

Decentring the Wizard:

An Analysis of the Constructed Discourses of Animality in the Harry Potter Series

Martine Juritzen Haugann



A Thesis Submitted to The Department of Literature,
Area Studies, and European Languages

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
MA Degree

Spring 2015

Decentring the Wizard:

An Analysis of the Constructed Discourses of Animality in the Harry Potter Series

Martine Juritzen Haugann

**A Thesis Submitted to The Department of Literature,
Area Studies, and European Languages**

University of Oslo

**In Partial Fulfillments of the
Requirements for the MA Degree**

Spring 2015

© Martine Juritzen Haugann

2015

Decentring the Wizard: An Analysis of the Constructed Discourses of Animality in the Harry Potter Series

Martine Juritzen Haugann

<http://www.duo.uio.no/>

Print: Reprosentralen, Universitetet i Oslo

ABSTRACT

This thesis seeks to explore the way constructions of animality present problematic discourses of race, gender and human ethnic groups in the Harry Potter series. This is done with special emphasis on the third novel, *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*, the fifth, *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*, and the seventh, *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*. The overall claim is that problematic representations of animality constructions in the series reinforce, rather than resist, stereotypes and prejudices against homosexuals, ethnic minority groups, females and “real” animals. It follows that these representations are problematic when portrayed in such a popular work as the Harry Potter series, and that this needs to be recognised and challenged in order to work against an animalisation of the Other.

Acknowledgments

First, I would like to thank my supervisor, Michael Lundblad, for invaluable guidance all the way through this process. This thesis would not have happened without your insight and knowledge, constructive feedback or encouragements. Thank you.

My co-students on the 10th floor, thank you. Your guidance and feedback, along with your company during lunch breaks have helped me maintain most of my sanity throughout this year.

To my mom, Hanne Juritzen, thank you for always pushing me, always believing in me and always keeping my feet on the ground. You are the inspiration for every good thing I do.

Last, but not least, Thomas. Thank you for enduring my mood-swings, panic attacks and near-violent outbursts during this year. I could not have done this without you.

But courage and adventure and pleasure in the uncertain, the undared –
courage seems to me man's whole prehistory. He envied the wildest,
most courageous animals and robbed all their virtues: only thus
did he become man.

- Friedrich Nietzsche

Table of Contents

Abbreviations	XI
Introduction	1
1 Constructing the Heterosexual: <i>Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban</i>	13
1.1 Light/Dark Dualism	14
1.2 Established Heteronormativity	19
1.3 “Man is a Wolf to Man”	24
2 Constructing the Other: <i>Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix</i>	34
2.1 The Other Within.....	36
2.2 The Mad Other.....	39
2.3 Animalisation of Other	43
3 Constructing Gender Roles: <i>Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows</i>	57
3.1 Stereotyped Gender Roles	58
3.2 Naturalisation of Motherhood	62
3.3 The Final Battle	69
4 Epilogue	79
Works Cited.....	81

Abbreviations

Quotations from the following works are cited with these abbreviations:

HP1	<i>Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone</i> , 1997
HP2	<i>Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets</i> , 1998
HP3	<i>Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban</i> , 1999
HP4	<i>Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire</i> , 2000
HP5	<i>Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix</i> , 2003
HP6	<i>Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince</i> , 2005
HP7	<i>Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows</i> , 2007

Quotations from the film adaptations will be cited with these abbreviations:

HP5	<i>Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix</i> , 2007
HP7	<i>Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows, Part One</i> , 2010
HP8	<i>Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows, Part Two</i> , 2011

Introduction

My general aim with this thesis is to explore how the immensely popular Harry Potter series, written by J.K. Rowling, reflects upon our contemporary society with special emphasis on what I argue to be a problematic domination of anthropocentric, or human-centred, values. *Harry Potter* displays a vast diversity of animals throughout the series, varying from mythological creatures to Animagi, people who can change into animal form at will, and I argue that these represent several human ethnic groups in a manner that both “naturalises” and justifies the stereotypes connected to them.

Some critics of Harry Potter, such as Roni Natov, Peter Ciaccio and Drew Chappell, argue that the Harry Potter series challenge constructed dualisms that prejudice certain groups of humans, class hierarchy and gender roles. They read the series as resisting an anthropocentric framework and by doing this they argue that the novels convey a message of multiculturalism, inclusion and diversity, which teaches the young readers the importance of an open mind. What these critics fail to recognise, though, is the problematic constructions of animality, which ultimately tends to reinforce rather than resist stereotypes of gender roles, racism, and class hierarchy. When critics do not pay attention to these constructions, they risk establishing the stereotypes and prejudices they presumably wish to work against. Rather than reading the series’ complex character display as situating multiplicity, I suggest a reading where the various constructed discourses at play in the novels display situations that “naturalises” the stereotypes.

With this, as an overarching aim, I attempt to provide an understanding of how I believe that too much of an anthropocentric framework forms the foundation for oppression of several groups of people in addition to other animals and nature. Therefore, I will structure my thesis into three chapters with each examining specific oppressed groups of humans, as they are represented within the text. In relation to this, I will explore the notion of Cartesian dualism, the Darwinist-Freudian framework, and ecofeminism. I will build my thesis on several fields of theory, ranging from animal and animality studies, eco-criticism, and post-humanism theory.

To relate my argument to the Harry Potter series, I will display what Suman Gupta explores in his book, *Re-reading Harry Potter* (2009), of the problematic presentation of race in the Harry Potter series. He investigates the relation between muggles and wizards and how the “theme of the fascist obsession with blood” (103) distinguishes how there is an ongoing

racist undertone throughout the series. He cites Andrew Blake's observations on how the "books do their best to raise awareness of racism, and they constantly attack ideas about purity, blood and race, but at the heart of all the stories is a semi-parallel magical world whose inhabitants are superior to ordinary humans, and that's that" (105). Thus, such critics as Gupta, Blake and Jack Zipes help raise awareness of the problematic portrayal of race within the series. As Gupta reminds us, it "is arguably not the job of the fictional world to correct the unpalatable facts of our world but to reflect them and raise awareness, and certainly such ambiguities are amply manifested even amongst the well-meaning and more tolerant institutions and people of our world" (106). He continues, "On the other hand, it is not so much that Zipes and Blake above question that such ambiguities exist in our world and therefore exist in the fictional Magic world, but that these are presented in a fashion that doesn't bring them to awareness: these are presented as being natural and comfortable" (106).

In other words, the problematic portrayal Rowling makes with muggles and wizards help establish and naturalise conceptions of race, class and gender that are dominant within popular culture. However, as much as I agree with Zipes, Blake and Gupta, I wish to explore this even further by looking not only into the relationship between the muggle world and wizard world, but into the various species introduced in the series. What Gupta, Zipes and Blake overlooks is the problematic representation the various species makes with ethnic human peoples and stereotypical images of other groups of people in the reader's contemporary world. I wish to investigate the representations of species with an animality studies perspective, along with an overarching view of eco-criticism. I will, as mentioned, structure my thesis into three chapters where each will explore one novel of the series each in order to see how the plot progresses into a more complex view of species. This is not to say that Rowling eventually manages to challenge the contemporary concept of racism or class differences, or even the trouble with patriarchal domination, but I argue that as the plot develops, the inclusion of other species become more complex, and that this provide for an interesting analysis of the anthropocentric mind-set of the reader's contemporary world. Henceforth in this introduction, I will attempt to outline some of the important thinkers and scholars talking about various ways to understand animality.

Most scholars, such as Val Plumwood and Richard Sorabji, traces the concept of Cartesian dualism back to Aristotle and Plato. Plumwood examines this in her book, *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature* (1993), where she explains three steps in the evolution of human/nature dualism, which is "the great gulf between the human and the natural which

has become characteristic of the western tradition” (107). The first step, she argues, “is the construction of the normative (the best or ideal) human identity as mind or reason” and thus “excluding or inferiorising the whole rich range of other human and non-human characteristics” (107). The second step is the “construction of mind or reason in terms exclusive of and oppositional to nature”, and the third step is the “construction of nature itself as mindless” (107). The last step is credited to Descartes who “wanted to connect soul only with consciousness” (Sorabji 98), and he thus substituted the word ‘soul’ with ‘mind’. This shows a brief history of the human/nature dualism that further developed into a more complex set of dualisms, such as feminine/masculine, reason/emotion, and nature/culture.

While Plato regarded human identity as outside nature, he had a different notion of nature than Descartes. Plato considered the disciplining and domination of internal nature, the body, emotions and senses, to be the primacy of reason (Plumwood 109). Plumwood reminds us that “Plato does not seem to think of the natural world itself, external nature, as a field for control, something humans have power over or have to struggle with” (109). This is one of the major differences between Plato’s ideology and Descartes’ theory of mind. Descartes believed that since humans are the only ones with a mind, everything else lies outside the human realm, and thus outside reason. Descartes broadly defined several psychological concepts within his notion of consciousness, such as “imagination, sensation, emotion, as well as intellectual functions” (113). What he argued, then, was not that “animals have sensation, and therefore must think, but instead that they cannot think (reason), and therefore must lack true sensation” (113). Samantha Hurn reminds us in her book, *Humans and Other Animals* (2012), of Descartes’ mechanistic view of animals, “animals lacked consciousness and, as a result, were nothing more than animated machines – their cries as he dissected them alive were involuntary and reminiscent of the springs and cogs in, say, a clock” (15). This illustrates Descartes’ broad definition of consciousness; if you lack reason, you also lack the ability to feel.

When critics talk about Descartes, they tend to refer to the highly influential work of Jacques Derrida, and especially his famous essay, “The Animal that Therefore I Am” (1997). Derrida spoke at a conference in 1997, called The Autobiographical Animal. His lecture would later be transcribed and turned into the essay aforementioned. Here, Derrida questions human subjectivity in relation to his own experience of one morning being caught naked by the gazing stare of his cat. He reflects; “I often ask myself, just to see, who I am – and who I am (following) at the moment when, caught naked, in silence, by the gaze of an animal, for

example , the eyes of a cat, I have trouble, yes, a bad time, overcoming my embarrassment” (3-4). The supposedly real situation leaves Derrida in embarrassment by the gaze, and he further feels ashamed of his embarrassment. He is ashamed that his cat’s gaze upon his nakedness leaves him in such shame. Atterton and Calarco reminds us how Derrida “moves beyond the project of deconstructing the human/animal binary and seeks to develop a positive thought of being-with animals that has its origins in the uncanny experience of being watched by the other animal” (xxii).

Derrida questions and critiques several influential philosophers before him with regard to the question of the animal, and he presents two hypotheses relating to the “radical finitude and multiplicity of other animals” (xxii). The first hypothesis concerns the increased and accelerated mistreatment of other animals, and how this is due to “an unprecedented transformation in our relationship with animals over the past two centuries” (xxii), as Atterton and Calarco reminds us. The second hypothesis derives around the concept of acknowledging and valuing animals’ “multiplicity and singularity with regard to each other and those beings called ‘human’” (xxii). Derrida attempts to accomplish this by coining the term “animot”, which suggests speaking of animals in the “plural of animals heard in the singular” (xxii). In other words, Derrida suggests that the uniting term of “animal” perpetuates every other species than human beings, as the ultimate Other to humans. Thus, he proposes another term, “animot”, which would suggest acknowledging the complexity and multiplicity of all the various species without representing them as one complete unit of Otherness.

In relation to Derrida’s influential work, I wish to mention the significant work of Michel Foucault in order to situate the question of the animal in terms of madness. Foucault’s *Madness and Civilization* (1967), traces the history of madness and relates various epochs to different constructions of animality. He argues for animality as a constructed discourse, which is defined differently from one epoch to the next, in accordance with the determining of madness. Foucault reads the mad in the Renaissance as resembling animals “whose fascinating qualities made them potential sources for religious revelation and esoteric learning” (Atterton and Calarco xx). This shift in the classical age when madness was considered “a social menace” (xxi), and the mad were portrayed as beasts, wild and untamed, and completely removed from reason. Thus, their animality evidently established their madness, and their lack of reason, in true Cartesian spirit, excluded them from humanity as the animals they were. I will elaborate more on the relation between animality and madness in chapter two, where I investigate some of the characters represented as mad. In terms of

connecting the constructions of animality with my central claim of *Harry Potter* adapting too much of an anthropocentric framework, I will continue with outlining some of the general conceptions of anthropocentrism.

Descartes' exclusion of mind from animals and nature situates humans in a position elevated far above everything else around us. This has made the basis for the anthropocentric worldview we live by today. Anthropocentrism can be defined as having human interest as the basis for ethics. As Patrick Curry explains in his book, *Ecological Ethics: An Introduction* (2011), "All value, for us, is *anthropogenic*: generated by human experience" (54). He argues that only "because value is generated *by* human beings, it does not follow that humans must be the main or only repository or concern *of* value" (54). In other words, although ethics is produced by humans, it does not necessarily have to exclude other beings from ethical treatment. As Curry further emphasises: "there is nothing wrong with a concern for human beings as such, nor is it necessarily inconsistent with a concern for nonhuman nature" (55). He therefore proposes another definition of anthropocentrism as referring to "*the unjustified privileging of human beings, as such, at the expense of other forms of life*, analogous to such prejudices as racism or sexism" (55). With this definition, anthropocentrism does not only suggest a value system based on human interest, it could mean to justify mistreatment of other human groups traditionally animalized due to racism, classism, sexism and other -isms that define oppressed groups. This reminds us of Frans de Waal's comparison between human compassion and the image of a floating pyramid.

De Waal writes in *Good Natured* (1996), how human morality depends on the well-being of oneself and the closest of kin around you, "The circle of altruism and moral obligation widens to extended family, clan, and group, up to including nation. Benevolence decreases with increasing distance between people" (212). He explains how we can see morality as a floating pyramid, rather than "an expanding circle" (213):

"The force lifting the pyramid out of the water – its buoyancy- is provided by the available resources. Its size above the surface reflects the extent of moral inclusion. The higher the pyramid rises, the wider the network of aid and obligation. People on the brink of starvation can afford only a tiny tip of the moral pyramid: it will be every man for himself" (213).

In other words, if a society can afford it, “the moral pyramid may swell to giant size, in principal embracing all of humanity, but always retaining its fundamental shape. Life forms other than our own may be included” (214). De Waal stresses that recent studies in animal behaviour suggest that we “reconsider the way animals are used for science, entertainment, food, education, and other purposes” (214), and that this process has already started to evolve in research institutions and in society. However, he explains how he is not comfortable when these issues are phrased in terms of rights, “Emphasis on autonomy rather than on connection has given rise to a discourse that is cold, dogmatic, and leaning toward an absolutism that fails to do justice to the gray areas of which human morality is composed” (214). De Waal exemplifies this with Paola Cavalieri and Peter Singer’s project, *The Great Ape Project*, where they suggest a community consisting of humans and apes on equal terms, suggesting that animals as close to us as the great apes should be placed in the same moral category as us. De Waal’s problem with this is, “If rights increase in proportion to the number of humanlike characteristics possessed by a species, it is hard to escape the conclusion that humans themselves deserve the most rights of all” (215). In other words, Cavalieri and Singer’s proposal, presumably well meant, imply a moral society just like the one we already have, with human beings right in the centre of receiving moral obligation. De Waal argues, “No matter how well intentioned the concerns of animal rights advocates, they are often presented in a manner infuriating to anyone concerned about *both* people and animals. [...] who can deny our species the right to construct its moral universe from a human perspective?” (215). Here, de Waal exemplifies the need for defining anthropocentrism as Curry does. There is nothing wrong in concerning moral obligation for humans, but that does not need to exclude animals, or oppressed and “animalised” groups of people from the intrinsic values.

When scholars are talking about animalising others, they tend to look to Darwin and Freud, as Michael Lundblad does in his book, *The Birth of a Jungle* (2013). He explores “the discourse of the jungle”, and argues that it “produces new constructions of animality as ‘naturally’ violent in the name of survival, and heterosexual in the name of reproduction” (2). In other words, the Darwinist-Freudian framework justifies violence and heteronormativity by the evolutionary logic that this is “natural” to us, due to instincts from our animal ancestors. Lundblad further examines how several texts from the turn of the twentieth century resist this discourse, and how “this discourse is more recent, complicated, and significant than current scholarship tends to suggest” (2). He examines the differences between the savage and the animal, and how the white, privileged man “became more interested in getting in touch with

their own ‘animal instincts’” (122). Lundblad examines a specific period at the end of the nineteenth century, “resulting in a ‘humane society’ broadly conceived that was capable of associating whiteness more with animality than savagery and elevating the animal in new and problematic ways” (123). Thus, animal instincts in white privileged men elevates them above those of “savage ancestry”, resulting in a racist discourse that undermines human ethnic groups as lower than that of animals.

This is one of the notions Lundblad explores, another is resistance within texts to the concept of heteronormativity. He suggests how “Tracing the genealogy of the jungle can lead to new possibilities for understanding the ‘species’ of the homosexual” (32), and builds this upon Michel Foucault’s famous work *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction*. Lundblad explores constructions of animality in Henry James’ *The Beast in the Jungle*, and in three of Jack London’s wolf stories, and argues that several discourses are at play here, and he offers a new reading of the texts that ultimately resists the Darwinist-Freudian discourse of the jungle. By “queering” the beast in James’ novella, and suggesting interspecies homoerotic relationship between Buck and Thornton in London’s *The Call of the Wild*, Lundblad provides an understanding of the animal as resisting and challenging the “epistemology of the jungle” (32). A more detailed discussion on the connection between animality and homosexuality will be taken up in my first chapter, where I examine the characterisations of werewolves in the third novel of *Harry Potter*.

Thus, the discourse of the jungle is problematic in how it “naturalises” certain prejudices and stereotypes of human ethnic groups, gender roles, the concept of heteronormativity and violence in the name of survival. It justifies the subjection of the privileged, white man, and the objectification of other ethnic groups of people. This relates, among others, to the theories and beliefs of ecofeminists, such as Val Plumwood, Carol J. Adams, and Carolyn Merchant.

Ecofeminism is, as Chris J. Cuomo writes in his book, *Feminism and Ecological Communities: An Ethic of Flourishing* (1998), “noticing similarities and connections between forms and instances of human oppression, including the oppression of women, and the degradation of nature” (1). In other words, ecofeminism builds upon the belief that there is a connection between patriarchal domination and the oppression of nature. When considering dualisms, female and nature belongs in the same binary category, while male and culture are the opposing notions. Curry explains it as “insofar as *patriarchy* identifies women with nature

and dominates both, they are internally linked, so a struggle to resist or overturn *either* must address both” (127).

A problematic aspect of ecofeminism is the various movements related to it, such as the Chipko Movement in Nepal in the 1970s, where tribal women fought against deforestation by surrounding and hugging the trees. Another is the community of Love Canal resisting, with Lois Gibbs in the lead, the increased toxic waste pollution affecting the entire community. These, along with other similar movements have painted a picture of ecofeminists as caring for and protecting the environment only when the environmental issues is threatening their private spheres. Catriona Sandilands problematizes this in her book, *The Good-Natured Feminist* (1999). She emphasises how this “motherhood environmentalism” is “all about threats to the children and self-sacrifice for the sake of future generations” (xiii), and how “Women’s knowledges of nature are reduced to a particular story about their children’s health, and any other appearance of nature in human life is rendered invisible and unnecessary to the homemaker’s activist consciousness or practice” (xiv). In other words, the way ecofeminism has been portrayed suggests that women care for the environment because of their relation to the home and family life. The earth is our greater home, and we must take care of it as we take care of our own private spheres. It further suggests a selfish motive where it is our children’s wellbeing that is the motivation behind environmentalist concern, as “The earth, remember, must be saved for *human* children; nobody really cares about the rest until it becomes a human health problem” (xiii). This, as Sandilands also emphasises, is functioning to reinforce, “or even reproducing, the types of domination against which it [ecofeminism] purportedly struggles” (xvi).

I agree with Sandilands that the portrayal made by these movements reinforces a stereotypical image of the caring mother, and in my opinion is this not what ecofeminism is about. I wish to explore ecofeminism as another aspect of why anthropocentrism and oppression is connected. This theory is more related to that of Val Plumwood and Carol J. Adams. Plumwood argues in her book, *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature* (1993), that “western culture has treated the human/nature relation as a dualism and that this explains many of the problematic features of the west’s treatment of nature which underlie the environmental crisis, especially the western construction of human identity as ‘outside’ nature” (2). This, I argue, does not only apply for the environmental crisis, but also for the prejudice against ethnic human groups and the mistreatment of other animals, which suggest a connection between environmentalism, animal studies and animality studies.

Plumwood argues further, that the “dominant and ancient traditions connecting men with culture and women with nature are also overlain by some more recent and conflicting ones” (20). These conflicting traditions suggest that the “unchangeable ‘male’ essence (‘virility’) is connected to a nature no longer viewed as reproductive and providing but as ‘wild’, violent, competitive and sexual, and ‘the female’ is viewed in contrasting terms as insipid, domestic, asexual and civilising” (20). Thus, the traditional relation between female and nature is not as simple as critics tend to suggest. As Plumwood also notes, “both the dominant tradition of men as reason and women as nature, the more recent conflicting one of men as forceful and wild and women as tamed and domestic, have had the effect of confirming masculine power” (20). I will engage this discussion further in my third chapter where I examine problematic female representations in HP7.

