Psalms, and she frequently draws from the trials of Job, using his words six times and referring to King David multiple times (Downing 255). Both figures epitomize unwavering faith in the midst of trials, offering Rowlandson a model for endurance. For example, she recounts the brutal murder of her family and community by quoting Job 1:15: "And I only am escaped alone to tell the News" (Rowlandson). She describes, "There were twelve killed, some shot, some stabbed with their spears, some knocked down with their hatchets... yet the Lord by His almighty power preserved a number of us from death, for there were twenty-four of us taken alive and carried captive" (Rowlandson). By referencing Job 1:15, Rowlandson paints herself as a survivor chosen by God to endure and testify, much like Job's faithfulness amid suffering. This connection underscores her belief in God's ultimate faithfulness

to preserve and restore; themes that resonate throughout her narrative.

Diving deeper into Rowlandson's comparison of herself with Job, reveals countless similarities between the two. In the Book of Job, there is a moment when Satan approaches God with a proposition: Satan believes that Job is only so faithful to God because he is prosperous; however, if everything was stripped away from Job, he would curse God's Name. Satan proposes that God allow him to bring destruction on Job's life, ripping everything from him, to demonstrate the truth of his hypothesis, and God allows this trial with the expectation that Satan will spare Job's life. With God's permission, Satan strips Job of all ten of his children, his status in his community, wealth, livestock; all the comforts of life that Job once knew. Even in the midst of all of this suffering, Job still does not curse God, so Satan tells God that it is only because Job still has his physical health that Job has not abandoned his faith. God allows Satan to inflict physical pain onto Job and he gets open, painful sores all over his body, yet Job still does not curse God's Name. Similarly, Mary Rowlandson is stripped of all the comforts of her former life—her husband, children, home, community—and even her physical body is harmed through a wound that pains her. Mary still does not curse God's Name in the midst of her suffering, just like Job. Job's story comforts Mary for a profound reason: God is sovereign over every moment, and He uses the testimonies of others to bring hope for humanity and to show the glory of His Name.

The Psalms are also a great comfort to Mary as she faces captivity at the hands of the Native American people. As mentioned earlier, nearly one third of Rowlandson's references to Scripture are Psalms, therefore proving their importance in her survival and hope (Downing 255). These references to the Psalms act as a way for Mary to express herself, and scholar Kathryn Derounian even argues that this self-expression is crucial to her psychological survival (91). Additionally, scholar Dawn Henwood reflects on the fact that white captives could not express their emotion because the Native Americans forced repression onto them and that Rowlandson herself does not succumb to outward emotion until the eighth remove, yet reflecting on Psalm 137:1 provides great comfort for her (171-172). The Psalm reads, "By the Rivers of Babylon, there we sate down: yea, we wept when we remembered Zion." In the midst of this Psalm, David is writing to express the sorrow of the Jewish people because they were in exile, longing for their home in Jerusalem.

Similarly, Mary Rowlandson is in captivity, away from her home and she weeps in longing for what she once had. The fact that the Jews also

wept in mourning provides Mary with the empowerment to also release her emotions that had been repressed. In suffering, God's Word instructs believers in Matthew 11:28 to "Come to me, all of you who are weary and burdened, and I will give you rest." God, who sympathizes with the pain of humanity, provides rest for those who come to Him. Furthermore, God shows that He sympathizes with the pain of humanity through the mocking, flogging, and crucifixion that He faced, but also through the fact that He had real human emotions. John 11:35 says that "Jesus wept" at the reality of Lazarus's death, and Jesus weeps even though He knows that He is about to raise Lazarus from the dead. Mary Rowlandson is consciously aware that turning to God in trials will provide rest, and this provides hope for her to survive in captivity.

While turning to Scripture as a source for hope is a powerful tool for survival, it is essential to consider the psychological effectiveness of this concept; is faith effective in building resilience in the midst of trauma? Psychological research on religious coping has shown that faith-based practices and beliefs can play a significant role in managing and recovering from trauma. Religious coping mechanisms, such as prayer, meditation, and engaging with sacred texts, have been found to provide emotional resilience and psychological comfort for individuals facing adversity. Studies from psychiatrists Harris, J. Irene, et al. suggest that religious beliefs can help individuals find meaning in suffering, offering them a framework to understand and contextualize their pain in a way that fosters emotional stability. For Rowlandson, her reliance on Scripture during her captivity can be understood as a form of religious coping, where her faith provided not only a sense of hope but also a means to reframe her traumatic experience. Research also indicates that religious coping strategies can buffer the effects of trauma by reducing feelings of helplessness and promoting a sense of agency, as individuals perceive themselves as participants in a divine plan rather than mere victims of circumstance.

Rowlandson's ability to endure captivity may, in part, be attributed to her reliance on these religious coping mechanisms, which provided her with both emotional strength and a sense of purpose in the midst of suffering.