Harry Potter Criticism

In order to fully understand the relation between the Harry Potter series and why anthropocentrism is problematic, I will outline what critics are, and have been discussing about *Harry Potter*, and I will attempt to show why I believe my argument is important in this relation. Much of the criticism about *Harry Potter* appeared before the series was concluded, which makes the debate mostly about the earlier novels. This could pose a problem when critics, such as Casey Cothran claims in his essay, “Lessons in Transfiguration: Allegories of Male Identity in Rowling’s *Harry Potter* series” (2005), that Rowling writes “about masculine sexuality and male identity” (123), when this might be true for the earlier novels, but not with the later ones. With *Harry Potter*, Rowling has been careful to reveal too much of her secrets before the end of the series, and she has let the characters grow and develop throughout the plot as they are growing from children into young adults. Thus, presumably, the plot would develop more maturely alongside the maturing of the characters. I would argue, however, that despite the natural development of age, the narrative does not suggest maturation, it stays fairly constant, which makes the early criticism of Harry Potter equally relevant after the series has concluded with the seventh novel, as when the essay was written after the fifth.

Most of what critics seem to debate is the problematic representations of female characters, the construction of male identity, along with a discussion on whether the series teach children good moral values or not. There are other kinds of debates going as well, such

as a connection between Harry Potter and modern day politics, as Karin E. Westman explores in her essay, “Spectres of Thatcherism: Contemporary British Culture in J.K. Rowling’s Harry Potter Series” (2002). Westman investigates here the various similarities between the world of Harry Potter and that of our own capitalist society. Other critics, such as Taija Piippo and Peter Ciaccio, focus on the notion of desire and of the Christian symbolism in the series. They explore the themes of death, power and sin in the novels, and look into how this might affect the child reader. Elizabeth E. Heilman writes in the introduction to her book, *Critical Perspectives on Harry Potter* (2009), that all the contributors to her collection of critical essays form “an interdisciplinary presentation” which is “emblematic of the ways in which approaches to literary discourse and other cultural discourses have become increasingly rich and entwined” (3). I agree with Heilman on this, and her collection of essays makes up an interesting assortment of various analyses in most categories of critical studies, such as race, class and gender. Nevertheless, despite one essay on animal advocacy, Peter Dendle’s “Monsters, Creatures, and Pets at Hogwarts: Animal Stewardship in the World of Harry Potter” (2009), there is virtually none about environmentalism or animality studies. This does not only go for Heilman’s book, but for most of the Harry Potter criticism I have come across. Heilman herself has contributed with an essay on the problematic representations of women in the Harry Potter series, “From Sexist to (sort-of) Feminist: Representations of Gender in the Harry Potter Series” (2009). Heilman co-writes this essay with Trevor Donaldson, and they focus on how the portrayal of female characters has developed throughout the series. As their title reveals, they suggest that “the last three books showcase richer roles and more powerful females”, yet that the “overall message related to power and gender still conforms to the stereotypical, hackneyed, and sexist patterns of the first four books” (140).

Several critics, such as Marion Rana, has also noted this unfortunate depiction of female characters in the series, however, her focus in her book, *Creating Magical Worlds: Otherness and Othering in Harry Potter* (2009), is on how several of the characters, both humans and other animals, can depict similarities with minority groups and other oppressed groups of humans. Rana’s work relates to my own as we both focus on how various forms of the Other can resemble different groups in society, and why this might be problematic. Where my argument differs from Rana’s, however, is with my environmental and animality focus. I attempt to both address and look beyond the problematic representations of otherness, as I argue that the basis for this is our deep roots with anthropocentric thinking. I attempt to provide an understanding of how anthropocentrism is linked with animalizing others, the

oppression of peoples, and the oppression of nature and animals as a whole. I will apply this linkage with the series of Harry Potter due its enormous success, both widespread and economically. This can thus tell us something of how contemporary society functions, and as I conclude, that the stereotypes we have presumably fought so hard to work against still lives within our culture in full extent.

By studying Harry Potter in this light, I hope to display an analysis of the text that will provide suggestions for its popularity and point towards some of the aspects in society we need desperately to address. As Rana writes in her conclusion, “Rowling’s fictional world is a simple one and its simplicity is enhanced by the fact that she reproduces many of the real-life prejudices inherent in contemporary society” (103). In other words, Rowling does little to challenge these prejudices and this could suggest why the series is so comfortable for the reader; it does not provoke any new thoughts, it merely offers an escape from the real world into a world not so different from ours, but with more magic.

As previously mentioned, I will structure my thesis with three chapters, each investigating one novel from the Harry Potter series, and one chapter with an individual subject. Along with the novels, I will refer to the film adaptations where I find this to be relevant, in order to illustrate more broadly the examples I think is important to investigate. The first chapter will examine the third novel, *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban* (1999), along with an investigation on how the novel depicts Cartesian dualism in a problematic way, and how heteronormativity is established in the series. My second chapter will explore the fifth novel, *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix* (2003), and I will here examine the notion of the discourse of the jungle. Here I will exemplify how several species, such as the giants and the centaurs represent various oppressed human groups, and along with an analysis of the film, I will attempt to show how this representation reinforces the racist stereotypes Rowling attempts to abandon. My third chapter will look into the last and seventh novel, *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows* (2007), along with an analysis of ecofeminism, and a further examination of the various species in the last battle at Hogwarts. Here I will look at how the female characters have developed throughout the series, with special emphasis on the films, and I will suggest how this is connected with the challenging dominant anthropocentric values of our contemporary society.

I have chosen these three novels in order to see how the plot develops and attempt to advert a deliberate change in especially films and novels according to a growing awareness of feminism, environmental problems and racism the past 20 years.

1 Constructing the Heterosexual: *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*

As stated in my introduction, this chapter will deal with the third novel of the Harry Potter series, and I will investigate how the novel reinforces a presumption that elevates humans above animals, both morally and intellectually. With this chapter, I will explore the notion of heteronormativity in the series, and argue that this is reinforced with the character of Sirius Black. I will also examine the representation of werewolves in terms of homosexuality, and I argue that the text thus portrays the “queer” negatively when studying the characters of Remus Lupin and Fenrir Greyback. In order to provide a framework that I suggest establish the aforementioned characters into a heteronormative context, I will outline some of the notions that I suggest are representing Cartesian dualism.

This will be done in order to explore how the notion of Cartesian dualisms forms and decides our conception of ourselves and other animals in our contemporary society. Cartesian dualism, as stated in my introduction, derives from Descartes concept of a divide between mind and body, and that the mind is what distances us from the animal, which supposedly do not have mind. I will focus on the characters of Remus Lupin and Sirius Black as both of them share the ability to transform into animals. Lupin changes unwillingly through the curse of lycanthropy, as he turns into a werewolf every full moon. I suggest a reading of the werewolf where the wolfish nature resembles homosexuality and thus undermines the heteronormativity of the series as a whole. I suggest that this is problematic due to the outwardly Cartesian framework of HP3, and I argue that this places homosexuality in the domain of violent sexuality connected with animality, rather than as a natural part of human nature.

I explore the character of Sirius Black in light of his Animagus form of a dog. He can transform at will after learning the complex magic of Animagi. Sirius Black represents stereotypical masculinity, which challenges and undermines the ragged nature of Lupin, and thus I argue that the character of Sirius Black functions to resituate heteronormativity in order to balance the homosexuality represented by the werewolf. Altogether, the representations of these two characters provide a different way of reading animality than has been done by critics of Harry Potter so far, and I will apply theory from two critics reading the Harry Potter series differently. First, I will outline some of the problematic framework, which provides a

Cartesian dualism of animals and humans, before I will move on to a discussion of the heteronormativity of Sirius Black. I will further examine the character of Lupin and Fenrir Greyback in order to provide a thorough analysis of two different werewolf characters and their significance in relation to homosexuality.

Several critics of *Harry Potter*, such as Drew Chappell and Peter Ciaccio, argue that even though the series seems to be filled with binaries on the surface, the series provide a more nuanced image when studied closely. Although I agree with these critics that the simple binary of good and evil becomes more complex as the plot develops, I argue that these critics overlook the concept of Cartesian dualisms. Peter Ciaccio argues in his essay, “Harry Potter and Christian Theology” (2009), that “the main moral teaching in the Harry Potter series is rooted in its anti-dualistic attitude” (42). He defends this by reminding us that the division between good and evil is not so simple as it first seems to be, that Voldemort acts out of his troubled childhood, and that Dumbledore has been lurking in the Dark Arts himself. Although this is true, it also paints a simplistic picture of dualisms. Rather than reading the complexities within the characters as challenging dualisms, I suggest a reading where Cartesian dualisms help constructing a heteronormative environment in the Harry Potter series.

Chappell argues in her essay, “Sneaking Out After Dark: Resistance, Agency, and the Postmodern Child in JK Rowling’s Harry Potter series” (2008), that the “events and structures in the Harry Potter novels prepare children for life as adults by teaching them about systems inside which both children and adults function” (292). Although I agree that many aspects of the series do this, I would also argue that Chappell overlooks the problematic and often concealed symbolism of race, class and gender that teaches the reader how stereotypes and prejudices are comfortable and should remain unchallenged. In this chapter, I argue that these prejudices are against homosexuality, and although the child reader presumably does not detect this, it does not mean that these conceptions should stay unchallenged. In order to show how the Cartesian dualisms of HP3 helps construct a problematic portrayal of homosexuality, I will begin this chapter with an analysis of the Dementors and the Patronus Charm in an attempt to show why I believe Peter Ciaccio makes his claim about no dualities too simplistic.

1.1 Light/Dark Dualism

Peter Ciaccio argues that in “Harry Potter, people are not divided into absolutely good or absolutely bad” (42). As mentioned, he argues that the Harry Potter series challenges

dualisms, and that there is no clear boundary between good and evil in the series. Ciaccio writes from “the perspective of a Southern European Protestant theologian” (33), and he focuses his essay on the Christian moral messages the Harry Potter series convey. What Ciaccio thus overlooks is the problematic message that justifies treating others as inferior to yourself. Ciaccio reminds us how children’s stories “are generally morality tales explaining many real issues and unpleasant realities in a symbolic or metaphorical way, so that children may better understand them” (33). What Ciaccio has failed to recognise, though, is the representation of evil in the Dementors, and the symbolism of good in the Patronus Charm. This is peculiar by how Ciaccio is concerned with exposing the absence of dualisms and Christian symbolism in the series, yet he overlooks the powerful image of light versus dark in the symbolism of these two creatures. I will explore the Dementors and the Patronus, and attempt to show why I believe these needs to be studied critically. I suggest that the Dementor and Patronus carries clear Christian symbolism, and that they simultaneously resemble a problematic manifestation of Cartesian dualism.

Dementors are “among the foulest creatures that walk this earth. They infest the darkest, filthiest places, they glory in decay and despair, they drain peace, hope and happiness out of the air around them” (140). Dementors guard the notorious magic prison of Azkaban, and they feed on happy emotions. In HP3, they are let out of their confined space in Azkaban to search for Sirius Black who has escaped. During Harry’s first meeting with a Dementor on the Hogwarts train, he notices its hand “protruding from the cloak and it was glistening, greyish, slimy-looking and scabbed, like something dead that had decayed in water ...” (66). This is the first glimpse Harry sees of what is underneath the Dementor’s cloak, and when he asks Lupin what it is under a Dementor’s hood, Lupin explains that, “the only people who really know are in no condition to tell us. You see, the Dementor only lowers its hood to use its last and worst weapon” (182). Yet, toward the end of the novel, Harry sees a Dementor lowering its hood: “Where there should have been eyes, there was only thin, grey, scabbed skin, stretched blankly over empty sockets. But there was a mouth ... a gasping, shapeless hole, sucking the air with the sound of a death-rattle” (281). Harry is about to witness and experience the Dementor’s Kiss, as Lupin explains: “It’s what Dementors do to those they wish to destroy utterly. I suppose there must be some kind of mouth under there, because they clamp their jaws upon the mouth of the victim and – and suck out his soul” (183). In other words, the Dementor threatens the very essence of self by removing all memories and personality, and everything that in Descartes’ view makes us human.

The Dementors are employed by the Ministry of Magic, but their allegiance change when Voldemort seizes power. In HP5, two Dementors attack Harry and Dudley, which marks the change in atmosphere as there are supposed to be “no Dementors outside Ministry control” (HP5 135), thus suggesting that someone else has taken over their charge. Rowling never grants the Dementors any focalization, but the reader gets a sense of these creatures as thoughtless and acting only on instinct. They do not have the ability to speak, or communicate in any reasonable manner, and they seem to be drawn toward all happy emotions to prey upon. This is emphasised when they appear during the Quidditch match, as Lupin explains, “I don’t think they could resist the large crowd around the Quidditch pitch. All the excitement...emotions running high...it was their idea of a feast” (HP3 140). When adapting a Cartesian perspective to this, it could suggest that the Dementors resemble the animal, without any emotions, they are merely automatons reacting by instinct and the mechanical need to feed.

The only time the narrative provides a suggestion of emotion to the Dementors is when Hagrid tells Harry, Ron and Hermione about his brief stay at Azkaban, explaining how the Dementors were reluctant to let him go. Hermione argues that Hagrid was innocent, and so they could not have protested, to which Hagrid replies: “Think that matters to them? They don’t care. Long as they’ve got a couple o’ humans stuck there with ‘em, so they can leech all the happiness out of ‘em, they don’t give a damn who’s guilty an’ who’s not” (164). Although the ability to not care might not be characteristic of having an emotion, it suggests a certain aspect of personality to the Dementors.

The Dementors distinguishes between animals and humans, as when Sirius Black tells he escaped from the notorious prison of Azkaban while in his dog shape. The Dementors are blind and can only sense human emotions. Black explains, “they could tell that my feelings were less – less human, less complex when I was a dog” (272). From an animality studies perspective, this could be read as Rowling undermining the complex nature of animals in a Cartesian manner, the dog mind of Black is less complex than that of humans and so the Dementors could not sense him. Another way to read this is how Black maintains his human mind whilst in dog shape, yet either his emotions is compromised or they are covered so deep by his animal body that the Dementors could not sense him. Either way, the symbolism suggest a lower form of intelligence in animals than in humans, as Black explains how the Dementors probably thought “I was losing my mind like everyone else in there” (272). Thus,

the mind of an animal would be equal to the mind of a human suffering from mental illness, which is a notion I will explore in greater depths in my next chapter.

Another aspect of this, which undermines animals, is the Patronus Charm, which shields a wizard from the Dementors. The Patronus Charm can only be conjured “if you are concentrating, with all your might, on a single, very happy memory” (176). The Patronus takes the shape of an animal, in Harry’s case it is the same animal shape as his father’s Animagus form, a stag. Even though the charm takes the form of an animal, it is a product of human memories. It could be argued that the animal shape of the Patronus resembles our “animal instincts”, and thus portrays it in a more complex way than the Darwinist-Freudian framework of sexuality and violence suggests, since the Patronus “is a kind of positive force, a projection of the very things that the Dementor feeds upon – hope, happiness, the desire to survive” (176). “The desire to survive” is arguably connected with violence for the sake of survival, as Lundblad emphasises, but the significance of hope and happiness could suggest a new understanding of “natural instincts” as a positive force. Yet, Lupin declares that the Patronus “cannot feel despair, as real humans can, so the Dementors can’t hurt it” (176). If the Patronus reads as a representation of “the animal within”, this is a problematic portrayal of animal instincts as limited and inferior to humans.

Another important reading of the relationship of the Dementors and the Patronus is within a Christian framework. The Dementors resembles the dark and evil drives that must be obliterated by the light and hope represented by the Patronus. When Ciaccio argues that people are not divided into completely good or completely bad, he needs to stress “people”. He overlooks the concept of Dementors and their nature as preying upon happiness and hope. Arguably, Dementors are never established as either people or animals, they are more of a demonic motif, or creatures of evil. Ciaccio also overlooks the notion of the Patronus, and its only function of conveying hope and happiness. These two beings resemble the struggle between good and bad, with each resembling the end of the spectrum. Ciaccio proves himself most concerned with the human characters of the series, and he thus risks reinforcing the concept of dualism he seemingly wishes to work against. I would argue that when Ciaccio overlooks the dualisms of human and animal, he helps reinforce the narrow anthropocentric and Cartesian perspective of the series.

Another aspect of the human/animal dualism, which Ciaccio overlooks, is the anthropocentric attitude towards pets and other animals emotionally connected to a human being, and how these are portrayed superior to the animals without such the connection to a

human. First, there is Hermione's cat, Crookshanks, which is a remarkably clever and intelligent cat. He understands immediately that Ron's pet rat, Scabbers, is actually a human in his Animagus form, and consequently acknowledges that he is a criminal. When Crookshanks meets Sirius Black in his Animagus form, he realises that he too is a human in animal shape, as Black explains; "he knew I was no dog. It was a while before he trusted me. Finally, I managed to communicate to him what I was after, and he's been helping me" (267). Crookshanks decides to help Black, presumably because he senses his good nature and innocence. Secondly, Harry's owl, Hedwig, is awarded the ability to show her discontent whenever Harry has to lock her up in her cage, along with the ability to show happiness and joy at being allowed outside in her true habitat. Along with the other owls at Hogwarts, she functions as a mail deliverer, and she always manages to find the recipient of Harry's letters, even if they are in hiding and even Harry does not know their whereabouts. These animals are in stark contrast to the animals used in Transfigurations Class, where the students practice Vanishing Spells and transformation charms in order to make animals disappear and transform them into other objects. The students typically practice on mice, which suggests the connection with animal testing in laboratories in the reader's contemporary world. The mistreatment of "lesser" animals are supposedly not meant to be questioned or challenged, as it is only mentioned in terms of illustrating the exciting school subjects at Hogwarts.

This is contrasted by the injustice of Buckbeak's trial and sentencing to death, which engages Harry, Ron and Hermione in advocating for animal rights. Prior to this, however, is the class where the students learn about the Hippogriffs for the first time. Hagrid tells the class what is polite and proper behaviour towards a hippogriff: "Yeh always wait fer the Hippogriff ter make the firs' move [...] It's polite, see? Yeh walk towards him, and yeh bow, an' yeh wait" (88). This suggests an anthropomorphic approach towards the animal, believing it to be "proud" and "Easily offended" (88). Harry is invited to approach Buckbeak, and when he manages to get eye contact with the animal, Buckbeak "was staring at Harry with one fierce orange eye" (89). After giving the Hippogriff a short bow, it "was still staring haughtily at him" (89). Without further notice the Hippogriff bows back at Harry and Harry pats him on the beak, to which the Hippogriff "closed his eyes lazily, as though enjoying it" (89). Since Buckbeak is never focalized, the reader never knows if the Hippogriff bows back at Harry in imitation of his move or whether it is, as Hagrid believes, in approval of Harry. Either way, the anthropomorphic attitude towards Buckbeak suggest how noble creatures and pets can be

appointed “human” characteristics, while animals not emotionally connected to a human are portrayed as mere mechanics and suitable for animal testing.

As I have now provided what I believe to be a framework of Cartesian thinking, I will move on to analyse the character of Sirius Black and attempt to show how his representation helps to stabilise heteronormativity in the Harry Potter series. This I do in order to provide a contrast to the “queerness” of Remus Lupin, and to show why this is problematic in light of the Cartesian dualism I have examined.

1.2 Established Heteronormativity

The advanced level of magic called Animagi in the Harry Potter series is performed first time with the transformation of Professor McGonagall into a cat in the beginning of HP1. This is illustrated when Dumbledore “turned to smile at the tabby, but it had gone. Instead he was smiling at a rather severe-looking woman who was wearing square glasses exactly the shape of the markings the cat had had around its eyes” (HP1 13). This episode marks the significance of magic of the series and sets the stage for anomalies and phenomena out of the ordinary. However, it is first in HP3 that Harry learn about this Animagi, and consequently it is here this kind of magic becomes significant. Animagi is described as “wizards who could transform at will into animals” (HP3 83-84), and as with the first time the reader is introduced to Professor McGonagall, the second time she transforms, it is evident she maintains her human consciousness during the metamorphosis. When Professor McGonagall realises the class is not paying attention to her magic, she is “turning back into herself with a faint pop”, she exclaims, “Not that it matters, but that’s the first time my transformation’s not got applause from a class” (84). Thus, she has been aware that the class did not pay attention. As I stated in my introduction, Descartes denied the concept of soul to any other beings than humans, and he connected mind with any ability to feel, leaving animals as mere mechanics responding to pain with only instinctual noises. Connecting Descartes’ theory to the presentation of the animal in Animagi, it is evident that Professor McGonagall does not transform with mind and body into the animal, she is still a human being, albeit with an animal body. This could thus function as a personification of Cartesian dualism, expressing the significance of the human mind, dominating the animal body.

Ciaccio reminds us how dualisms “radically allocates opposites” and that this “allocation creates false and subjective analogies between negatives or positives” (43). As seen with the example of Professor McGonagall’s transformation, the opposition between animal and human aligns human in the positive analogy, and animal in the negative. Thus, as mentioned, when Ciaccio argues that in “Harry Potter dualism is continually challenged” (43), I suggest that he fails to recognise the notion of Cartesian dualism. However, when Ciaccio claims that the series challenges dualisms, he focuses only on the concept of good and evil characters, and he argues that only the people of the series “with a dualistic understanding are the real ‘bad ones’ of the story” (43). In my understanding, this is too simplistic and Ciaccio overlooks several problematic dualisms presented in the series, such as the division between male and female, culture and nature, and human and animal. I will explore more aspects with the Animagus in an attempt to show why I believe this is an important aspect of the dualisms Ciaccio overlooks, and to show why I believe the Animagus should be recognised as personifying the Cartesian dualism.

Critic Amy M. Green argues in her article, “Interior/Exterior in the Harry Potter Series: Duality Expressed in Sirius Black and Remus Lupin” (2008), that “the creatures they become provide the reader with insight into the darkest, most flawed aspects of their personalities” (n.pag.). She explores the characters of Remus Lupin and Sirius Black, and looks into the various aspects of their different animal transformations. Lupin as a werewolf is an aspect I will examine below, and Black as an Animagus differs from Lupin in how his metamorphosis happens willingly and he keeps his human mind. When Green argues that the reader is provided with insight into “the darkest, most flawed aspects” of these characters’ personalities, she fails to recognise the aspect of “natural” instincts at play in their animal form. As Michael Lundblad emphasises, the “Darwinist-Freudian framework soon associates animality with the supposedly essential, biological instincts for heterosexuality in the name of reproduction and for violence in the name of survival” (4-5). Thus, when Green associates their animality with their darkest aspects of their personalities, she draws a sharp line between the negative connotations of animality and human nature. Arguably, Green does not explore the notions of Black’s Animagi and Lupin’s lycanthropy from an animality studies perspective, however, it is hard to study the relation between their animal bodies and their human minds without thinking of the Darwinist-Freudian framework. Green focuses her article on the representations of folkloric legends and myths, and how these have been adapted in the characters of Black and Lupin. I would argue, however, that the way she

explores the character of Black as more or less genuinely connected with death, reflects the problematic conception of animality connected with negative factors. I argue for a more complex reading of Sirius Black, where his animality reads as reinforcing the Darwinist-Freudian framework of sexuality and violence, and “naturalising” heteronormativity.

Sirius Black enters the plot of HP3 as a notorious mass-murderer, convicted for the murder of 13 muggles and his friend, Peter Pettigrew. He is wrongfully thought to be the one who gave up Harry’s parents to Voldemort, and he is Harry’s godfather. This sets the background for his character, and when Harry learns that Black is after him to finish the job for Voldemort, he becomes more angry than afraid. This provides a more nuanced picture of Harry, and it functions as a bridge between Harry’s childhood and his early adulthood. As this is a vulnerable period in a young boy’s life, it seems a relief when he finally encounters his ultimate father figure in Sirius. As it turns out, however, Sirius has maintained his reckless and immature nature since his youth, and he frequently eggs Harry on to step beyond the line of rules. Green emphasises Black’s immature nature: “When he emerges from prison and finally proves his innocence to Harry and his immediate circle of friends, he does not have the wherewithal of a man in his thirties but rather that of one in his early twenties” (n.pag.). In other words, Black seems to be clinging on to the sense of self he had in his school years when he was a handsome, popular and witty boy. Harry learns of Black’s thoughtlessness when Lupin tells of the incident where Black almost got Severus Snape killed by exposing him to the “fully grown werewolf” of Lupin (HP3 261). To this, Black shows no remorse, he only responds with a “derisive noise” before muttering; “It served him right” (261).

Black’s reckless nature and immaturity constructs an image of a man who does not think of consequences and merely acts out of fun or boredom. Eventually this is what ends his life in HP5 when he sneaks out instead of respecting his curfew in Grimmauld Place to join the fight against Voldemort’s Death Eaters. Although his death is credited to Bellatrix Lestrange, Black put himself in the situation and whether or not it was Bellatrix’s curse that killed him, or if it merely made him trip and fall over into the archway, the reader does not know. Either way, Black’s death reflects his life; he shows off, he is thoughtless and acts rashly, and he boosts his masculinity through violence and sexual appeal.

Green argues that “the association with death highlights Sirius's lack of judgment both prior to and during the events of the novels” (1). When people see the large, black dog of Sirius’s Animagus form, they presume it to be the Grim, rather than a stray dog. I will

explore the notion of the Grim first, and then relate it to Black's reckless nature, and show how my argument differs from Green's.

Harry first learns about the Grim in Divinations Class where, after a session of tea leaves reading, the class's teacher, Professor Trelawney looks into Harry's cup, "gasped, and then screamed" before claiming, "you have the Grim" (82). She explains: "The Grim, my dear, the Grim!" [...] "The giant, spectral dog that haunts churchyards! My dear boy, it is an omen – the worst omen – of *death!*" (82-83). Thus, when Harry observes Crookshanks lurking around with this giant dog, he assumes it to be the Grim. Harry has, on earlier occasions, seen what he believes to be the Grim, and in every incident he has been close to death or fatal injury. The Grim is supposedly a spectre only the person affected can see, thus, only the one who is subject of the omen can truly observe the dog, and death will immediately come to you. In other words, Harry is perplexed when he learns that Crookshanks has befriended the dog; "And next moment, it had emerged: a gigantic, shaggy black dog, moving stealthily across the lawn, Crookshanks trotting at its side. Harry stared. What did this mean? If Crookshanks could see the dog as well, how could it be an omen of Harry's death?" (224).

The Grim bears resemblances to the hound in Arthur Conan Doyle's *The Hound of the Baskerville's* (1902), and how this gigantic hound provokes fear and dread by reputation. As Philip Armstrong writes in his essay "The Gaze of Animals" (2011), the hound of the famous Sherlock Holmes' story is influenced by British folklore which "include the Padfoot, Barguest, Hellhound, Black Shuck and Demon Cat" (184). Armstrong discusses how post-enlightenment literature "maintain earlier mythical ideas regarding the gaze of animals" (Taylor 13), while drawing ideas from both Derrida and John Berger, he argues that the removal of the visual agency from nonhuman species "served to reify human superiority" (13). As Armstrong emphasises, the nineteenth century started to dispute the worth of myths and legends of animals with gleaming eyes, and adopted a more sceptical attitude to the supernatural. This was presumably due to the new discoveries in science and Darwin's theories becoming more adaptable. In the story of the hound of the Baskervilles, this is emphasised as Holmes and Watson, having shot the animal dead, discovers that the dog's eye-sockets have been painted with phosphorous. Armstrong suggests "in the first years of the twentieth century, the reader's satisfaction aligns with the triumph of the analytical scrutiny of science as it discredits the uncanny gaze of the animal" (185). In other words, modern technology situates human superiority and helps construct the anthropocentric values we live by today.

The Grim first appears after Harry has run away from his aunt and uncle's house. He stops to look through his trunk when he "straightened up suddenly, looking around him once more. A funny prickling on the back of his neck had made Harry feel he was being watched" before he sees "the hulking outline of something very big, with wide, gleaming eyes" (30). Here, the relevance to the mythical creatures of Armstrong's essay is evident, especially dogs with gleaming eyes based on theory of how eyes could contain beams of poison. Next time Harry sees the dog is in the bookstore of Diagon Alley, where he notices the cover of a book called "Death Omens: What to Do When You Know the Worst Is Coming", "Harry continued to stare at the front cover of the book; it showed a black dog large as a bear, with gleaming eyes. It looked oddly familiar ..." (45). After this, it is the situation in Divination Class where Harry learns that the dog is a death omen, and then it turns up again during a Quidditch match. This is the only time where Harry is in real danger because of the Dementors showing up and making Harry lose consciousness and thus falls off his broom. Harry sees "the silhouette of an enormous shaggy black dog, clearly imprinted against the sky, motionless in the topmost, empty row of seats" (133).

The sub-plot of the Grim serves as means to define Harry's situation as severe. It follows him throughout the plot, and for the first time in the series, it is not Voldemort that threatens Harry's safety. Yet, toward the end of the novel, Harry learns that the dog he believed to be the Grim throughout his entire school year, was actually Sirius Black who is an Animagus and can change into animal shape. This, Harry learns when Black has dragged Ron by his feet into the Shrieking Shack. As Harry is told, the only way Black could escape from prison was because he could sneak out as a dog, and as the Dementors are blind, they feed on emotions. They cannot, however detect animal emotions, and since Black was an unregistered Animagus, no one would suspect the sighting of a big black dog to be the supposed murderous convict.

The significance of the Grim in relation to Black, is how everyone Black encounters in his dog state believes him to be the omen of death. This emphasises the violence connected with Black's animality, and thus I argue that the character of Black reinforces the Darwinist-Freudian framework of "naturalising" violence. As I will attempt to show below, I argue that the lycanthropy of Lupin and Greyback poses a reading of wolf as homosexual, and that the dog of Black functions to balance this notion. Black is outwardly heterosexual, in HP7, Harry enters the old bedroom of his godfather, and sees "many pictures of Muggle motorcycles" and "several posters of bikini-clad Muggle girls" (148). The fact that these pictures portray

Muggles suggests how this is recognisable to the reader, along with showing Sirius's stand against his blood-obsessed family. This suggests a nuanced picture of Black, as the stereotypical masculinity coincides with his moral stands against the fascist regime of Voldemort. He proves himself to belong to the "good" side, and at the same time, this establishes his virility.

As I have attempted to show the connection between "naturalising" violence and the animality of Sirius Black, along with emphasising his masculinity, I will continue with a discussion on the problematic representation of the werewolves of the series.

1.3 "Man is a Wolf to Man"

When Freud argues that "man is a wolf to man (*homo homini lupus*)" (Lundblad 38), he thinks of the "natural" violence of animals rather than the sexual aspect of the discourse of the jungle. However, as Lundblad reminds us, Freud's "interpretation of the wolf in a broader sense, and in individual case studies, often explicitly associates animality with human heteronormativity" (38). When considering the term "wolf" in relation to human beings, though, the word has adapted new definitions over time, which suggests a different reading of Freud's statement. As Lundblad argues, the term reads differently in certain contexts, "in the early decades of the twentieth century [...] wolf was used to designate the role of the penetrator, rather than the penetrated, in queer anal sex" (38). This definition relates more to my reading of wolf, or werewolf, in the Harry Potter series, and as I will attempt to display, the narrative presents the "queer" in a way that reinforces, rather than resists the prejudices against homosexuals.

In general, werewolves function as wide variety of metaphors, ranging from suppressed sexual tension to masculinity, and the wrongful treatment of minority groups. Green reminds us that the "werewolf proves the perfect vehicle for the expression of wanton sexuality in that the lycanthropic transformation frees him or her from societal constraints while under the elements of the curse" (n.pag.). She argues that the Harry Potter series would "never depict blatant expressions of sexuality" (n.pag.), and although this is true as the novels are children's stories, there is a darker underlying theme with the motif of the werewolf, that I suggest constructs homosexuality as unnatural to human beings. I argue that the character of Lupin resist a "naturalisation" of heterosexuality in terms of the discourse of the jungle. Along with Lupin, another werewolf appears later in the series in the character of Fenrir Greyback. I will

investigate these two characters in terms of the Darwinist-Freudian framework, and I will attempt to show how Greyback potentially could destabilize the heteronormative conception of the novels, but that this is undermined by the narrative structure that portrays him problematically. The figure of the werewolf becomes more complex and interesting with the character of Greyback, and although he does not appear until HP6, I will examine him here as I contrast him alongside Lupin to show the difference between the two lycanthropes. In this relation, I argue that as the plot progresses throughout the series, the animal figures and their significance become more multifaceted and that this may signify an awareness from Rowling that her species representations have been too simple.

When Lundblad examines Jack London's famous novella, *Call of the Wild*, he focuses explicitly on the relationship between John Thornton and Buck. Lundblad argues for a reading of the pair where they are involved romantically and sexually, providing a resistance to the discourse of the jungle as naturalising heterosexuality. He questions the relationship and asks if to label their interaction as "queer" could be invoked "without simultaneously evoking the deeply problematic logic that links homosexuality with bestiality in order to condemn both as 'unnatural'" (68). In other words, by connecting Thornton and Buck's relationship with homosexuality, one risks also connecting it with bestiality due to Buck being a dog/wolf. However, bestiality can be problematic, and in the case with Thornton and Buck, it can be limiting by how it "also implies genital intercourse and nothing else (petting, stroking, snuggling, kissing [...]) (68). This suggests a connection between wolf and homosexuality, which links it with bestiality, and thus denounce homosexuality as unnatural and simply connected with the animal. I argue, that the way werewolves in Harry Potter are portrayed through Lupin and Greyback, suggest such a reading which deems homosexuality unnatural. As I have attempted to show, HP3 builds its animal representations mostly on Cartesian dualism, which denies any agency with animals. Thus, with my reading of werewolves as representing homosexuality, their sexual orientation is connected with their animal nature and is therefore condemned inferior as the rest of the animal world is in the novel. Their bestiality evidently suggests genital intercourse without the "human" aspect of caressing, snuggling or kissing, which then excludes homosexuality from the emotional relationship of the "normal" heterosexual. This, in other words, is highly problematic as the Harry Potter series reaches out to such a vast audience and its implied messages is conveyed unconsciously and reinforces already problematic prejudices.

The significance of werewolves in opposition to Animagi is how they unwillingly change into animal form at a given time. The werewolf is violent and loses all human consciousness while being in animal state, as opposed to the Animagus who maintains his human mind. The werewolf signifies a complete loss of self as the transformation into animal form happens unwillingly, and the human loses his/her consciousness when transformed. The narrative gives several hints that something is out of the ordinary with Lupin, that he is hiding something, as when the Boggart takes the shape of a “silvery white orb” (105), hinting that Lupin is most afraid of full moons, or when Professor Snape dedicates a whole class session to the subject of werewolves (128). In the chapter where Harry learns Black’s real story, Hermione reveals the secret of Lupin when Harry prepares to listen to Lupin’s version of the story, “‘NO!’ Hermione screamed, ‘Harry, don’t trust him, he’s been helping Black get into the castle, he wants you dead too – *he’s a werewolf!*’” (253). This suggests a prejudice against werewolves as something dangerous, and it gives a certain sense of being contagious. Green reminds us how the shunning of werewolves in literature can read as “commentaries on modern societal inequities ranging from racism, class distinctions, homophobia, and the discrimination AIDS sufferers face, especially in the early days of the disease” (n.pag.). In the case where Harry, Ron and Hermione learn of Lupin’s werewolf nature, it carries resemblance to the prejudiced fear and disgust AIDS sufferers had to struggle, along with a conservative consensus against homosexuals. As the reader learns in later novels, the werewolves have been cast away from society, deemed dangerous and considered unfit to become parents. This is further emphasised by Ron, who has grown up in a wizarding family and has experienced the racism towards werewolves as part of his upbringing. When he gasps, “*Get away from me, werewolf*” (253), Ron shows how the traditional attitude towards werewolves suggest racist undertones, segregation and fear.

Even though, as Green argues, Rowling would presumably never depict obvious sexual representations in her famous series, the theme of sexuality and werewolves is interesting to explore as it says something about the violent sexuality we adapt to animals, and thus distances ourselves from as humans. The image of a human being transforming into a beast while losing his humane consciousness, revealing all his oppressed instincts coincides with the discourse of the jungle as justifying violence in the name of survival. I argue that the character of Remus Lupin represents more aspects of violence than of sexuality, while with Fenrir Greyback the sexual implications emerge. Fenrir appears at a later point in the series, and thus his sexual implications could be accepted according to the presumed maturing of

both characters and reader. The implied reader of the Harry Potter series is supposedly someone who grows alongside the novels, and when the maturity level of Harry and his friends is as young adults, the implied reader is supposed to have reached a higher level of maturity since previous novels. Thus it would be appropriate to introduce the character of Fenrir Greyback at a later point than Lupin, as violence occurs earlier in the series than sexual tension does.

With Lupin, the violence appears when he forgets his potion after Sirius has appeared at Hogwarts, he starts to transform and Rowling makes the transformation a continuum from Lupin's human self and into something other. The narrative tells how "There was a terrible snarling noise. Lupin's head was lengthening. So was his body. His shoulders were hunching. Hair was sprouting visibly on his face and hands" (279). Signified by Lupin's name and how "his body", "his shoulders", and "his face" is transforming, and then suddenly turning into "As the werewolf reared, snapping its long jaws" (279). There is a significant change from human form to fully animal body, and Rowling chooses to show this by changing the pronoun and distinguishing how "he" has become an "it".

Upon this metamorphosis, Sirius changed into his canine form as well to protect the others, as presumably only animal can fight animal. They fight and "Harry turned to see the werewolf taking flight; it was galloping into the forest" (279). Sirius, still in animal form, he is hurt and carries evidence of the violence from the fight, "Sirius was bleeding; there were gashes across his muzzle and back" (279). In other words, the fight between the two men happens while both are in animal form, which could resemble the "natural" instincts of our animal ancestors emerging. The fight is between two beasts, yet both are at the same time human. Roni Natov argues that "As Lupin becomes a werewolf when he doesn't take his potion, madness and selfdestructive impulses are depicted with a kind of psychological truth. Rowling attempts to humanize the demonic, rather than demonize the human" (136). What Natov overlooks here is the homosexual implications with the motif of the werewolf. Rowling does not attempt to "humanize the demon", what she does instead is to distance the "demon" from the "human", and thus suggest which is "normal". Although, I agree with Natov in her claims that the reader is "led beyond the simple concept of evil as purely 'bad guys'" (136), and that this gives an interesting depiction of characters in the series, I disagree that this is what is happening with Lupin. By making Lupin at his most violent while in animal form, I suggest Rowling reinforces the concept of suppressed instincts, and that this is justifiable due to the animality of Lupin's nature.

Natov also overlooks the character of Fenrir Greyback when she argues about the werewolf as a metaphor for a split self with both good and evil sides. She suggests; “What is most interesting here is that the potentially destructive part of the werewolf is humanized and offered with understanding” (136). Greyback is characterised as vicious and bloodthirsty, and appears mostly wolf-like than human. He joins Voldemort and is “permitted to wear Death Eater robes in return for his hired savagery” (HP7 362). Thus, Greyback does not fit into Natov’s argument of humanizing the beast, he is more fitting with a personification of violent sexuality. Greyback is notoriously attacking young females, and the sexual undertone is evident in the scene in HP7 where he is among the crew capturing Harry, Ron and Hermione, and he turns to Hermione saying, “Delicious girl...what a treat...I do enjoy the softness of the skin” (362). This suggest a connection between the werewolf’s violence and the sexual undertones, as he supposedly enjoys “the softness of the skin” in relation to attacking her violently and biting in order to kill, all the while resituating the female as a piece of meat and reinforcing the rapist stereotype connected with violence. Greyback attacks and kills Lavender Brown in the final battle at Hogwarts (HP7 519), and he is infamous in his attacks of children, emphasised in his mocking of Dumbledore in HP6, “But you do how much I like the kids, Dumbledore” (554). In this episode Dumbledore also underlines Greyback’s distance from his human self; “Am I to take it that you are attacking even without the full moon now? This is most unusual...you have developed a taste for human flesh that cannot be satisfied once a month?” (554). This could also read as Greyback embracing his “condition”, and thus representing the outwardly homosexual, the “queer out of the closet”. The problematic element with this, though, is how Greyback’s taste for females and children suggest a most vicious character, which conflicts with Natov’s claim that the werewolf “humanizes the demon” rather than demonising the human, as Greyback is not humanised, he is portrayed completely as beast. In other words, Greyback’s outwardly queerness is frowned upon, and the narrative constructs him as a vicious creature, removed from all that makes him human.

Greyback’s beastly nature reinforces the notion of violence and sexuality in terms of animal instincts, and his character seems to attempt undermining the heteronormative concept that mostly colours the Harry Potter series. When examining the motif of the werewolf in terms of sexuality, critics often explores masculinity in terms of intrinsic violent predispositions, and situate this in accordance with attacking and dominating a female. Even though Greyback prefers females, he has been prone to attack men as well, as he both attacked Lupin as a child, and he attacks Bill Weasley in HP6. Reading these attacks as

violent sexual intercourse or rape, the character of Greyback undermines the heteronormativity and open up for a new understanding of the animal and “natural” instincts as linked with heterosexuality. I would be careful to argue that Rowling uses the metaphor of the werewolf in this manner to conceal her characters’ homosexual intercourse, but I will suggest that the werewolf represents the sexual orientation of homosexuality, even if its attack does not necessarily resemble copulation. When Greyback increasingly refers to his victims as “delicious”, and the way Rowling depicts him; “Blood trickled down his chin and he licked his lips slowly, obscenely” (HP6 554), I argue that there is an underlying sexuality in accordance with homosexuality, and that this is depicted through the narrative as filthy and disgusting.

In contrast, Lupin’s animal nature is mostly represented by violence. Even though he marries and impregnates Nymphadora Tonks, he has second thoughts about it, as he is afraid their child will become like him. In contrast to Greyback, Lupin is portrayed asexual and in almost complete control of his supposed animal instincts, he seems to be a castrated wolf. Because Harry has learnt to know Lupin despite of his condition, he has never been prejudiced towards him. It is not until Harry confronts him about Lupin’s planned abandoning of Tonks that Harry recognises the wolf in Lupin: “Lupin sprang to his feet: his chair toppled over backwards, and he glared at them so fiercely that Harry saw, for the first time ever, the shadow of the wolf upon his human face” (HP7 175). This reinforces the conception of violence and aggression, rather than blatant sexuality, connected with Lupin’s animal nature. When Lupin breaks the news of Tonks’s pregnancy, he seems to regret ever having been involved with her romantically. He explains about the child how “It will be like me, I am convinced of it – how can I forgive myself, when I knowingly risked passing on my own condition to an innocent child?” (HP7 176). Again, there is a distinct reminding of AIDS sufferers, and when considering how AIDS, at least in the beginning, was connected with homosexuality, I would argue that with this example, Rowling manifests Lupin as of homosexual orientation. The prejudice of negative connotations connected with AIDS and queerness is further emphasised when Lupin tells how people when “they know of my affliction, they can barely talk to me!” (175), and how Tonks’s “family is disgusted by our marriage, what parents would want their own daughter to marry a werewolf?” (176).