The relationship between faith and survival in Mary Rowlandson's captivity narrative reveals a tension between spiritual reliance and human instincts for self-preservation. Branka Arsić's critique further suggests that Rowlandson's grief and typological use of Scripture do not adequately sustain her emotional or physical wellbeing during captivity. Instead of relying on religious concepts to endure her trauma, Rowlandson's survival seems driven more by her desperation and the pressing need to address her physical

state, such as her hunger. Arsić points out that while grief and typology may have helped Rowlandson interpret her suffering within a broader religious framework, they fail to provide her with the kind of direct emotional relief necessary for survival in the most dire circumstances. Rowlandson's narrative portrays her desperation for food and safety as primary motivators during her captivity, suggesting that it is not her religious convictions that sustain her in the immediate moment, but the fundamental human instincts for self-preservation. This raises important questions about the limits of religious faith in extreme trauma. Can faith alone truly support a person in the face of such immediate physical and psychological suffering, or does it merely provide a post-hoc justification for survival after the fact? Arsić's analysis challenges the view that typology and religious faith are sufficient tools for enduring the overwhelming conditions of captivity. In examining Mary Rowlandson's narrative, it is evident that Scripture plays a pivotal role in providing her with emotional, spiritual, and psychological support during her captivity. Through the lens of typology and her reliance on Biblical passages, Rowlandson interprets her suffering and finds solace in the belief that her pain serves a higher, divine purpose. The Psalms offer a source of comfort and hope, and her faith becomes a crucial mechanism for survival. However, the counter-argument raised by Branka Arsić presents a valid critique of the limits of faith in addressing the immediate physical and emotional needs of a person in trauma. Arsić suggests that while Rowlandson's religious convictions help her interpret her suffering, they fail to provide the tangible support necessary for survival in such extreme conditions.

In "The Narrative of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson," hope emerges as a profound force that allows Rowlandson to endure extraordinary trials. Rooted in her Puritan faith, she navigates the trauma of captivity by interpreting her experiences through Scripture, which provides her with a lens of hope and resilience. By aligning herself with biblical figures such as Job and David, Rowlandson finds meaning in her suffering and a promise of ultimate restoration. This reliance on Scripture as a coping mechanism underscores not only her personal faith but also the broader Puritan theological framework that views suffering as a pathway to spiritual growth and divine grace. Moreover, her narrative demonstrates the psychological benefits of religious coping, revealing how faith can provide emotional resilience, a sense of agency, and hope in the face of adversity. Rowlandson's story reminds us that even in the darkest moments, hope—whether derived from faith, community, or personal conviction—can sustain and strengthen the human spirit.

Works Cited

- Arsić, Branka. "Mary Rowlandson and the Phenomenology of Patient Suffering." *Common Knowledge*, vol. 16, no. 2, 2010, pp. 247–75.
- Derounian, Kathryn Zabelle. "Puritan Orthodoxy and the "Survivor Syndrome" in Mary Rowlandson's Indian Captivity Narrative." *Early American Literature*, vol. Spring; 22, no. 1, 1987, pp. 82-93.
- Downing, David. "'Streams of Scripture Comfort:' Mary Rowlandson's Typological Use of the Bible." *Early American Literature*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 252–59.
- Edwards, Johnathan. "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God." *Sermon Index*, 8 July 1741.
- Harris, J. Irene, et al. "Christian religious functioning and trauma outcomes." *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, vol. 64, no. 1, 26 Dec. 2007, pp. 17–29.
- Henwood, Dawn. "Mary Rowlandson and the Psalms: The Textuality of Survival." *Early American Literature*, vol. 32, no. 2, 1997, pp. 169–86.
- Rowlandson, Mary White. "Narrative of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson." Project Gutenberg, 2009, ebook #851.

Contributors Notes

SARAH ALLEN is a 2025 graduate from Southern Illinois University-Carbondale, where she received a B.A. in English.

Originally from Benton, Illinois, MAKENNA MUMBOWER attends Southern Illinois University-Carbondale, where she majors in English Education. After graduation, she plans to teach in her hometown while working toward a master's degree. When she's not parsing the complexities of captivity in 19th century literature, she enjoys distance running, pilates, reading for pleasure, spending time at the lake with friends and family, and trying out new Pinterest recipes in the kitchen. This paper was originally written for Dr. Boulukos's "Slavery, Captivity, and Freedom" undergrad seminar.

Originally from Carrier Mills, Illinois, MADISON MURPHY currently attends Southern Illinois University-Carbondale, where she majors in Secondary Education-English. She is a member of Sigma Tau Delta and Golden Apple. This paper was originally written for Dr. Amos's course, "Magic & Meaning: The Literary Uses of Enchantment."

KAELIN NATLAND is a 2025 graduate of Southern Illinois University-Carbondale, where she majored in Secondary English Education with a minor in Psychology.

MARY SCHELLENBERG is an undergraduate student studying English Literature with minors in history and American studies. Over her academic career at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, she has been a member of SIU's honor program, worked as an English tutor for Intercollegiate Athletics, and been published in SIU's *Grassroots Literary & Arts Magazine*, as well as two anthologies by Eber & Wein Publishing. Now she is a consultant at SIU's Writing Center and a member of the English honor's society Sigma Tau Delta. After graduation Mary will continue teaching English and Writing at Trinity Christian School in Carbondale, IL. The featured paper was written for Professor Tony Williams' class, "Literary Perspectives of the Modern World."

KATRINA STANLEY graduated from Southern Illinois University-Carbondale with a degree in English and a concentration in pre-professional writing. When she's not working at her local library, Katrina enjoys taking care of her cats, reading, and journaling.

KIRSTEN WHITE is a 2025 graduate of Southern Illinois University-Carbondale, where she majored in English with a focus in Secondary Education. She currently teaches 7th grade English at Orange Beach Middle & High School in Orange Beach, Alabama, where she also enjoys coaching middle school volleyball and high school softball. Kirsten is a proud military spouse. She and her husband, Bruce, enjoy beach life with their one-year-old lab, Sunny. This paper was originally written for Dr. Boulukos's "Slavery, Captivity, & Freedom" course.