Lupin “controls” his animality with the Wolfsbane Potion, as long as he takes the potion, he is able to “curl up” in his office, “a harmless wolf, and wait for the moon to wane again” (HP3 258), which further gives the impression of a castrated wolf. Although, without

the potion, Lupin turns into the same beastly nature as Greyback, but he chooses to control and undermine it. Another aspect of Lupin's restrained bestiality are his friends, James Potter, Sirius Black and Peter Pettigrew. Lupin explains how "They couldn't keep me company as humans, so they kept me company as animals [...] A werewolf is only a danger to people" (260). This phrasing is interesting by how it suggests Lupin's nature is so dangerous that his friends need to metamorphose themselves in order to spend time with him during his transformation. They needed to transform to his level in order to be able to restrain him. Lupin emphasises this: "Under their influence, I became less dangerous. My body was still wolfish, but my mind seemed to become less so while I was with them" (260). Considering this in light of my suggestion of Black as personifying heteronormativity, it seems a way of confining Lupin's sexual orientation and restricting it in terms of "normalcy". A certain means of restraining him within his closet.

The difference between Greyback and Lupin is how Greyback has embraced his condition and even acts out his "bestiality" outside the transformation period. Greyback could thus resemble a homosexual outside the closet and out in the open, and the community shuns him for it. Lupin, on the other hand, seems embarrassed and wishes to hide his nature. He contains his "inner beast" with potions and he hides away from society when the transformation is ongoing. Greyback has made it his mission to transform as many as possible, and he is despised for his outward "queerness". Lupin is well received and even though he has trouble finding decent work, the good-hearted Dumbledore accepted him at Hogwarts both as a student and as a teacher.

When considering how Lupin is generally portrayed throughout the series in contrast to Black, it is evident that Black comes out of it in a better light than Lupin. Rowling has adapted a narrow third person narrative, which limits the reader's view to that of Harry's perspective. Although Harry frequently refers to Lupin as his favourite teacher, he also undermines him by remarking how he seems inferior to his father and Black. When Harry searches Black's old room in Grimmauld Place, he notices a picture of the group back in school, remarking how "Lupin, even then a little shabby-looking, but he had the same air of delighted surprise at finding himself liked and included" (HP7 148). Lupin admits how he always felt grateful for his friends back in school, and how his dependence on them often blinded him of injustice and mistreatment of others. During the group's monthly engagements in the Forbidden Forest, where all in animal form kept Lupin company, they encountered situations which put both them and others in danger. Lupin explains how "there were near

misses, many of them. We laughed about them afterwards. We were young, thoughtless – carried away with our own cleverness” (HP3 260). After what has been told of Black and James Potter, presumably they were the ones laughing and thought themselves clever. Lupin admits his own cowardice when Black escapes from Azkaban and breaks in to Hogwarts, he has always felt guilty for abusing Dumbledore’s trust and has thus never revealed that his friends learned Animagi. When Black escapes, Lupin wonders “whether I should tell Dumbledore that Sirius was an Animagus. But I didn’t do it” (260-261). Telling Dumbledore would mean revealing how he abused his trust in his school years, and still abusing it now as a teacher, and Lupin admits that “Dumbledore’s trust means everything to me” (261). In other words, Lupin is so dependent on others that he rather risk the safety of the children at Hogwarts than to risk losing a friend.

Lupin is generally portrayed as the weaker one of him and Black, never daring to speak up against injustice, and despite, or perhaps because of, all the discrimination he has had to put up with, he never stands up for himself either. Black, however, is the daring of the two. He notoriously stood up to his family and their belief in the “purification of the wizarding race” (HP5 104), he acts rashly and often without thinking the situation through, as when he sought to confront Peter Pettigrew after his betrayal which led to the deaths of Lily and James Potter, and consequently ended up imprisoned in Azkaban for it. When he thus realises that Pettigrew, disguised as his rat Animagus, hides at Hogwarts, he breaks out of Azkaban in order to avenge his beloved friends. He acts out of love, and his immature nature is more due to his twelve year long imprisonment than his neglect of mental development. In his years at school he charmed the girls with his good looks and devil-may-care attitude.

The differences between Lupin and Black are many, and when examining the characteristics of the two as a whole, it is clear that Black carries the more positive depiction. As I have argued, the werewolf nature of Lupin could resemble the notion of homosexuality, while the Animagus dog of Black could represent masculinity and heteronormativity. Thus, it is problematic when the distinctions between these two characters makes for a clear divide between positive and negative characters, with Lupin at one end and Black on the other. This would then signify the inferior position of homosexuality, as the portrayal of Lupin and Greyback is undermined by the strong characterisations of Black.

Even though Black is presented as reckless and emotional, Harry’s attitude towards him places him in a higher position than Lupin. Although several of the other characters, such as Molly Weasley and Hermione sees Black as immature and not always considers his advice

the best, this merely functions to reinforce his masculinity as they are portrayed as inferior themselves. Both Mrs Weasley and Hermione is generally characterised as motherly and caring figures, and when Black conflicts with them he distances himself from their values and what they represent, which situates his masculinity in opposition to their stereotypical femininity. Lupin on the other hand goes along well with the more feminised characters, Molly frequently asks him over for dinner and when he comes to Grimmauld Place where Harry, Ron and Hermione is planning their hunt for Horcruxes, Hermione takes Lupin's side in his argument with Harry. When Lupin offers his service to the trio to escape his pregnant wife, Harry tells him "I think you're feeling a bit of a daredevil. [...] You fancy stepping into Sirius's shoes" (HP7 176), to which Hermione begs, "Harry, no!" (176). When Lupin leaves in anger after Harry has called him a coward, Hermione wails "Harry [...] How could you?" (177). This scene exemplifies Lupin's cowardice as he attempts to abandon the responsibility of having a child because "My kind don't usually breed" (176), simultaneously it situates Lupin on the other side of the continuum of Black, as Harry mocks his offer as an attempt to become more like Sirius. Thus, this scene reinforces the stereotypical negative image of homosexuality and resituates it as inferior to heterosexuality.

As I have attempted to prove with this chapter, the werewolf can be read as a representation of homosexual nature, and when Rowling depicts both Lupin and Greyback as such negative characters as she does, the narrative provides an understanding of homosexuality as inferior to heterosexuality. This is further emphasised with the character of Sirius Black and his Animagus form of a dog. When Rowling opposes these two characters she creates a gap between them with Lupin on the negative side and Black on the positive, which problematizes the representation of homosexuality and reinforces a heteronormative environment in the Harry Potter series. When critics argue that there are no dualisms in the Harry Potter series, I disagree and I have attempted to show that HP3 contains several dualisms between human and animal, and homosexual and heterosexual. With Cartesian dualism so apparent as I argue it is in HP3, it is problematic when Rowling thus depicts homosexuality in the form of Lupin as that of animal mind from a Cartesian perspective. This suggests how homosexuality is poorer in value than that of heterosexuality, which is represented by the masculinity of Sirius Black and thus belongs in the human spectrum of Cartesian dualism.

With my next chapter I will examine the same notion of animality as I have done here, albeit with special emphasis on the fifth novel of the series, Harry Potter and the Order of the

Phoenix (2003). Here I will explore various species and investigate how they problematize our conception of race and otherness.

2 Constructing the Other:

Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix

As I explored the discourse of the jungle in relation to heteronormativity in my previous chapter, I will, with this chapter examine other aspects of the Darwinist-Freudian framework. Where I investigated the werewolves as representing homosexuals, and the character of Sirius Black as representing heteronormativity and masculinity in chapter one, I will here explore the problematic constructions of animality as representations for human ethnic groups.

Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix (2003), is the first novel after Voldemort has risen anew. This forms the foundation for a struggle between good and evil, both within the political context of the book and within several of the characters as well. Harry experiences an increasing anger and wonders if he, somehow unconsciously, are becoming bad. The students are making an uproar against authority as Ministry worker Umbridge is placed into a teacher's position at Hogwarts, and the students experiences the trauma of mental illness when they make a visit to the wizarding world's hospital, St. Mungo's. The prominent struggle between good and evil is epitomised by the disagreements between Dumbledore and the Minister for Magic, Cornelius Fudge. As Harry and Dumbledore have been warning people of Voldemort's return, many would not believe them, and the Ministry for Magic makes this into a propaganda fight in order to show that they have the situation under control. These examples illustrate how there is a distinct border between the good and the bad in HP5, and even though this is one of the central themes in the Harry Potter series as a whole, I would argue that this is best illustrated with the fifth novel. The reason for this is, as mentioned, that Voldemort's return is not popularly acknowledged yet, and this presents a situation where friends are split in their beliefs. The characters are challenged by means of internal dangers, as well as external, and this provides for an interesting analysis of the ways in which evil works.

This chapter follows much of the same methodology as Lundblad uses in his book, and as I mentioned in my introduction, Lundblad argues how the Darwinist-Freudian concept of human animality has been constructed through "the discourse of the jungle" (2). This human animality suggests how natural instincts drive humans unconsciously, and in terms of "real" animals, Lundblad writes that he wishes to accomplish how "revealing the constructed

nature of this discourse for humans [...] might also help us to see it as a constructed discourse for ‘real’ animals as well, whose lives are more complex than many biological explanations suggest” (11). This is closely tied to what I wish to achieve with this chapter, however, I will focus mostly on the constructed discourse for humans, and then consider the discourse for “real” animals in my next chapter. I wish to provide an analysis of HP5 that shows how the narrative of Harry’s inner struggle lays the responsibility of his bad temper on external factors, as well as internal, and that the representation of Voldemort resists the Darwinist-Freudian framework. This resistance emphasises how several discourses are at play in the series, and I will explore this in an attempt to prove why these ways of thinking about animality forms the basis of prejudices and stereotypes today.

Lundblad writes in his introduction that his “book focuses more on discursive resistance, on examples of texts that offer alternative constructions of what it means to be ‘human’ or ‘animal’ in relation to the growing hegemony of the Darwinist-Freudian jungle” (16). In other words, Lundblad examines texts that undermine the Darwinist-Freudian jungle discourse in order to provide a resistance to it. With the same goal in mind, I argue that HP5 provides a discourse that reinforce the Darwinist-Freudian discourse on natural instincts in humans through the animality construction of the giants and the centaurs, rather than challenge it, and I explore simultaneously the Christian framework of the series that challenge it. This provides a nuanced picture of the image critics have constructed of the Harry Potter series of teaching “good” moral values to children. As it is true how the novels conveys a message of the importance of right choices, through its Christian framework, it also suggests a continuing and comforting of prejudices and stereotypes that we ought to dispose of.

I will draw on some of the conclusions from my first chapter about Cartesian dualism and animal representations, to provide an analysis of the constructed discourse of human animality. This chapter will explore situations where the characters are torn between good and evil, and I will attempt to show how this helps construct a discourse of animality as representative for the “bad” sides of human nature. My general project with this chapter is thus an attempt to show how the Harry Potter series, exemplified with book five, constructs a discourse of animality representations which reinforces prejudices against various human ethnic groups. To do this, I use examples of Harry’s inner battle and his struggle against the growing influence of Voldemort in order to emphasise the animality of the Dark Lord. In order to outline animality constructions of human ethnic groups, I will examine some of the species introduced in HP5, such as the centaurs and the giants, and by close reading explore

the problematic ways these are portrayed. Furthermore, I will investigate the representations of madness in the novel and film, and by applying theory from Michel Foucault I hope to accomplish a thorough analysis of how madness is related to animality, and how this is mostly connected to the “bad” people of the series in order to encompass the relation of animality constructions and negative connotations.

2.1 The Other Within

As mentioned, one of the main plots in HP5 is Harry’s increasingly short temper. The first hint of this is when Harry experiences anger and disappointment when he thinks about how his friends have been too busy to update him throughout the summer. Harry thinks back to when Cedric Diggory died before the holiday, and wonders “Why wasn’t he, Harry, busy? Hadn’t he proved himself capable of handling much more than them? Had they all forgotten what he had done?” (13). This shows a more unsympathetic side of Harry than the reader is used to. Earlier, Harry has been more modest and happier to be out of the spotlight than in it. In other words, the thoughts Harry experiences here suggest a shift in his way of thinking. This shift is due to a connection with Voldemort, Harry learns later, and this is what makes this plot problematic, seen from an animality studies viewpoint. There are several ways to read this situation, one of them might be as a psychoanalytic motive of Harry battling his unconscious desires, another is to think of Harry’s struggle as a fight against “natural” instincts, yet another could be as a personification of Christian moral theory. I will focus my argument around a resistance towards the discourse of the jungle, through the Christian motif of “the beast within” in order to explore the various ways in which to think about animality.

There are several occasions where the narrative shows Harry’s struggle, and where it is evident that his emotions get the better of him. During a quarrel between Ron and Hermione, Harry loses his temper and after shouting at them, he leaves while “The anger that had just flared so unexpectedly still blazed inside him, and the vision of Ron and Hermione’s shocked faces afforded him a sense of deep satisfaction” (212-213). This deep satisfaction is new to the reader, and hints towards Harry’s split psyche. Even though Harry has lost his temper in the past, it has never been emphasised how good he feels about this afterwards. Hints like this keep recurring in the novel, but it is in the film adaptation the connection between Harry and Voldemort is best emphasised. There is a short scene before Harry enters

the Hogwarts Express where he sees, or believes he sees, Voldemort on the platform. Voldemort watches him and as Harry draws nearer, Voldemort makes a movement with his neck, a sort of twitching. Harry repeats this movement on several occasions in the film, however it is most notable in Dumbledore's office after Harry wakes up from the dream where he attacks, as a snake, Arthur Weasley. At 66:18 in the film, Harry's desperation comes into focus when he does the neck movement while the background sound is an inverted echo voice increasing in strength, this happens simultaneously as Dumbledore avoids eye contact with Harry, and Harry shouts "Look at me!" while sweating and panting, before he asks "What's happening to me?". In the novel, however, Harry meets the eye of Dumbledore, and

"At once, Harry's scar burned white-hot, as though the old wound had burst open again – and unbidden, unwanted, but terrifyingly strong, there rose within Harry a hatred so powerful he felt, for an instant, he would like nothing better than to strike – to bite – to sink his fangs into the man before him –" (419).

This rage is Voldemort's, not Harry's, and the sudden desire to "sink his fangs into" Dumbledore comes from Voldemort's deep connection with his snake, Nagini. In the dream Harry had just awoken from, Harry experiences Voldemort's possession over the snake. In the novel, it is not emphasised that Harry is a snake in the dream, but the reader is served several hints that something is out of the ordinary. Harry realises that his body is different, "he was flat against the floor, sliding along on his belly" (408), next sign of something out of place is when "Harry put out his tongue...he tasted the man's scent on the air" (408). In the movie, however, this is shown from Harry's point of view as the snake, and in one shot he tilts his head and the audience sees Harry's reflection as a snake on the wall (67:43). This looks like the snake is focalized in the film, but in the novel, Snape explains to Harry that Voldemort "was possessing the snake at the time and so you dreamed you were inside it, too" (470). The feelings of rage Harry experiences is thus due to his shared emotions with Voldemort, Snape explains this to Harry: "The curse that failed to kill you seems to have forged some kind of connection between you and the Dark Lord [...] you are sharing the Dark Lord's thoughts and emotions" (469). These are a few examples of Harry's inner struggle, and I will proceed with applying theory to show why I suggest this relationship is problematic.

The psychoanalytical approach derives from Freud's theory on the unconscious and this can be combined with the social-Darwinian theory, as Lundblad reminds us, "Freud

famously identifies Darwin as dealing the ‘biological blow’ to human narcissism” (4). Furthermore, in her book, *When Species Meet* (2008), Donna Haraway reminds us how Freud “described three great historical wounds to the primary narcissism of the self-centered human subject” (11), the first wound being that of science and Copernicus which “removed Earth itself, man’s home world, from the center of the cosmos” (11). The second wound being that of Darwin, “which put Homo sapiens firmly in the world of other critters”, and the third wound is “the Freudian, which posited an unconscious that undid the primacy of conscious processes, including the reason that comforted Man with his unique excellence” (11-12). It needs to be mentioned that Haraway suggests a fourth wound, “the informatics or cyborgian, which infolds organic and technological flesh” (12), this is not relevant in relation to my thesis, however, so I will not pursue this further. These wounds suggest not only how human narcissism was injured, they also provide a view of how morality based on Christian faith lost its position in society. I argue for a reading of the Harry Potter series where the Christian framework resists the Darwinist-Freudian conception of “natural” instincts, and yet it resituates human narcissism along the lines of valuing the anthropocentric “goodness” in humans.

As exemplified above, Harry’s connection to Voldemort is the main challenge he has to overcome. Voldemort is one of the most animal-like characters, and he is often compared to a snake. His appearance is snakelike, as clearly seen in the film where his face is sleek and his nostrils are only narrow slits. This is emphasised in the fourth novel, *Harry Potter and The Goblet of Fire* (2000), when Voldemort returns and regains his body, he is described as “Whiter than a skull, with wide, livid scarlet eyes, and a nose that was as flat as a snake’s, with slits for nostrils” (558). In other words, Voldemort’s appearance suggests a connection between him and the devil in both their treacherous form of the serpent, and Voldemort’s ability to speak snake-language, Parseltongue, emphasises this even further. Harry resembles the pure, white, male hero who always makes the good moral decisions. He stands up for injustice, he befriends outcasts, and he even saves his enemies when they are in danger. Harry is the modest orphan boy who rose out of poverty and into a famous life of riches, he has experienced injustice first hand, and he devotes his life to fight it. In other words, when Harry experiences repressed anger and rage, satisfaction of screaming at his friends, and an overwhelming lust for attacking his mentor, Dumbledore, this cannot come from Harry alone. The internal influence of Voldemort resembles the evil drives of the devil, which tempts the victim into acting immorally, just as Harry experiences emotions that are new to him.

Harry's concern about his anger is conveyed through a sincere talk with Sirius in the film adaptation. Harry asks Sirius if the connection with Voldemort is because "I am becoming more like him? I just feel so angry all the time. And what if, after everything that I've been through something's gone wrong inside me? What if I'm becoming bad?" (71:33). This suggests how Harry supposedly believes one needs to be "bad", or be like Voldemort, in order to feel anger. Something must have gone wrong inside him, he is not able to repress his darker feelings. Sirius explains to Harry how "the world isn't split into good people and Death Eaters. We've all got both light and dark inside of us. What matters is the part we choose to act on. That's who we really are" (73:18). Sirius provides here the voice of reason, but the general assumption in both film and novel, suggest that in order to be "bad", one needs to be more like Voldemort than Dumbledore. This conflicts with the discourse of the jungle, as "The animal within you, just like the animal in the wild, is naturally hardwired for survival in the jungle, even if the human part of you is defined by the capacity for restraining – or repressing – those animal instincts" (Lundblad 5). In other words, the Darwinist-Freudian framework justifies violence as a "natural" part of humans, while the Christian framework suggests how these instincts derive from dark temptations and must be subjugated.

Thus, the relation between Harry and Voldemort seems to follow the logic of the Christian framework. Through his serpent-like features, Voldemort is both connected to the figure of the devil, and he is connected to the "real" animal through his snake, Nagini. This suggests a continuum from the Christian framework to animality studies, which emphasises how there are several ways to think about animality, and that the Harry Potter series poses several of these discourses. I will continue examining these discourses and by applying theory from Michel Foucault, I hope to provide a thorough analysis of the notion of madness in relation to animality studies.

2.2 The Mad Other

As Foucault eloquently writes in his work *Madness and Civilization* (1967), "Animality has escaped domestication by human symbols and values; and it is animality that reveals the dark rage, the sterile madness that lie in men's hearts" (21), which suggests another discourse of animality than the Darwinist-Freudian framework does. Where the discourse of the jungle credits "natural" instincts to animality, Foucault suggests madness to

be an aspect of our animality, as excluding reason would exclude you from being human. This resonates with Clare Palmer as she argues in her essay on Foucault, “Madness and Animality in Michel Foucault’s *Madness and Civilization*” (2004), that “If reason constitutes itself by the exclusion of madness then the very establishment of a discourse of reason renders madness and animality outside reason” (80). This is reminiscent of a Cartesian thinking of humans and animals, and it also establishes the mad as animals, and thus outside humanity. There are several constructions of madness in HP5, and I will examine these in order to provide the nuanced depiction of animality representations in the novel.

One of the new characters introduced in HP5 is Bellatrix Lestrange, cousin of Sirius, and devoted follower of Voldemort. In the film, the mass break out of Azkaban is shown, and Bellatrix is filmed as she walks among the shattered bricks, laughing hysterically. Her hair is in a mess, and her general appearance reminds the viewer of that of a mad person. Although it has been remarked earlier that Azkaban drives people insane because of the ever-present Dementors, there are more connections with Bellatrix and madness than this. When Harry, Ron and Hermione visits Arthur Weasley at St. Mungo’s Hospital, they encounter Neville visiting his parents. The group, except for Harry, did not know of Neville’s past, and Harry explains: “...that’s what Bellatrix Lestrange got sent to Azkaban for, using the Cruciatus Curse on Neville’s parents until they lost their minds” (455). Even though Bellatrix is not the mad person in this example, she is the reason for Mr. and Mrs Longbottom’s insanity, and her violent ways are not considered that of a sane person’s. This connects violence and madness, and along with her devotion for Voldemort, her character seems to unite these three aspects in one person. When Bellatrix kills Sirius, she becomes even more a symbol for evil for Harry, and the way she is described as constantly laughing madly makes her even more deranged. Sirius even describes her as his “deranged cousin” in the film (73:51).

Another of the characters in HP5 that turns out to be connected with madness is the Minister for Magic, Cornelius Fudge. One of the main sub-plots in the novel is of the fight between the Ministry for Magic and Dumbledore. Fudge frequently uses the Daily Prophet as his propaganda medium to paint a picture of both Harry and Dumbledore as mentally disabled because he does not believe Voldemort has returned. This is shown best in the film where there are several shots of the cover page of the Daily Prophet showing pictures of Harry and Dumbledore with headlines like “Is he daft or is he dangerous?” (19:12). When Harry arrives at Grimmauld Place 12 first time, some of the member of Order of the Phoenix lingers and discusses how Fudge believes Dumbledore is after his job. Harry claims that “No one in their

right mind could believe that” (16:04), to which Lupin replies, “Exactly the point. Fudge isn’t in his right mind” (16:07). Fudge’s scepticism towards Harry is often referred to as “Fudge’s paranoia”, and he is frequently ridiculed by Harry’s friends and members of the order for believing Dumbledore is gathering an army against him. This is emphasised when Ginny suggest that the defence group Harry is teaching, should call themselves “Dumbledore’s Army, because that’s the Ministry’s worst fear, isn’t it?” (347). And Sirius remarks how “Fudge thinks Dumbledore will stop at nothing to seize power. He’s getting more paranoid about Dumbledore by the day” (272).

The connection between Fudge and madness is also a connection with a desire for power. In HP5, Fudge and the ministry are portrayed as the “bad” people, alongside Voldemort. This suggests again how madness, and thus animality, is presented as negative. Furthermore, this picture is fulfilled with the entrance of Dolores Umbridge. Fudge places Umbridge at Hogwarts as the new Defence against the Dark Arts teacher, and she is not popular with the students. From her first introductory speech, it is clear what her purpose at Hogwarts is, as Hermione explains Harry and Ron: “It means the Ministry’s interfering at Hogwarts” (193). This illustrates the battle between the Ministry and Hogwarts, especially between Fudge and Dumbledore. It is fear that has put Fudge in the position where he does not want to believe Dumbledore or Harry, and instead of reason, he reacts with paranoia and delusions. He believes Dumbledore is after the Minister job and so he places a spy at Hogwarts to ensure his own position.

Another character that needs to be studied in this sense is Luna Lovegood. Her character challenges the discourse of madness and the “bad” people by her revealed position as Harry’s trustworthy friend. When Harry first meets Luna on the Hogwarts Express, she occupies a compartment of her own, and Neville does not want to sit with her, “Harry knew at once why Neville had chosen to pass this compartment by. The girl gave off an aura of distinct dottiness” (168). Luna “was reading her magazine upside-down” and she “did not seem to need to blink as much as normal humans” (168). When Ron mimics Goyle as a baboon, Luna laughs harder than anyone else, she “let out a scream of mirth that caused Hedwig to wake up and flap her wings indignantly”, she is “rocking backwards and forwards, clutching her sides” (172), and she gazes at Ron, “breathless with laughter” (173). Luna is portrayed here, as someone out of the ordinary, and even her name is an indication of the mentally unstable, with its strong connotation to “lunatic”. Yet her last name, Lovegood, suggests a warmth and kindness, which characterise her in a very suitable way. Although

Luna, at first, seems to scare her fellow students, Ron especially seems critical to her, she certainly grows on both the other characters and the reader. She proves herself a valuable asset for Harry in the battle against Voldemort, and she provides a wisdom and reason that even gives Hermione a competition. This resonates with Foucault's theory on madness in the Renaissance, which he thought of as revealing a hidden truth. As Palmer reminds us: "This dark, demented animality is associated not only with Unreason, with the unavailability and loss of Reason, but also with the dawning of a dark revelation, which, beyond the bounds of Reason, is 'like an inaccessible truth'" (77). In other words, the Renaissance period considered madness and animality as something dark and monstrous, yet with providing a truth, a wisdom about humans that was not accessible through reason and sanity alone. The character of Luna functions well with this theory, but she is nevertheless portrayed as strange and distanced, and she is connected with the "bad" side through her father in book seven. Luna's father, in an act of desperation, reveals Harry to the Death Eaters in HP7, and although he does this out of love and concern for Luna, he does portray a threat to Harry's safety. Thus, although Luna's madness has more "good" connotations, the narrative does not portray her as positively as many of the other characters.

In terms of revealing a hidden truth, Luna is, along with Harry, able to see the Thestrals. In the film, it is Luna who tells Harry about these mysterious creatures (in the book it is Hagrid who tells about them), and the scene opens with a view of Luna standing barefoot in the chill autumn setting of the forest, which works to emphasise her strangeness. She explains to Harry that she and her father believes in him, and that they think the Ministry and the Daily Prophet is conspiring against Harry. Harry replies that they seem to be the only ones who do, to which Luna says: "I suppose that's how he wants you to feel" (44:29). "If I were You-Know-Who, I'd want you to feel cut off from everyone else...because if it's just you alone...You're not as much of a threat" (44:43). This shows a Luna with much insight and reflection, and this image of her, I would argue, reflects Foucault's theory on the mad in the Renaissance.

The first time Harry notices the Thestrals is when he arrives at Hogwarts after the summer holiday and notices how the carriages he always thought to be dragging themselves, suddenly are dragged by new creatures. Harry tries to identify them; "If he had had to give them a name, he supposed he would have called them horses, though there were something reptilian about them, too" (178). He notices how "they were completely fleshless, their black coats clinging to their skeletons, of which every bone was visible" (178). When Harry asks

what they are, Ron obviously is unable to see them as he does not understand what Harry is pointing at. The only other person seemingly able to see them is Luna Lovegood. Due to Luna's entrance in the series as a mentally unstable person, Harry does not feel reassured when she claims to see them as well. Presumably, the Thestrals makes Harry question his own mental health. Harry experiences Ron's worry for him when he does not see where Harry is pointing when asking about the Thestrals, and Harry certainly feels uncomfortable when he realises that there are creatures there only he and Luna can see. As in the second film of the series, *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets* (2002), Harry learns from Hermione that "even in the wizarding world, hearing voices isn't a good sign" (48:03). Thus, Harry would draw lines between that episode and this, believing himself to have lost his mind, which would probably be confirmed when Luna joins him in his vision. The Thestrals then, could resemble a threat to the human psyche, yet as Harry and his friends learn in Hagrid's Care for Magical Creature's class, "The only people who can see Thestrals [...] are people who have seen death" (394). This resonates with Foucault's madness as revealing an inaccessible truth; if you see death, your vision simultaneously opens up for new knowledge.

As I have attempted to provide an overview of the several ways HP5 constructs animality, I will continue with an examination of the animality constructions I argue reinforce the discourse of the jungle. To do this, I will explore the centaurs and the giants, two species that are presented very differently in the both novel and film, and I will attempt to show how one is presented more human-like and the other more like an animal in terms of "natural instincts".

2.3 Animalisation of Other

One of the relatively new characters introduced in HP5 is the centaur, Firenze. Even though Harry met him briefly in HP1, Rowling has given him more narrative space in HP5. Kirrilly Thompson argues in her article "Theorising Rider-Horse Relations" (2011), how the "centaur metaphor conveys the fundamental theme of human-animal studies: the nature of the human-animal boundary" (225), in other words, how the centaur constructs a continuum of animal and human. Thompson argues how a close relationship between human and horse can be signalled as the ultimate blurring of the subject/object dualism, as the interspecies communication and cooperation places both actors on equal terms. She uses the centaur as

metaphor for the rider-horse relationship, as a unity composed of both species where there is a continuum from one body to the next, almost undivided. Notably, the centaur metaphor functions where there is a close relationship and cooperation between a horse and a rider, as when the rider masters the horse, yet they are both interdependent on each other. In relation to HP5, I argue that the centaur represents a human with a “beast within”, not within a Christian framework, but in terms of Cartesian dualism and the discourse of the jungle.

The centaur Firenze could resemble a metaphor for a rider-horse relationship, yet this would only reinforce his function of elevating humans (both intellectually and physically). When closely studying the character of Firenze, I argue that his position is one of the most complex figures of undermining anthropocentric thinking, yet this potential is not fulfilled due to both narrative structure and how he is portrayed. As Firenze, and the other centaurs, are intent on distancing themselves from humans, it would suggest their position as animals, however, their construction of animality reads them more as humans than animals, and this undermines their potential of resisting the anthropocentric framework of the series. Firenze is never focalised, and due to the third person narrative Rowling adapts, the reader’s conception of Firenze is limited to that of Harry’s, and of how other characters describe him, as I will emphasise below.

Firenze is employed by Dumbledore when Professor Umbridge discharges Professor Trelawney from her teacher’s position in Divinations Class (525-527). Firenze is given a classroom on the ground floor, as his hooves makes it difficult to climb the stairs. The classroom is transformed into what looks like a forest; “The classroom floor had become springily mossy and trees were growing out of it; their leafy branches fanned across the ceiling and windows, so that the room was full of slanting shafts of soft, dappled, green light” (529). Not only is the centaur appropriated a teacher’s position, he is also granted a classroom as close to his natural habitat as possible, suggesting how Dumbledore recognises his needs and meets them as an equal. He is given the authority over the students, and he functions as a bridge between wizards and centaurs, who the reader learns have had a difficult relationship for a long time. Harry recollects his last meeting with Firenze, during his first year at Hogwarts: “Harry remembered how, nearly four years ago, the centaur Bane had shouted at Firenze for allowing Harry to ride safely on his back; he had called him a ‘common mule’” (530).

This episode suggests a suspense between the centaurs and wizards emphasising how centaurs are not to be judged as horses, and they clearly distance themselves from wizards as

well. They are neither horse nor human, they are their own species, and claims a righteous acknowledging from the wizarding community. This notion is further emphasised by Firenze's expulsion from the Forbidden Forest, "My herd has banished me. [...] Because I have agreed to work for Professor Dumbledore," said Firenze. "They see this as a betrayal of our kind." (530). During this conversation, the students are surprised when learning there are more centaurs in the Forest, and Rowling makes a good example of human ignorance with questions such as "Herd?" said Lavender in a confused voice, and Harry knew she was thinking of cows" (530), and "Did Hagrid breed you, like the Thestrals?" asked Dean eagerly" (530). To which Firenze replies "Centaur's are not the servants or playthings of humans" (530), further emphasising the distinction between horses and centaurs, and distancing himself from the ignorance of humans.

It seems as though Rowling attempts to question human subjectivity with the character of Firenze. During class, Firenze provides the students unquestionable knowledge and seemingly question human superiority. Firenze introduces the subject of astrology, to which Parvati tells what they have previously learned, "Mars causes accidents and burns and things like that, and when it makes an angle to Saturn, like now' – she drew a right-angle in the air above her ' - that means people need to be extra careful when handling hot things" (531). Firenze immediately insert himself above Professor Trelawney's knowledge by claiming, "That [...] is human nonsense.' [...] 'Trivial hurts, tiny human accidents" (531). Firenze continues to minimise human concerns by explaining how "These are of no more significance than the scurrying of ants to the wide universe, and are unaffected by planetary movements" (531). He situates human knowledge alongside his centaur knowledge and suggests which is the wiser, "I, however, am here to explain the wisdom of centaurs, which is impersonal and impartial" (531). Firenze emphasises that reading of signs and studying the planets is never certain knowledge and that by suggesting it is, humans are arrogant and ignorant. Compared to the world of the reader, the magical world contains a different knowledge than we are used to, we do not necessarily put much confidence into astrology, however when compared to general knowledge and assumptions, Firenze's claims could be worth exploring. With Firenze, Rowling presumably attempts to exemplify how human assumption sometimes is taken for truth and knowledge, and that this belief needs to be questioned. However, by providing this knowledge to an animal with so much similarities to humans, Rowling manages only to reinforce what she attempts to undermine.

Considering Firenze, and the general attitude of centaurs, it becomes evident that centaurs feel it important to distinguish themselves from horses. The need for this is pointed out when Hermione, who is considered the most reasonable and just character, exclaims “I’ve really never liked horses” (528), after Parvati asked if she wished she had not given up Divination. To this Lavender tells her “He’s not a horse, he’s a centaur!”, before Parvati concludes: “A *gorgeous* centaur ...” (528). Parvati’s last comment suggest how Firenze appeals to humans in various ways, including in sexual terms.

Centaur have the upper body of a human while the lower part of their bodies belong to the horse (Thompson 221), and thus the centaur would seem a personification of Cartesian dualism. With a human head, the centaur have the mind and consciousness of humans, giving him the highly valued reason in light of Descartes’ theory. Simultaneously, the centaur carries the body of an animal, including its sexual organs. This signifies a resonance with the discourse of the jungle, in terms of justifying sexual drives as “natural” and part of our animality. Thus, when Parvati and Lavender feels attracted to Firenze, this emphasises the sexual drives as animality drives, and simultaneously builds up under the notion of heteronormativity of the series, as Firenze is a male, and Parvati and Lavender are females.

Their ability to communicate as a human would is significant. In an attempt to map the debate on the philosophy of mind, Richard Sorabji discovered how the Stoics distinguished humans from other animals by our ability to speak. He found that “According to Diogenes of Babylon, animals have a voice[...], but it is merely air struck by an *impulse*[...], whereas the human voice is sent out by the mind[...] and is articulated[...]” (81). Furthermore, “The Latin word for speaking (*loqui*)[...] is connected with *locus*, a place, and implies being able to put words in the right place” (81). Sorabji found that modern discussions makes the same conclusion, and that even though chimpanzees could learn sign language, they “at best operated with single terms: they did not string them together syntactically”, which went well with Noam Chomsky’s view, as Sorabji reminds us, that “the syntactic abilities of man are a unique property of the human species” (81). Thus, the centaur’s human upper body is significant in relation to speech and how this distinguishes it as more of a human being than other animal.

With Sorabji’s argument on moral decisions based on ability to speak, along with the reception of him from other characters, Firenze would be placed on the human side of the human/animal continuum. This suggests that Firenze’s “natural instincts” belong to the realm of the human, and as he is portrayed as wise, handsome and brave, his character does not

contribute to undermine the Darwinist-Freudian framework, he merely functions to reinforce it. It needs to be mentioned, though, that the other centaurs are portrayed more brutish and violent, but I would argue that their characterisation as a herd, not as individuals, picture them as objectified animals rather than the human image Rowling has provided for Firenze.

Another aspect of Firenze and the centaurs is their problematic representation of the noble savage, or Native Americans. Marion Rana suggests a reading of the centaurs as representing the “exotic Other” (54), which encompasses their portrayal as “mystic, sorrowful and noble” and “as dangerous, wild and inferior” (54). I agree with Rana in her arguments, however, I find her characterisation of the centaur as the exotic Other to be too limiting. Rana argues that exoticism serves to domesticate the foreign (30), and that “by trying to explain the nature of the Other, it is transformed into something we can understand” (31). This is problematic because “our very interest in its otherness prohibits any real assimilation” (31). This characterisation resonates well with the reaction Lavender and Parvati has to Firenze, however from my perspective, it does not encompass the situation with the rest of the centaurs. Rana suggests that the centaurs can be presented as noble savages as she argues; “They are proud, beautiful and knowledgeable about the laws of nature” (57), but that “under the surface, however, they still harbour an aggressive and wild side and are, ultimately, inferior beings” (57), and that this therefore characterises them as the exotic Other. What Rana fails to acknowledge, though, is how the representation of the exotic Other is limited to the characterisation of Firenze, while the other centaurs resonates better with a representation of the noble savage. When Rana neglects this, she fails to see the problematic construction of prejudice which is reinforced by this representation, and when dismissing the representation of the noble savage, the misconception of this human ethnic group stands unchallenged.

In my reading, the centaurs represent the noble savage, and their “aggressive and wild side” suggest a construction of animality that problematizes how the human ethnic group they represent are conveyed. The centaur’s knowledge about nature, their pride and their distance from the wizards suggest the characterisation of the noble savage, and when the narrative portrays them as violent, brutal and treacherous, this reinforces the discourse of the jungle, rather than disqualifying them of representing the noble savage. In other words, the brutality and wild nature of the centaurs reinforces prejudices against the human ethnic group they resemble, and this needs to be recognised critically, rather than dismissed, as Rana does.

As I have attempted to show how the centaurs reinforce the Darwinist-Freudian framework by representing the noble savage and by personifying Cartesian dualism, I will

move on to a discussion on the giants in order to suggest a reading of them as representing the “black savage”, or the “uncivilized Other”.

The giants are introduced in HP4, but granted more narrative space in HP5, and they can be read as representing the violence of human animality in terms of the Darwinist-Freudian framework, or as I suggest, as situating human ethnic groups as savages and uncivilized. Lundblad suggests, “that animality can first be distinguished from savagery and second elevated above savagery in a disavowal of the evolutionary link between (black) savagery and (white) humanity” (140). With this in mind, I attempt to analyse the giants as representing human ethnic groups in terms of savagery.

In HP5, Harry, Ron and Hermione, and thus the reader, learns more of the relationship and history between wizards and giants. The giants are portrayed as brutal and violent, and they are organised in primitive tribes. As Hagrid explains, the giants seem to be in danger of extinction, “’eighty left, an’ there was loads once, musta bin a hundred diff’rent tribes from all over the world. Bu’ they’ve bin dyin’ out fer ages” (377). This, Hagrid explains, is due to “’the wizards who forced’em to go an’ made ‘em live a good long way from us” (378). In other words, the giants have forcefully been moved by the wizards, and are now in danger of extinction. As Hagrid explains, he was sent to bargain with the giants and try to persuade them into joining Dumbledore in the fight against Voldemort. This suggests a resemblance of imperialist, or colonial, rule over others, yet I believe Rowling has chosen to let this part stay in the plot to show how the “good” wizards are aware of this injustice and try to make it right. However, the chapter about the giants in HP5 prove to undermine the species, and thus the “uncivilized Other” even further, and this imposes strong imperialist connotations within the text. As the giants are portrayed as “naturally” brutal and uncivilized, the wizards’ decision of moving them away from civilization is portrayed as wise and necessary, rather than racist or xenophobic. I will with this section attempt to provide an analysis of the giants that demonstrate how they function to portray certain human ethnic groups as savage, rather than animal, in accordance with Lundblad’s suggestions about the “black savage”. By characterising the discourse of the jungle as associating “animality with the supposedly essential, biological instincts for heterosexuality in the name of reproduction and for violence in the name of survival” (Lundblad 4-5), it is evident that the giants function to resist this, and that their brutality defines them more of a savage, than either human or animal.

I believe this is important to acknowledge and challenge, as Giselle Liza Anatol argues in her essay, “The Fallen Empire: Exploring Ethnic Otherness in the World of Harry Potter”

(2003), that “the ideology of imperialism, colonialism, and xenophobia is often encoded so deeply – both in the text and in our own perception of the world – that it becomes almost invisible” (165-166). Anatol examines the Harry Potter series from a postcolonial studies perspective, where she exemplifies several of the problematic situations where supposed ethnic others are stereotyped within the text. What she fails to acknowledge, though, is the constructions of animality that reinforce stereotypes of other human ethnic groups. She argues that “Rowling makes a strong move towards encouraging multiculturalism, especially with her messages condemning the bigotry of both normative Muggles like the Dursleys, pure-blood witches and wizards who scorn ‘Mudbloods,’ and all magical folk who assume the natural inferiority of house-elves and fear and persecute giants and werewolves” (174). This is her only mentioning of other species, and I would argue that even though she concentrates her essay on human portrayals, the animalization of human ethnic groups is important to recognise and challenge, as it formulates much of the same imperialist thinking as she critically assesses in her analysis. I will continue with posing examples from the text I find specifically problematic in this manner, and then apply theory from Lundblad to support my arguments.

The giants have their own language, yet as Hagrid emphasises when he introduces his half-brother to Harry and Hermione, it sounds like grunting sounds, “‘Grawp?’ said Harry. ‘Yeah...well, tha’s what it sounds like when he says his name’” (609), which reinforces the impression that giants are uncivilized. Some of the giants understand English, as Hagrid had an interpreter when he conversed with the leader of the tribe (379), yet most of them seem to be portrayed as generally ignorant towards the wizard community. The reader does not get to form a personal impression of the giants, as Hagrid is the one focalising them. Hagrid’s telling gives the impression that the giants are easily manipulated, as when he describes they had to bring gifts for a few days before they speak business, “*We’ll come back tomorrow with another present, an’ then we do come back with another present – gives a good impression, see?*” (379). In other words, Hagrid suggests that the very leader of the tribe is easily bought and affected as long as you can impress him with a few interesting presents. This does not give the impression of a powerful leader, nor are the people who have chosen him to lead significantly brilliant.

This narrative suggests how the giants are rightfully objectified by wizards, which is problematic seen from a postcolonial perspective. They have been exiled, forced to live together where different tribes inevitably start fighting and eventually kill each other.

Although Hagrid tells his tale and shows the cruelty of wizards, his telling of his own experiences with the giants reinforce the impression that giants are better off far away from wizards, and that this is the safest for both of them. He tells of the brutality of giants, as when Gorgomath kills Karkus, his leader, and takes his place instead. They are portrayed as uncivilized and without any democracy, as Hagrid emphasises, “overload ‘em with information an’ they’ll kill yeh jus’ to simplify things” (380). They kill, slaughter and fight without any consideration for their own species, “Yeh’d think, seein’ as how their whole race is abou’ finished, they’d lay off each other, bu’...” (380). In other words, the giants are not as intelligent as the wizards, and thus it is safer to keep them at a distance, or they have to carry the “white man’s burden” and attempt to civilize them.

When examining the narrative about the giants, it is easily recognised that they are never focalised. They are told, not shown. This provides a one-sided interpretation of them, and it is easy to conclude that these creatures are portrayed from a subjective human and thus objectified as animal. Arguably, even though the narrative gives the impression of humans as ignorant towards other species, this does not challenge or undermine the subjective role of humans. We are shown an example of former superiority of wizards over the giants, and how they traditionally view the giants, yet if Rowling wanted to use this as advocating for the subjectivity of other species, she has done this too simplistic. The fact that Harry, Ron and Hermione know very little about giants, as when Ron asks “How big are they?” (377), and “What do you give a Giant? [...] Food?” (379), suggest an ignorance and arrogance from the wizarding community towards giants. They know very little about them, and there has not been much interest in understanding this other species. The giants are granted little narrative space, and they are rarely mentioned after this chapter.

Presumably, Rowling wishes to provide a nuanced image of the relationship between species to the reader, as there are “good” giants, as Karkus and his followers who was intrigued by Dumbledore’s message and gifts, along with the “bad” giants, as Gorgomath. Gorgomath takes the role of leader after killing Karkus, and Hagrid explains “I knew it was no go before I’d opened me mouth. He was sitting there wearing Karkus’s helmet, leerin’ at us as we got nearer. Black hair an’ matchin’ teeth an’ a necklace o’ bones. Human-looking bones, some of ‘em” (381). In the valley where the giants live, the wizards have to act by their rule and obey to their customs. As Hagrid and Olympe went negotiating with the giants, so did the Death Eaters, and as Hagrid emphasises, the representative from the Death Eaters, Macnair “Likes killin’ as much as Gorgomath; no wonder they were getting’ on so well”

(382). In other words, this narrative provides both nuances of wizards and giants, and I believe this is Rowling's way of suggesting there are more than one way to communicate, there are other possibilities than the human way of acting. Nevertheless, this narrative functions to further employ a human subjectivity.

Lundblad argues in his reading of *Tarzan of the Apes* that "On the one hand, the novel constructs the black male rapist (and therefore African Americans in general) as more savage than animal, linked more with the cruelties of African torture than the survival-of-the-fittest logic of predator and prey" (140). I find this reading to resonate well with the representation of the giants in HP5. As we have seen, the giants resemble a brutality removed from the "natural" violence of the Darwinist-Freudian framework, and as they not only attack their enemies, but also slaughter each other within the tribe, they resemble an uncivility considered neither human nor animal. The giants' resemblance of the uncivilized Other, or the "black savage" builds upon the "relationship between cruelty and the discourse of the jungle" leading to "constructions of a new kind of hierarchy" (126), as Lundblad argues. This hierarchy suggests how "*some* human beings have supposedly evolved enough to be 'humane' not only toward animals but also toward other human beings" (126), in other words, "A 'civilized' society, supposedly, would not delight in the *inhumane* treatment of either human or non-human animals" (126). The giants, then, would not qualify as either civilized or humane, ultimately excluding them from being human altogether.

Some critics would argue that the giants never were meant to be read as humans, and that their savagery is in the nature of a mere fictional character. However, because Hagrid is half-giant (his mother was romantically, or at least sexually, involved with a wizard) I would argue that the representation of the giants resemble a much more complex construction than that of a fantasy character.

Another imperialist notion of the wizards' treatment of giants is Hagrid's attitude towards his half-brother, Grawp. When Hagrid finds Grawp among the giants, he decides to bring him home to Hogwarts (Britain), and teach him how to behave like a wizard (white man). Hagrid brings Grawp to his own home, against Grawp's will, he places him in the forest to hide him from the rest of the wizarding community, and he insists on teaching him English (608-613). As the reader learns, Hagrid's attempts is rather unsuccessful, and the differences between the brothers undermine the similarities; "But Grawp merely gave another low roar; it was hard to say whether he was listening to Hagrid or whether he even recognised the sounds Hagrid was making as speech" (613). Hagrid wishes to completely assimilate

Grawp into the “civilized” society of the wizards, rather than to promote integration and acceptance, and he wishes to teach him the language of the empire in order to make him as human as possible. This resembles the narrow-mindedness of imperialist thinking of bringing “apparently superior European knowledge and experience to the [...] developing areas of the world” (Anatol 164).

Even though Hagrid finally (and at least partially) succeeds in his attempt in integrating Grawp, as the reader learns in HP7, I suggest that this reinforces the assumption of Western superiority over other ethnicities. Hagrid forces another being to become more like himself in order for people to understand and appreciate him. The text thus further promotes the giant’s nature negatively, and by denying him his true nature and imposing Hagrid’s culture on Grawp, Hagrid suggests that his own nature is the better one. Nevertheless, Hagrid himself is portrayed as a less intellectual being. He is a drop-out from school, his speech is stigma of a lower social class and he is a naïve character. His actions are presumably made to be portrayed as a bit foolishly and a means of comic relief, all the while being warm-hearted and well intentioned. The narrative suggests that his actions are not to be taken seriously, and the reader presumably understands that everything he does is example of eccentric behaviour. Thus, this could be another of Rowling’s presumed attempts to provide a nuance to the narrative, Hagrid’s attempt to socialise Grawp could be read as a way of reaching out to humanity and imploring appreciation for species/ethnicities other than us. However, again, Rowling does this too simplistic, and it shows itself to further situate (Western) human beings above others.

However, the film adaptation seems to approach the problematic portrayals of savages in a more discreet manner than the novel. When introducing Grawp in the film, there is little doubt that this is a giant due to his enormous size, yet apart from this he appears to be very much like a human. In the novel, Grawp is described as looking “strangely misshapen” (611). Grawp’s head is “much larger in proportion to the body than a human head, and was almost perfectly round and covered with tightly curling, close-growing hair the colour of bracken” (611). He is huge, and his feet are “large as sledges” (611), and when Harry and Hermione first encountered him, Harry mistook him for a “great mound of earth” (608). In the film, the only things distinguishing Grawp from the rest of the group is his size and his manners, his face is very much like that of a human’s.

Grawp’s behaviour seems to be more adapted towards human behaviour in the film too. The scene where Hagrid brings Harry, Ron and Hermione into the forest to introduce

them to Grawp, exemplifies this. Grawp attempts to communicate with Hermione by giving her a bicycle stem with a bell on it. Grawp first makes the bell ring, then gives it to Hermione, and when she rings it back, Grawp is visibly pleased. This encounter suggests how Grawp is not as dangerous or difficult as they imagined him to be, and he manages to communicate his feelings for Hermione so openly that Ron becomes jealous and screams “You just stay away from her, all right?” (90:41). Grawp’s ability to communicate is minimal, yet his facial expressions clearly shows how he feels. In the scene, Grawp lifts up Hermione, and she instructs him in a strict tone to put her down, while pointing a finger at him, and Grawp’s expression shows regret. This proposes a more humane character than the one Rowling has depicted in the novel. When studying this, it seems as though the filmmakers wish to avoid the unfortunate depiction of giants as uncivilized savages by first, making Grawp look as human and non-distinct in race as possible, and second, by reducing Hagrid’s tale about the giants to a section lasting only a few seconds. In the film, Hagrid comes home and tells briefly about his quest, yet as with other scenes and the other films, there are sequences much like this one that is enacted and shown to the audience. In other words, it seems as if this is done deliberately by the filmmakers in order to avoid the racial implications this scene could impose. As I have attempted to show another way of thinking about constructions of animality, which suggests that of both the noble savage and the uncivilized Other, I will proceed with an examination of the animality constructions with the house-elves in order to explore how they represent racism and class differences.

An important aspects of the wizarding world is as Peter Dendle writes in his essay, “Monsters, Creatures and Pets at Hogwarts” (2009), “The wizard world’s attitude towards animals and animal welfare, much like our own Muggle world attitude, is riddled with ambiguity and hypocrisy” (166). Dendle draws examples from almost all books of the series where animals are either mistreated or used for comic relief. He exemplifies how “it is apparently acceptable to toss gnomes for fun and for lawn aesthetics, while noble creatures such as the Hippogriff should be admired and protected” (173), which is something I will examine more closely in my next chapter. Dendle also emphasises Hermione’s campaign for the rights of house elves as contradicting. Although Hermione’s campaign, called S.P.E.W., is one of the subplots of HP4, she attempts to continue her work in HP5. This is omitted from the movies, and as with the giants, I believe this is done deliberately due to the racial implications they might convey. As Dendle also notes, “The elf rights subplot of the series is not among Rowling’s greatest successes” (165). This is mostly due to how Rowling let all the

other characters react to Hermione's campaign, and how the reader thus understand Hermione's attempt to free the house-elves as a comical backdrop to an otherwise increasingly darker main plot.

The house-elves are portrayed in a manner that points directly towards black slaves and thus Hermione's campaign of freeing them should be narrated more seriously than Rowling has done. Several critics has also noted this symbolism, such as Peter Dendle's remarks on Dobby's "racially charged pidgin" (165), referring to his lack of syntax in speech, and Marion Rana mentioning how the house elves' language "resembles [...] that of migrant workers" (45). Rana also examines the house-elves as representing slavery, and she emphasises how "their depiction as unintelligent and inferior becomes especially critical because it reflects back on an actual group of people in society" (45). Although my argument lies close to Rana's suggestion, I argue that the constructed animality of the house-elves "naturalises" the inferior position of ethnic human groups through the discourse of the jungle.

The house-elves usually work for a wizard family for the entirety of their lives, or until they are set free by their master in the ritual of giving the elf clothes. The house-elves are not prone to have any possessions of their own, and their servitude is signified by them wearing old tea towels, oven mittens and such as clothing. Thus, when presented with real clothes, the elf is set free, which usually is against an elf's wish and functions as means of punishment. As Hermione is told, on several occasions, her liberation campaign is futile because the house elves want to serve the wizards, it is in their nature, "They *like* being enslaved" (HP4 198), as Ron tells Hermione. This construction of animality is problematic as it "naturalises" the enslavement of human ethnic groups, such as black slaves and African Americans in general. Another aspect of this is as Karin Westman notes in her essay, "Spectres of Thatcherism: Contemporary British Culture in J.K. Rowling's Harry Potter Series" (2002), "For the British reader, the "slavery" of the house-elves would suggest not only a history of race relations, as for the American reader, but class relations in British schools" (325). Thus, through the discourse of the jungle, the constructed animality of the house-elves presents not only racist implications, it also "naturalises" the position of the lower classes.

When Harry goes to the Ministry of Magic for his disciplinary hearing, he notices the fountain in the hall, formed with statues of a "noble-looking wizard with his wand pointing straight up in the air", "a beautiful witch", and "a centaur, a goblin and a house-elf". Harry notices how the "last three were all looking adoringly up at the witch and wizard" (117). This reads as a manifestation of the anthropocentric framework of the Harry Potter series, with the

witch and wizard adored by the animalised minority and ethnic groups surrounding them. However, as Harry is the focalizer of the novels, it is through his impressions and perspectives the reader is experiencing the plot, and as this is Harry's first impression of the fountain, it needs to be mentioned that when he takes a closer look after the hearing, he notices how the handsome wizard "looked rather weak and foolish" (142). He realises how the witch was "wearing a vapid smile like a beauty contestant" and "from what Harry knew of goblins and centaurs, they were most unlikely to be caught staring so soporily at humans of any description" (142). With my reading of centaurs as the "noble savage", and goblins as the stereotypical Jew (as I will explore in my next chapter), it seems as if Rowling attempts to display an attitude of multicultural inclusion, and a resistance towards the constructed discourse of animality. However, the result is a constructed discourse of the jungle that reinforces the "naturalised" servility of ethnic human groups and class constructions when Harry notices "Only the house-elf's attitude of creeping servility looked convincing" (142). Ultimately, Rowling reinforces the notions of racism she presumably attempts to condemn.

With this chapter, I have attempted to display several ways to think about animality in HP5, and how this depicts problematic representations of various human ethnic groups. I have applied Lundblad's theory of the discourse of the jungle, and attempted to show several ways constructions of animality resists this discourse.

I have shown, by close reading, examples from both novel and film, including the narrative of the giants, the centaurs, and the constructed animality of the house-elves, in an attempt to prove how these situations undermine the message that Rowling presumably wished to convey of multicultural potential. With this, along with an examination of various characters connected to madness, and finally Harry's connection with Voldemort in terms of Christianity, I hope to have provided an analysis of HP5 that shows how the anthropocentric framework forms the basis of prejudices and stereotypes. My third, and final chapter, will build on the theory from this and my previous chapter in order to investigate how the seventh book of the series portray female characterisations, along with an analysis of the representations of species in the final battle at Hogwarts.

3 Constructing Gender Roles: *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*

As my two previous chapters have examined the relationship between animals and humans in light of Cartesian dualisms, and the relationship between what we consider natural instincts and the animal world, I will with this chapter look into ecofeminism in order to connect the discussion on animality and *Harry Potter*. Even though the Harry Potter series contain several strong female characters, critics have argued that, when studied critically, most of these women provide a characterisation of females as weaker than the males. As Elizabeth Heilman and Trevor Donaldson writes in their article, “From Sexist to (sort-of) Feminist: *Representations of Gender in the Harry Potter series*” (2009), “the Harry Potter books, like many popular books for children, mostly reinforce gender stereotypes” (139). They have examined the series as a whole with a gender criticism perspective, and concludes, “while the last three books showcase richer roles and more powerful females, we find that women are still marginalized, stereotyped, and even mocked” (140). My reading of the series concludes the same way, however as I write from an eco-critic perspective I have not yet put much emphasis on the constructed discourse of gender in this thesis. But as the seventh and last Harry Potter book, *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows* (2007), presents various female portrayals that differs very much from film to novel, I find this chapter to be a good place to connect the discussion on animality with that of eco-criticism, and combine it with a discussion on ecofeminism. Val Plumwood argues that “When four tectonic plates of liberation theory – those concerned with the oppressions of gender, race, class and nature – finally come together, the resulting tremors could shake the conceptual structures of oppression to their foundations” (1). Thus, as I have examined the theory of race and class in my previous chapters, with this chapter, I will combine the theory of feminism and eco-criticism, in order to emphasise the relation between anthropocentrism and oppression.

I will examine the various female characters and argue that, especially in the novel, they ultimately reinforce the discourse of the jungle, which generally naturalises gender roles according to evolutionary logic. In addition to this, and in an attempt to connect the final novel with my arguments in previous chapters, I will study the various species representations in the last battle at Hogwarts. I argue that these poses both problems and potential in terms of reading animal representations as resembling both human ethnic groups and “real” animals. The last battle includes several individuals of species the reader has already met in earlier

novels, and I argue that these function to make the reader reassess the stereotypes that their species are otherwise subjected to. Ultimately, though, the problematic elements that are initially more anthropocentric, sexist and racist, undermines this potential intent. First, I will outline some of the problematic representations of gender in the text in order to provide the background for why I think the sexism of HP7 undermines the potential of the species in the final battle.

Ecofeminism, as stated in the introduction, derives around the concept of a similarity between patriarchal oppression and the human dominance over nature. Earlier it has been identified with projects such as the Chipko Movement and Love Canal, but as I mentioned in the introduction, this is a problematic presentation of ecofeminism as it merely reproduces the stereotypical and submissive image of women. To relate this to the sort of gender representation in HP7, I would like to adapt Heilman and Donaldson's heavily used term of "token inclusion" (142). They argue that the increased inclusion and influence of women characters in the three last novels of the series "reads as a wilful attempt at gender inclusion" (142). They exemplify this expansion of female characters and emphasises how the reader learn of women in powerful positions and how "many females develop beyond the stereotypical femininity in which they have previously been cast" (143). I wish to look into this further and study the representation of several of the major, along with some minor, female characters in HP7. To read HP7 from an ecofeminist perspective, I will investigate the female characters and attempt to prove that they are portrayed in a sexist manner, and then I will connect this with representations of other species in a discussion on the series' attitude towards otherness. To do this, I will study what I consider to be the token inclusion of subjected animals in the last battle of Hogwarts, I will investigate the similarities between muggles and the treatment of other species, and I will explore various ways in which otherness is portrayed, especially with the character of Griphook. Then I will attempt to tie these various portrayals of otherness together and in conclusion show their relation to the ecofeminist perspective, and animality studies as a whole.

3.1 Stereotyped Gender Roles

As mentioned, Heilman and Donaldson argues how the increased influence of female characters in the last three novels of the series were problematic as they function as token

inclusion due to the notable absence of strong female characters in the first four novels. Rowling herself complained about the increasing demand from fans for strong heroines, and argues that Hermione is strong enough, “She is most brilliant of the three, and they need her” (quoted by Roni Natov, 131). In other words, Rowling is presumably unaware of the negative reinforcement she makes when Hermione, along with most of the other girls, is described as on the brink of tears and generally more emotional than the boys are. In HP7 there are several dangerous situations Harry, Ron and Hermione must face, yet it usually is Hermione who is the most unsure and nervous when danger approaches. After their narrow escape from the Death Eaters in Tottenham Court Road, the three decide to hide in Grimmauld Place even though they fear Snape has told Voldemort how to get in. Once inside, they encounter the protective spells put up by members of the Order, one which resembles Dumbledore’s body rising from the floor and leaping at them. This terrifying experience leaves Hermione “crouched on the floor by the door with her arms over her head and Ron, who was shaking from head to foot, patting her clumsily on the shoulder and saying, ‘It’s all r-right ...it’s g-gone’” (142). This is not the only time Ron needs to comfort Hermione. When Scrimgeour arrives at the home of the Weasley’s with the will of Dumbledore, Hermione strives to contain her emotions when receiving Dumbledore’s gift, she speaks in a “thick voice”, is “wiping her eyes on her sleeve”, and finally “She suppressed a sob. They were wedged together so tightly that Ron had difficulty extracting his arm to put it around Hermione’s shoulder” (107). Although this is used as emphasising the increasingly romantic tension between the two, it also functions to portray Hermione as fragile and emotionally weaker than the boys. As Heilman and Donaldson also notes, “The females are emotional and cry readily throughout all seven books” (149). As my emphasis in this chapter is on HP7, and not the other novels, I will pay most attention to the female characteristics presented in this novel. However, Heilman and Donaldson exemplifies several occasions where the girls burst into tears throughout the series, as when “Lavender Brown cries when her pet rabbit, Binky, dies” or even when McGonagall “regretting her treatment of Pettigrew, ‘sounded as though she had a sudden cold’” (149). They contrast these female emotional outbursts with those of the male one’s. “Acceptable male tears occur when Dumbledore had an aesthetic response to music” or “when Wood ‘sobbed unrestrainedly’ after winning the Quidditch game” (150).

By Heilman and Donaldson’s many examples, it becomes clear that Hermione’s emotional outbursts are not significant of her alone. However, in HP7 a large part of the plot derives around Harry, Ron, and Hermione’s journey in search of the Horcruxes. They spend

most of the time alone, which makes the contrasts between male and female behaviour even more visible. The representation of Hermione on their journey is problematic as she takes on a maternal role, and while Harry and Ron are the more adventurous of them, Hermione reinforces her stereotype by reading and cooking. Harry and Ron destroys the first Horcrux while Hermione is at sleep, and their bravery is emphasised by Harry's struggle to retrieve Gryffindor's sword, and Ron's heroic act when using the sword to destroy the Horcrux. Their masculinity is given. When it finally is Hermione's turn to destroy a Horcrux, it is, firstly, not done by the use of the sword, she uses the teeth of the dead Basilisk (already killed by Harry) from HP2. Secondly, as Heilman and Donaldson also notes, "this is only mentioned in passing, not described in rich detail like the heroics of the boys" (146). Furthermore, when Ron complains about the food, Hermione replies, "Harry caught the fish and I did my best with it! I notice I'm always the one who ends up sorting out the food; because I'm a *girl*, I suppose" (241). Rowling might have put this into the dialogue to show that the feminist struggles of the real world exist as much in the magical world as well, as a way to acknowledge and put emphasis on the problem. Ron denies Hermione's comment by saying, "No, it's because you're supposed to be the best at magic" (241). However, Rowling's presumed attempt functions against its purpose as it is Hermione who always ends up providing the food. Along with the general portrayal of Hermione as less adventurous and more easily scared than the boys, Hermione's comment merely reinforces her stereotypic portrayal as a traditional female, not as a progressive one.

After their escape from Gringotts, riding on the back of the dragon, Harry becomes aware that "Behind him, whether from delight or fear he could not tell, Ron kept swearing at the top of his voice, and Hermione seemed to be sobbing" (439). The constant crying of the girls does not seem to impress the boys much, and Harry even emphasises this when he thinks about his affection for Ginny. "She was not tearful; that was one of the many wonderful things about Ginny, she was rarely weepy. He had sometimes thought that having six brothers must have toughened her up" (99). Yet, after Ron interrupts their kiss, Ginny turns her back to Harry, "He thought she might have succumbed, for once, to tears. He could not do anything to comfort her in front of Ron" (99). Heilman and Donaldson also notes this, and agrees, "In his desire for Ginny, Harry defines what attributes are favorable in women, marking all the feminine distinctions that characterize the plurality of female characters as undesirable" (154).

With desire, the series provides another problem for the female character. The male characters mostly seem to desire the outward beauty of a woman. When Fleur's family comes

to the Burrow for Bill and Fleur's wedding, Mr Weasley is struck by Mrs Delacour's appearance. "The first sound of their approach was an unusually high-pitched laugh, which turned out to be coming from Mr Weasley [...] leading a beautiful, blonde woman in long, leaf-green robes, who could only be Fleur's mother" (92). When Mrs Delacour greets the others and compliments Mr Weasley's "amusing stories", he gives another "maniacal laugh" which results in Mrs Weasley giving him a look "upon which he became immediately silent" (93). Then Fleur's little sister approaches "with waist-length hair of pure, silvery blonde" throwing Harry a "glowing look, batting her eyelashes", which makes Ginny clear "her throat loudly" (93). As the reader learn in HP4, Fleur is descendant of a Veela, an enchanting woman figure with powers to lure and seduce men. As Gupta explains about the Veela's power; "The pure physical manifestation that inevitably grips the male gaze and erases every other presence in the vicinity – the completely crystallized object that puts everything else out of focus – is the trigger of male sexual desire" (130). This explains Mr Weasley's reaction to Mrs Delacour, and Ginny and Mrs Weasley's jealousy.

Several times is female beauty emphasised, as when Harry speaks to the Ravenclaw ghost, the Grey Lady, and "Harry supposed that she was beautiful, with her waist-length hair and floor-length cloak", yet remarking that she "also looked haughty and proud" (494). It seems as if the typical feminine appearance, such as waist-length hair, attracts the males. Yet, as with Ginny, the non-typical behaviour, such as not giggling and crying, is attractive. Heilman and Donaldson writes that the "inferior position of females is further reinforced through characterizations that highlight their insecurities and self-hatred, especially as it relates to their looks, bodies, and specifically feminine attributes" (151). There are examples of males being concerned by their looks as well, but it is not as prominent as it is with the females. Gupta exemplifies female desire with the character of Gilderoy Lockhart from HP2. Lockhart is extremely obsessed with his looks, and exclaims that he has won the award for "most charming smiles" twelve times in a row (find quote in HP2). Yet he is ridiculed, and he turns out to be a fraud and not the hero he has built his image upon. Gupta emphasises that it "is more Gilderoy Lockhart's image, carefully constructed and relentlessly advertised by him, than his person that appeals to women" (129). This suggests that women are attracted by the classic hero with ability to save them from danger, while men are attracted to straightforward beauty.

The expectance of women to be beautiful and men to be brave is problematic by how it further reinforces the conception of women as passive objects and men as the acting subject.

When considering the constructed dualism I discussed in my first chapter, the problem of the objectified women characters in the series is put alongside the objectified animals in a continuum of the nature/culture dualism. Reason/unreason and male/female suggests how the oppression and objectifying of women is connected to the dominance over animals, which altogether is the main philosophy behind ecofeminism. As Patrick Curry puts it in his book, *Ecological Ethics: An Introduction* (2011), “while reason is taken to be the ‘highest’ aspect of being human – thus implicitly but firmly excluding women – scientific rationality presents itself in turn as the ultimate expression of reason” (129). He speaks here of the “fathers of the Scientific Revolution” (129), meaning Bacon, Descartes and Galileo, and as mentioned previously especially Descartes played an important role in defining dualisms undermining other species. With this in mind, along with Plumwood’s argument of including other theory fields, I will further examine some of the concepts in HP7 I find challenging to leave read uncritically.

There are several problematic portrayals of the female characters in HP7 and I will continue with an investigation of these, alongside how they are connected to other problematic aspects, such as the relationship between wizards and goblins, and species inclusion/exclusion. Altogether, this will form the basis of my argument that HP7 problematizes the concept of otherness in a way that reinforces the anthropocentric worldview I have discussed in previous chapters.

3.2 Naturalisation of Motherhood

Along with the problematic portrayal of Hermione in the series, several other female characters also reinforce traditional gender stereotypes. Here, I will analyse the characters of Molly Weasley, Ginny Weasley, Bellatrix Lestrange, and Professor McGonagall. These are some of the major female characters, and they thus function well as exemplifying the problematic patriarchal domination of the series. I will also, in this section, explore the differences in film and novel, as I argue that there is major differences in how the females are portrayed in these two mediums. In the film, the female characters are much stronger, less emotional and much more involved. This varies so much from the novel that I believe it to be done deliberately, and I will look into some problematic aspect of this as well.

Molly Weasley has been portrayed through most of the series as the ultimate mother figure. She cares for her seven children, she is a stay-at-home-mother, and she is often associated with dinner cooking and knitting. Ron always gets a home-made sweater for Christmas. Mrs Weasley's character is not much involved in the plot of HP7, she appears at the beginning while the whole house prepares for Bill and Fleur's wedding. Here Mrs Weasley mostly fulfils the role of a worrying mother, trying to get information on Harry, Ron and Hermione's plans. When she fails this she appoints the three of them several household tasks separately, as Harry suspects, in order to "keep him, Ron and Hermione away from one another" (78). Later, she appears during the final chapters of the novel, where she participates in the battle against Voldemort. Heilman and Donaldson argue, "Mrs. Weasley, initially a narrowly written, exclusively domestically minded, worrying mother, seems transformed in the final battle of *Deathly Hallows*" (143). They refer here to her duelling, and eventually killing, Bellatrix Lestrange. Before the battle commences, she denies Ginny to participate in the battle, telling her "I won't permit it! The boys, yes, but you, you've got to go home!" (486). Although her denying Ginny to fight is because of her age and not necessarily due to her being a girl, their discussion functions to reinforce Mrs Weasley's character as a concerned mother. Mr Weasley is nowhere to be found in this conversation, even though we learn that he is present when Percy suddenly shows up and "Mrs Weasley burst into tears" while "Mr Weasley blinked rather rapidly, then he, too, hurried to hug his son" (487). Yet, he did presumably not feel the need to assist his wife in her argument with their daughter. It is not until Lupin suggests that Ginny can stay inside the Room of Requirement that Mr Weasley joins the argument, supporting Lupin. "That's a good idea," said Mr Weasley firmly. "Ginny, you stay in this Room, you hear me?" (488). Mr Weasley is here presented as the final authority who agrees with the reasoning of Lupin, another male, unlike his wife who merely acts out of emotion and has no final saying.

In the battle, Ginny ends up fighting alongside Luna and Hermione against Bellatrix. When a "Killing Curse shot so close to Ginny that she missed death by an inch" (589), Harry runs towards her to help, but "before he had gone a few steps he was knocked sideways" (589), by Mrs Weasley screaming at Bellatrix, "NOT MY DAUGHTER, YOU BITCH!" (589). Harry, who have generally been portrayed as the hero, finds himself redundant when Mrs Weasley's maternal instincts makes her a warrior. As Heilman and Donaldson also notes, "Molly Weasley leaves the Burrow to protect her children and duels to defend her daughter, making her aggressive assertions consistent with her mothering role" (144). Furthermore, Mrs

Weasley's outburst, calling Bellatrix a "bitch" "reads like a catfight added for comic relief" (144). In other words, Mrs Weasley's duel and killing of Bellatrix is excused and explained by her maternal instincts, while there is no such portrayal of the male characters in the battle. The problematic way of presenting the women in the battle as fighting for their children rather than for the greater cause, suggests a reinforcement of the discourse of the jungle, which "naturalises" and permits stereotypical gender roles according to evolutionary logic. The job of the female is to be caring and maternal, and provide safety for the children within the home of her heterosexual marriage.

This logic is further established with the character of Narcissa Malfoy and her devotion to her son, Draco. The Malfoys have devoted their life and services to Voldemort, and up until Lucius Malfoy breaks the prophecy Voldemort sorely needs in order to defeat Harry, the Malfoys have been highly valued by the Dark Lord. After this event, however, Voldemort attempts to punish the family by ordering Draco to murder Dumbledore, knowing that he will fail and be murdered in the attempt. Upon learning this, Narcissa approaches Professor Snape and implores him to assist Draco in his attempt (HP6 37-41). She keeps pleading, "My son...my only son" (38), while Bellatrix, her sister, argues that she "should be proud" and emphasising, "If I had sons, I would be glad to give them up to the service of the Dark Lord!" (39). This distinguishes the difference between the two sisters, one with a family and fulfilling her "naturalised" role as caring and stay-at-home mother, the other one devotes her life in service of a man who neglects her. The two are portrayed as devoted women, both "naturalised" in their way of putting others before themselves, but with different motives. Narcissa is the caring mother, while Bellatrix is the submissive lover, and neither of them are agents of their own. The distinction between lover and wife is further emphasised in the final battle at Hogwarts, where Bellatrix dies in service of her lover, and Narcissa betrays the Dark Lord in order to find her son. After Voldemort's Killing Curse has ended the Horcrux living within Harry, both Harry and Voldemort fall unconscious. Bellatrix approaches the Dark Lord and she "spoke as if to a lover" (580), pleading his name. When Voldemort thus wakes up and wishes to know whether Harry is alive or dead, he sends Narcissa to examine him. Harry feels hands, "softer than he had been expecting" touching his face, they "pulled back an eyelid, crept beneath his shirt, down to his chest and felt his heart" (581). Narcissa's soft hands and gentle touch are witnesses of a caring mother, and when she asks Harry, "*Is Draco alive? Is he in the castle?*" (581), she proves her motive as a mother, rather than a warrior of Voldemort.

In the novel, Bellatrix was the first in command with Voldemort, however, she had to give up her position when Snape reappeared among the Death Eaters. Her devotion is rewarded with the responsibility over one of the Horcruxes, and she remains superior to most of the Death Eaters when Snape is seated at Hogwarts. However, in the film she is constantly shown as submissive and inferior to Voldemort. In the scene where Voldemort meets his Death Eaters at Malfoy Manor, Bellatrix leans toward Voldemort with a look of longing, while she whispers seductively “My Lord. I’d like to volunteer myself for the task. I want to kill the boy” (HP7 06:06). This scene does not appear in the novel, but there is a description of Bellatrix that coincides with her appearance in the film: “Bellatrix leaned towards Voldemort, for mere words could not demonstrate her longing for closeness” (16). In the film, however, she retreats to her seat crumbling down like a child who has received scolding, when Voldemort tells her that he must kill Harry Potter. She is still vicious in the film, but she is also portrayed much less dangerous and bloodthirsty than in previous films where she is portrayed more like a mad person. Heilman and Donaldson argues that Bellatrix is mocked by Voldemort and that she is not “respected and is only kept because of her faithfulness” (145). In other words, her implied feelings for her master is what keeps her valuable. Bellatrix’s affection for her master emphasises the “naturalised” gender roles of the discourse of the jungle. She devotes her life to serve him, and it is out of fondness for him rather than spirit, she fights his cause.

In stark contrast to Bellatrix and Narcissa is Professor McGonagall, yet her character fulfils the maternal role of Hogwarts.. McGonagall has usually been characterised as a strict, but fair teacher, and on more than one occasion has she fulfilled the maternal role with her students. She cares for them, and it is the very occasions where she acts out of character that makes her so likeable for the reader, and for the students at Hogwarts. Nevertheless, as Heilman and Donaldson reminds us, even though she takes on a leading role in the final battle, in “preceding situations McGonagall would have deferred to a male superior or consulted with her colleagues rather than being decisive on the spot” (143). They exemplify McGonagall’s powerlessness with situations from some of the previous novels, showing how she is “chastised by Dumbledore, who calls her by her first name”, how she is “effectively silenced by men when offering her opinion about what to do next” in HP4. They argue that the “relative powerlessness of the two most masterful women in the series only underscores female weakness” (149). Although I agree with their statements, I would argue that McGonagall is one of the most dynamic characters of the series, and that the examples

Heilman and Donaldson uses can be read as McGonagall knowing her role in the situation, where she is in a debate with the headmaster of the school and a Ministry worker. It is not necessarily her position as a woman, but her position as a teacher that makes her inferior in the precise examples they convey.

Nevertheless, McGonagall's character is interesting in this context by how she is portrayed differently in the novel and in the film. In the novel, she takes on a leading role after she finds Harry in the Ravenclaw tower. She assembles the teachers and start evacuating the school, sending all under-age students out and into safety. She becomes a sort of mother figure, ensuring the safety of the children. In the movie, however, Snape is still leader when Harry confronts him in front of the entire school. When Snape attempts to attack Harry, McGonagall steps forward and fights Snape in Harry's place. When Snape flees, McGonagall stands up and becomes the natural leader. The difference between these two situations is that of McGonagall's position as caring mother figure in the novel, and that of defendant and fighting champion in the film. Also, in the film, McGonagall fails to secure the students. There are several shots of students running around desperately and scared, children screaming and seemingly unaware of where to go. This further emphasises the differences between film character and book character, McGonagall is more caring and maternal in novel than in film. Furthermore, the scene in the film where McGonagall assembles the statues and suits of armour to defend the school, she stands alongside Mrs Weasley, suggesting a united power between the two women. Here, McGonagall seems much more adventurous than in the novel, saying after the statues have marched right pass her, "I've always wanted to use that spell!" (HP8 42:33), looking eager and like she is having fun.

I would argue that there is a distinct difference between the female characters of the film and of the novels. It seems as if the "bad" characters on Voldemort's side is portrayed weaker in the film than in the novel, and the "good" characters fighting for Harry are given much stronger characterisations in the film than in novel. Generally, in the novel, most female characters are less adventurous than the boys are. As we have seen with Hermione especially, the girls are more emotional and more easily scared than the boys tend to be. As Heilman and Donaldson also notes, "At the height of action, females are not typically very involved, and they are always fearful and emotional" (146). In the film, however, the female characters seem to have transformed dramatically, they only cry on occasions where the boys cry as well, they are more knowledgeable than the boys, they are often braver than most of the boys, and they seem to stand up for themselves in ways they have never done in the novels. I will

proceed this section with several examples from the two last films adapting the last novel, and I will examine some major differences between film and novel where the female characters.

On a general note, Hermione's character in the last two films of the series is more wise and clever than in the novels. Although her character is generally portrayed as the smartest and most brilliant, she is mostly just doing her homework and generally working hard to achieve her good grades. She is book smart and nerdy, and when it comes to the real dangers outside of Hogwarts, Harry is the hero, not Hermione. This continues in HP7, but in the films, she is given more of the tasks Harry solves in the novel. One example is when the trio of Harry, Ron and Hermione is trying to escape the wizard bank, Gringotts, after finding a Horcrux in Bellatrix's vault. In the novel, the idea of escaping on the back of the dragon is Harry's: "inspiration, or madness, came to Harry. Pointing his wand at the thick cuffs chaining the beast to the floor he yelled, '*Relashio!*'" (437). Harry "sprinted towards the blind dragon" while Hermione cries "Harry – Harry – what are you doing?" (437). In the film, this happens differently as it is Hermione's idea of using the dragon. In the desperate situation where they are fighting off the Gringotts guards, Ron asks Hermione if she has got a plan, to which Hermione answers, "I've got something, but it's mad!" (HP8 20:16). She then jumps onto the back of the dragon, and while Ron and Harry stands back and looks at her in shock, she screams to them "Well come on, then!" (HP8 20:33). The two different portrayals of Hermione suggest two very different characters. In the novel, Hermione questions Harry's idea, and she seems reluctant of the idea of escaping on the dragon. This is further emphasised, as mentioned, when she is heard sobbing while Ron is swearing "on the top of his voice" (439). The film version of Hermione is the courageous one, and while the boys are hesitating, she encourages them to follow her. She is suddenly taking charge.

Another example where the film version of Hermione does not coincide with the novel version, is when the Horcrux they found in Bellatrix's vault is to be destroyed. As mentioned, when Ron destroyed the first Horcrux this was elaborated in rich detail in the novel, as it is in the film. When it is Hermione's turn, this is mentioned in passing: "Hermione stabbed it. Thought she should. She hasn't had the pleasure yet" (501). In the film, this is made into a scene, where the viewer is taken back to the Chamber of Secrets, we see how Ron gives Hermione the Horcrux, and she stabs it with a Basilisk fang. In the novel there is no description of how the Horcrux fought back, as all the other Horcruxes did, but in the movie this is shown as a wave of water, with Voldemort's screaming face in it, suddenly chases Ron and Hermione (HP8 51:52). Not to mention that this is the first Horcrux Voldemort seems to

notice being destroyed. Earlier, he had no knowledge that Harry was chasing Horcruxes, but after he found out, he starts feeling them vanish. The difference between film and novel here is significant because it shows a very clear distinction between the two Hermione characterisations. One only mentions in passing her brave act, the other makes up its own version of it.

There are several other distinctions between Hermione in film and in novel, as when she suddenly is comfortable on a broomstick even though she rides together with Ron in the novel, and when she understands on her own accord that Harry needs help with Bathilda Bagshot, even though he needs to call on her in the novel. However, these are not as prominent or important, yet they are worth mentioning as they help to build up a very different version of Hermione than both novels and previous films has done. However, other female characters also transform when they appear in the film. When Harry tells the others that he needs to find a historical item from Ravenclaw, which he supposes is the next Horcrux, Luna tells about Ravenclaw's lost diadem. In the novel, Luna tells Harry "Well, there's her lost diadem. I told you about it, remember, Harry? The lost diadem of Ravenclaw?" (470), then she takes Harry to the Ravenclaw common room to show him a replica of the crown. Harry wonders for himself "Who could have told him [Voldemort] where to look, when nobody had seen the diadem in living memory? *In living memory ...*" (492). Thus, Harry resonates for himself that he needs to speak to the Ravenclaw ghost about the diadem. In the film, this reasoning is credited to Luna. She chases Harry while he runs around without a clue of where to look, and when he does not seem to listen to her, she raises her voice and claims respect for herself: "Harry Potter, you listen to me right now!" (43:38), before she explains to him how Cho Chang had mentioned that nobody "alive today had seen the diadem" (needs quote). This scene makes an example of how the male characters in the novel often seem to disregard the females, and that Luna is more reasonable than Harry in this particular situation.

When Harry goes to talk to the Ravenclaw ghost, the Grey Lady, it seems as if the filmmakers have deliberately taken a stand against her objectifying nickname. In the novel, Harry asks "You're the Grey Lady?", to which she "nodded but did not speak" (494). In the film, Harry asks the same question, yet her reply suggests another tone, "I do not answer to that name". Harry excuses himself by saying: "No, I'm sorry, I'm sorry. It's Helena, isn't it? Helena Ravenclaw? Rowena's daughter?" (HP8 45:05). Harry has to make her a subject by identifying her by her real name, and connecting her to her powerful mother. This is very

different from the novel where Harry did not know she was Helena Ravenclaw, “You’re her *daughter?*” (495). Another moment in the film that needs mentioning is Draco Malfoy’s mentioning of using his mother’s wand. He says to Harry that her wand is “powerful, but it’s not the same” (HP8 59:23). In the novel, however, Draco never mentions anything about the wand being powerful. “Who lent you theirs?’ ‘My mother,’ said Draco. Harry laughed” (505). There is a clear difference between acknowledging a powerful wand belonging to Draco’s mother, and laughing at the wand of Draco’s mother.

I believe the filmmakers have deliberately made these distinctions. One could argue that for the sake of good filming, some of these examples have happened on accident to make the story flow more easily. However, I would argue that where the filmmakers have gone to extra length to add scenes that empower women, and adding extra dialogue to avoid objectification, this is not done on accident. Furthermore, it suggests that the filmmakers have also noticed the problematic female portrayals in the novel, and that they wish to do it otherwise in their adaptation. As films often reach a wider crowd than books, they have presumably done this to take a stand against sexist entertainment, albeit on the cost of the story’s original text. However, I would argue that even though this puts emphasis on the novel’s problematic female characterisations, they overdo some of the situations, and it could be read as a token inclusion. This is true especially when considering that this change came with the last films, and has mostly been consistent with the characterisations in the book in previous films. Thus, the change is presumably done deliberately and it makes the transformation seem counterfeit. As I have outlined the problematic representations of females in HP7, and suggested how this novel consists of several sexist elements, I will move on to a discussion on the various species presented. I attempt to show how Rowling concludes her series with a different portrayal of the animal representations she has depicted earlier, and that this could work to resist the prejudiced way they have been presented before.

3.3 The Final Battle

In HP7, as with the most of the other novels, there is a problem with how various species are presented. There are not as much species variety in this novel as in some of the previous I have examined, but the reader is introduced more thoroughly to the goblins, as well as Rowling has carefully interwoven most of the characters met all through the various books,

as a grand finale for the series. Thus, the reader is reminded of everyone before the series completes. With this section, I will look into some of the problematic characterisations of the goblins, and connect them with my previous analysis of the house-elves. I will also examine the portrayal of various species in the final battle in order to analyse how their representations both problematizes and give potential to various forms of advocacy. Some of the previous animal representations I have outlined are presented in the final battle in a manner that gives them potential to destabilize the prejudices they have been subjected to earlier. However, at the same time, the problematic divide between good and evil in the battle situates several animals in negative positions that reinforce a prejudiced way of thinking about both “real” animals and the various ethnic groups of people they represent, which ultimately functions to undermine the potential of the aforementioned animals that are portrayed “better” than previously. First, I will investigate the character of Griphook and attempt to show why his portrayal helps undermine the potential advocacy presented in the final battle.

The goblins run Gringotts, and they are described as vicious. Griphook, Harry notices, is “larger than a house-elf, but not by much”, having “long, thin fingers” and “black eyes”, and “his domed head was much bigger than a humans” (393). In the film, however, Griphook’s vicious nature is further emphasised by his small, pointy teeth and his pointy nails, almost like claws (HP8 03:50). The appearance of the goblins are stereotypical of sinister creatures, and this is a problematic presentation of them since, as Peter Dendle also notes, “that goblins embody many caricatured traits of stereotypical Jews” (165). With this, we can see how the Harry Potter series can function well as exemplifying ecofeminism with the theories of class, gender and race. When considering how the goblins may embody the stereotypical Jew, by how they are long-fingered, have crooked noses, and works in the bank handling money, it is problematic when they are portrayed as someone not to be trusted, and as vicious and selfish creatures. When Harry and the rest of the group arrives at Shell Cottage where Bill and Fleur lives, Bill warns Harry about bargaining with goblins. He points out that “we are talking about a different breed of being”, and “If you have struck any kind of deal with Griphook, and most particularly if that bargain involves treasure, you must be exceptionally careful” (417). Bill explains that goblins have very different “notions of ownership” (417), and that they consider the rightful owner of an object to be the one that made it, not the one that purchased it (418). This builds upon the caricature image of a cheap Jew, and how Jews stereotypically takes care of their own kind to keep business within their own ranks.

Furthermore, the narrative paints a picture of Griphook as completely selfish. He will only help Harry if he is rewarded the sword of Gryffindor in return, as this is goblin-made, and he believes himself to be the rightful owner. When they plan their forced entry at Gringotts, Harry notices how Griphook “was unexpectedly blood-thirsty”, that he “laughed at the idea of pain in lesser creatures” and that he “seemed to relish the possibility that they might have to hurt other wizards” (412). Rowling presumably attempts to nuance the story by including some perspective on the traditional dispute between wizards and goblins, as Hermione explains that “Goblins have got good reason to dislike wizards [...] They’ve been treated brutally in the past” (409). Griphook mentions how “The right to carry a wand [...] has long been contested between wizards and goblins” (395), and when Harry argues that the fight against Voldemort is not about “wizards versus goblins or any other sort of magical creature”, Griphook exclaims “But it is, it is precisely about that! As the Dark Lord becomes ever more powerful, your race is set still more firmly above mine!” (395). This suggests how Rowling attempts to make the reader aware of the hierarchy of races. She seems to suggest that one should take a stand against discrimination when Griphook asks “Gringotts falls under wizarding rule, house-elves are slaughtered, and who among the wand-carriers protests?” (395). Hermione positions herself alongside the situation of Griphook by exclaiming “We protest! And I’m hunted quite as much as any goblin or elf, Griphook! I’m a mudblood” (395). And when Bill warns Harry about bargaining with Griphook, he mentions “There have been faults on both sides, I would never claim that wizards have been innocent” (417). This emphasises how the wizards are aware themselves about the cruelty done to goblins, and it could suggest how Rowling puts emphasis on human’s disrespect for other species in our contemporary world, and how she suggests this represents a real situation. However, as with the giants I discussed in my previous chapter, this is done too simplistic, and the narrative reinforces, rather than undermining, the abuse of other species.

Rowling describes Griphook as cruel and selfish, and she ridicules him when he emphasises the differences between him and the wizards. “The goblin ate only grudgingly with the rest of them. Even after his legs mended he continued to request trays of food in his room, like the still frail Ollivander” (412), and when he is forced to eat with the rest of the group, he “refused to it the same food, insisting, instead, on lumps of raw meat, roots and various fungi” (412). This seems as an attempt to show how difficult Griphook is, and how much trouble the others have to put up with for having him there. However, I read it as wizard ignorance. As Bill emphasised, Griphook is a “different breed of being”, and thus he

presumably would require different food than the wizards. Rowling emphasises how much trouble Griphook makes by requesting food fit for his palate, by showing how “Harry felt responsible: it was after all, he who had insisted that the goblin remain at Shell Cottage so that he could question him” (412). Furthermore, the continuing use of “the goblin”, rather than his name, further suggests an objectifying of Griphook, ranking him lower than the rest of the group. When considering the goblins resemblance to the stereotypical image of a caricatured Jew, the treatment and portrayal of Griphook is problematic. However, even when considering Griphook as a being of another species, the presentation of him is still problematic as it suggests a lower status for him, and that it is okay to treat others of lower status the way the others treat Griphook.

Rowling has been careful to introduce new characters in HP7, it seems as if she wishes to conclude her series by reminding the reader of the other characters introduced in previous novels, and to learn to know these better. However, even though Rowling has spent a lot of time on other kinds of species in her previous novels, it is not until the final battle at Hogwarts the reader is reintroduced to the several species. Here, the species are divided between the evil team of Voldemort, and the good team of Harry. However, the inclusion of species in the final battle seems to be an attempt at reassessing the inferior position they have been subjected to previously. This could signify a resistance of the problematic discourses Rowling has constructed through most of her previous novels. However, I would argue, that the dividing of the species in the last battle makes for a new problematizing situation when several of the species are put onto the “bad” side of Voldemort, and thus is presumed to belong in the “evil” realm. As the last battle signifies the essence of the good and the bad divide, it is problematic how the various species are placed into these two categories. It suggests how the various ethnic groups of humans and nonhuman animals they may represent are still confined within the stereotypical and prejudiced depiction they have been defined by, and that the Harry Potter series functions as means of reinforcing this.

Grawp is helping Harry’s side in the battle, yet all the other giants fight for Voldemort. This suggests that the giants, as allegories for “the black savage”, belongs to the dark side, they are confined within the evil realm of Voldemort. Grawp, however has been taught the language and manners of the white man, and thus he would belong naturally on the “good” side. When Grawp is re-introduced, he is compared to the other giants, “Grawp came lurching round the corner of the castle; only now did Harry realise that Grawp was, indeed, an undersized giant” (520), which further emphasises Grawp’s connection with humans and

distance from the rest of his species. While Grawp's attempts to help Harry and the rest are clumsily and naive, the other giants are characterised as brutal in their fighting, "The gargantuan monster trying to crush people on the upper floors looked around and let out a roar" (520). This further distances Grawp from his species, and simultaneously emphasises the violence of giants. In the film, Grawp is omitted and only the "bad" giants are shown briefly as they run towards the castle and knock out the statues of Hogwarts. These are difficult to distinguish from the troll that appeared in the first film, *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone* (2001), as their appearances are much alike. This establishes the giants as a unit while Grawp is an individual, due to Grawp's human features in the film adaptation of HP5.

Besides the transparent divide between Grawp and the other giants, Grawp nevertheless represents the prejudice of "black savages" along with the other giants, and when he helps on Harry's side in the battle, the narrative establishes Grawp as a "good" character. Presumably, this is done in order for the reader to re-evaluate the negative representations made previously by the other giants. However, as I will attempt to show below, this rather makes for an unfortunate exclusion of other species and, although it supposedly is well intentioned, it ends up signalling more prejudice rather than openness.

Other animals that show up in the battle are the descendants of the giant spider, Aragog from HP2. The giant spiders have been friends of Hagrid up until the death of Aragog in HP6, and supposedly, after this they decided to join the side of Voldemort. Even though the giant spiders show a malignant nature towards Harry and Ron in HP2, their friendship with Hagrid suggests a capacity for cooperation and co-existence with humans, which destabilises the assumption of spiders as menacing. Thus, when they suddenly follow Voldemort's lead, this resituates the spiders as "bad" and evil. Furthermore, they attack Hagrid; "Hagrid vanished amongst the spiders, and with a great scurrying, a foul swarming movement, they retreated under the onslaught of spells, Hagrid buried in their midst", and moments later "the spiders were swarming away with their prey" (520). In other words, Hagrid is not friend of the spiders anymore; instead, he has become their prey. This establishes the giant spiders as treacherous and evil, and when reading them as a construction of "real" animals, this is problematic in how they are "naturalised" as violent.

Dementors are also fighting for Voldemort, as they have been under his command the past three novels. The Dementors are signified as mass-objects, they rarely appear single-handedly, and as they enter the battle, they are "swirling figures of concentrated blackness,

moving in a great wave towards the castle” (521). The Dementors function as manifestations of evil and, as I argued in chapter one, as representations of the animal mind. Their participation in the battle thus “naturalises” the instinctual violence of animals as opposed to that of humans. Another species with some similarities to the Dementors are the Thestrals. They are also associated with death and their appearance suggests that of a stereotypically evil creature. However, the Thestrals have been bred by Hagrid, and have been studied in his class, Care for Magical Creatures, and they have been helping Harry and his friends several times earlier. Thus, they are already established as “good”, and function as means of destabilising the negative prejudices of animals made by Dementors and the giant spiders. The Thestrals, along with the Hippogriffs, provide urgent need in the fight, and they prove themselves effective in fighting the giants: “Harry saw great winged creatures soaring around the heads of Voldemort’s giants, Thestrals and Buckbeak the Hippogriff scratching at their eyes” (587-588).

Another species coming to the “good” side’s aid are the centaurs. During the battle of Hogwarts, Rowling emphasises the inclusion of Firenze; “Behind her [McGonagall] stood the remaining teachers, including the palomino centaur, Firenze” (489). Firenze joins as one of the teachers, but the other centaurs are absent at first. This further constructs, as I discussed in chapter two, their image as the noble savage, removed from society and concerned with themselves. When Harry pretends to be dead and Hagrid carries him back to the castle, Hagrid suddenly bellows, “BANE! [...] Happy now, are yeh, that yeh didn’t fight, yeh cowardly bunch o’ nags?” (583), and “Harry wondered how many centaurs were watching their procession pass” (583). Thus, the centaurs did not fight up until then, neither for Harry nor Voldemort. Yet for some reason not told, the centaurs decide to fight against Voldemort, presumably because they realised that their position would not improve with Voldemort’s reign. Harry hears the sound of “hooves, and the twangs of bows, and arrows were suddenly falling among the Death Eaters” (587) and the “centaurs Bane, Ronan and Magorian burst into the Hall” (588). At least, the centaurs fight for the “good” side, and thus are portrayed “better” than the giants, yet the fact that they needed scolding from Hagrid and they waited until the very last moment to join suggest how they were relentless of fighting at all. As Rana also notes, “Even though the centaurs come to the wizards’ and witches’ help in the final novel when they break into the castle to fight Voldemort alongside the humans, the overall image of their aggression and barbarism remains” (56).

Along with the centaurs, the “house-elves of Hogwarts swarmed into the Entrance Hall, screaming and waving carving knives and cleavers” (588). “They were hacking and stabbing at the ankles and shins of Death Eaters, their tiny faces alive with malice” (588), which suggest the inferior position of the elves. We know from earlier that the elves possess another kind of magic than the wizards, as when Dobby rescued Harry and the others from Malfoy Manor, thus the “hacking and stabbing” with knives places the elves in an inferior position where they turn to another kind of direct violence than the others. As Peter Dendle also questions, “Why malice? Neville, Harry, McGonagall, and many others all fight in the same battle: are they too beings of malice?” (168). Considering the problematic portrayal of the house-elves as that of black slaves, as I explored in my previous chapter, their participation in the battle as violent and malignant creatures poses an unflattering image of the group as a whole. Along with this, Kreacher leads the crowd of elves, screaming “Fight! Fight! Fight for my master, defender of house-elves” (588). This shows how the elf has transformed drastically throughout the plot, from treacherous slave of Sirius, to abiding server of Harry. As Rana also notes, when “Harry starts to feel sorry for the elf and treats him with respect, the change in Kreacher’s behaviour is remarkable” (44), she refers to how Kreacher starts cleaning the house, cooking food and behaves nice and pleasant, even with Hermione who he earlier constantly called a “mudblood”. Rana argues, “His behaviour underlines the idea that house-elves need a master to look up to and to serve in order to bring out the best of them. The nicer the master is to them, the more obediently they will serve him” (44). In other words, Kreacher only fights in the battle in servitude of his master, he does not fight for his own benefit or own rights. When he exclaims that Harry is the “defender of house-elves”, he refers to the simple act of kindness Harry has shown Kreacher. This kindness is also quite recent, as he earlier yells at him and mistreats him for betraying Sirius. Thus, the rest of the house-elves are presumably fighting out of servitude to their master as they belong to Hogwarts. Dendle remarks how this is “reminiscent in some respects of African Americans who fought for the Confederacy during the Civil War” (174), which further emphasises the resemblance between house-elves and black slaves.

As mentioned, the film adaptation has omitted the participation of other species, except for the brief shot of the giants and spiders, in the battle of Hogwarts; this could suggest an awareness with the filmmakers of the racial implications these scenes may impose, as I suggested in my previous chapter with the omitting of the giants. Although, when considering the liberty they have taken with the female characters, it seems unnecessary to omit the other

species. As the last two films are adapted from one novel, the filmmakers have had more space to work with on this novel than previous ones, thus they would presumably have had the space to include the house-elves and the centaurs in the last battle, and portrayed them in a better light than the novel. Thus, it seems as if by prioritizing female advocacy, the filmmakers did not have place or time for advocating for other oppressed groups. This is problematic in the sense that the films reach a much wider audience than the novels, and by deliberately empowering women and thus omitting other species, they send a message of exclusion. In other words, we can only advocate and care for one group at a time, right now we prioritize women. This both excludes all others and at the same time minimalizes women by making them a token inclusion.

When the various species appear in the last battle, they seem to be portrayed differently, and more nuanced, than earlier. The centaurs decide to join the fight despite their previous reluctance against wizarding affairs, and even though Hagrid had to yell at them before they reacted, their help was important in order to win against the Death Eaters. This suggests an inclusion of the centaurs into the community of the wizards, which signifies an openness towards other cultures and ethnicities. This also applies for the house-elves, which is signified in the text after Harry's victory over Voldemort and everybody is sitting in the Great Hall, "all were jumbled together, teachers and pupils, ghosts and parents, centaurs and house-elves, and Firenze lay recovering in a corner, and Grawp peered in through a smashed window" (597). This paints a harmonic picture of inclusion and integrity of every animals and humans fighting for the "good" side in the battle, and it seems as if this is meant to promote openness and understanding instead of segregation. The narrative even includes the Malfoys; Harry walks among the people in the Great Hall, and "he spotted the three Malfoys, huddled together as though unsure whether or not they were supposed to be there" (597). Presumably, this is done to show the duality in the characters that it is possible to appreciate the "good" side even if you have been integrated with the "bad" people. Most of the other Death Eaters fled the battle as soon as they realised Harry was not dead, while Mr and Mrs Malfoy was searching for Draco in the battle. As Draco has been Harry's nemesis at school, it is symbolic that they manage to co-exist after the battle. This suggests that once the evil of Voldemort vanishes, the general good in people unites despite their differences.

The problem with this, however, is the exclusion of the species fighting for Voldemort in the battle. By excluding them from the reuniting in the Great Hall, Rowling ultimately categorises them as intrinsically "bad". The rejection towards other species, and thus the

ethnic groups and representations of “real” animals they resemble, undermines the positive image of inclusion. This constructs a hierarchy of inclusion, which eventually reinforces the negative ways constructions of how animality represent race, gender and nonhuman species. Along with the rejection of “bad” species, the blatant sexism of HP7 overshadows the humble attempt at integrating the centaurs, house-elves and Grawp into the society of wizards. When reading the centaurs as the noble savage, or Native Americans, the house-elves as representing African Americans, and the giants as savages, the text presumably attempts to make the reader reassess their objectivity when including them in a positive manner. Thus, when considering the spiders, Dementors, Thestrals and Hippogriffs as representing “real” nonhuman animals, Rowling reinforces the objectivity of these when they are excluded from the Great Hall, even if they fought for the “good” side. In other words, those species blatantly representing human ethnic groups are included and integrated, but the animals representing “mere” nonhuman animals are further undermined and thus excluded. This could suggest how Rowling has become aware of the problematic portrayals of race she has evoked earlier, however, it does not justify the sexism and exclusion of nonhuman species, and it is done too simplistic.

What I have attempted to show with this chapter is how ecofeminism connects the theory from race, class and gender studies with that of nature. This is relevant to how various constructions of animality represents different human ethnic groups and ways to think about “real” animals, and how this is constructed through the discourse of the jungle as “naturalising” oppression of nonhuman animals and ethnic others. The oppression of women is naturalised through the discourse of the jungle by evolutionary logic: women should stay at home and be caring mothers, while men do the important work of fighting and providing for their families. This logic is reinforced in the final battle at Hogwarts when the female characters mostly are portrayed as fighting for their children, not for the greater cause, as I exemplified with Molly Weasley and Narcissa Malfoy. As I have discussed in previous chapters, the discourse of the jungle naturalises violence and heterosexuality as well as gender roles, and I have attempted to prove this through constructions of animality as undermining both human ethnic groups and nonhuman animals. This is problematic, as the text continues to prejudice and undermine females, animals, and ethnic minority groups, and thus sends a message of sexism, racism and anthropocentrism as being necessarily stabilised and unchallenged.

4 Epilogue

All of these examples I have looked into, Cartesian dualism, the discourse of the jungle, ecofeminism, they all function to exemplify how the anthropocentric mind set we apply today works in different ways to undermine not just animals and the environment, but also certain groups of people. Why I have linked it with *Harry Potter* is because it proves how we unconsciously have employed this notion, as HP is one of the biggest successes in literature we have ever seen. This, as I have suggested, is because of the comfortable stereotypes Rowling employs, and because we recognize all the sub-meanings and caricatures she herself probably unconsciously provides. Arguably, Rowling attempts to advocate for multicultural inclusion and integration when she introduces other wizarding cultures in HP4, during both the Quidditch World Cup and the Triwizard Tournament. The names of Padma and Parvati Patil, and Cho Chang suggest a multicultural society within Hogwarts, along with the description of both Dean Thomas and Angelina Johnson as black. Rowling has presumably attempted to convey strong female characters, as well, as several critics applaud Rowling for her depiction of Hermione as the cleverest and brightest of the school. In addition to this, Hermione's campaign for liberation of the house-elves reads for some, as an important message of believing in the possibility for change, and standing up against mistreatment of others.

However, as I have attempted to display, the strong analogy of the house-elves with African American slaves, the "naturalised" stereotypes of gender roles, and the problematic representations of animalised Others all undermine Rowling's humble attempts, and ultimately function to reinforce the stereotypes, rather than resist them. This proves how much our society, represented by Rowling, have adapted these discourses and how easily they infiltrate our popular culture. Rowling's attempts are presumably well intentioned, but they nevertheless provide good examples of why animality studies should be combined with other kinds of cultural or literature studies, as it enables us to say something about how representations of animality can reflect back to our own contemporary society and depict the challenges we need to work on. Some might argue that by presenting the various species differently in the last novel, Rowling has become aware herself of the problematic portrayals she was constructing, but as I have attempted to demonstrate, the negative connotations with the caricatured Jew conveyed through Griphook and the other goblins function to ultimately undermine this potential.

As I have suggested, it seems as if the filmmakers have been aware of the problematic constructions of animality in the Harry Potter series, and that they have attempted to minimize the damages by portraying both species and female characters differently in the film adaptations than in the novels. I suggest that this emphasises my arguments and that it signals a move towards recognising problematic representations of groups of people in popular media.

I have only scratched the surface of the massive field of animality studies, and what I have looked into reflects only a small portion of what remains to be studied. As I have attempted to open up for a discussion on how anthropocentric thinking actually can discriminate against other human beings by the animalisation of other ethnic human groups, it would be interesting to look at other aspects of anthropocentric thinking with more potential of resisting stereotypes. I have attempted to provide an understanding of anthropocentrism as problematic when portrayed *too* concerned with human interests, and I have attempted to show why I believe this has been the case in most of human history. In my view, too much of an anthropocentric thinking would “justify” the discrimination of other groups of people by animalising them, and thus remove them from humanity. From an eco-critic or animal studies perspective this seems counterproductive, as humans in fact are animals, and by not acknowledging this one risk neglecting human beings dependence on the environment around us, including other species.

I would therefore suggest, that with a wider knowledge and understanding of this amongst more human beings, anthropocentrism would not suggest the narrow-minded human interest it could do today. Rather it would suggest a concern for everything and everyone around us as our species survival depends on the well-being of the natural environment around us. With this in mind, it would be interesting to explore other texts, as well as Harry Potter, to try and detect a growing awareness of this notion, and suggest a new and different definition of anthropocentrism than I have suggested in here, but that goes beyond the scope of this thesis.

I hope to have opened the door for new and interesting ways to think about constructions of animality in relation to the definition of anthropocentrism I have presented, and I hope this can inspire to other works along the lines I have suggested.

Works Cited

- Anatol, Giselle Liza. "The Fallen Empire: Exploring Ethnic Otherness in the World of Harry Potter". *Reading Harry Potter: Critical Essays*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger. 2003. Print.
- Armstrong, Philip. "The Gaze of Animals". *Theorizing Animals: Re-thinking Humanimal Relations*. Ed. Signal, Tania and Taylor, Nik. Leiden: Brill. 2011. Print.
- Calarco, Matthew and Peter Atterton. "Editor's Introduction: The Animal Question in Continental Philosophy". Introduction. *Animal Philosophy: Essential Readings in Continental Thought*. Ed. Matthew Calarco and Peter Atterton. London: Continuum. 2004. Print.
- Ciaccio, Peter. "Harry Potter and Christian Theology". *Critical Perspectives on Harry Potter*. Ed Elizabeth E. Heilman. London: Routledge. 2nd ed. 2009. Print.
- Chappell, Drew. "Sneaking Out After Dark: Resistance, Agency, and the Postmodern Child in J.K. Rowling's Harry Potter Series". *Children's Literature in Education* 39 (2008): 281–293. *Springer Science+Business Media*. Web. 25 March 2015.
- Cothran, Casey. "Lessons in Transfiguration: Allegories of Male Identity in Rowling's Harry Potter series". *Scholarly Studies in Harry Potter: Applying Academic Methods to a Popular Text*. Ed Cynthia Whitney Hallett. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press. 2005. Print.
- Cuomo, Chris J. *Feminism and Ecological Communities: An Ethic of Flourishing*. London: Routledge. 1998. Print.
- Curry, Patrick. *Ecological Ethics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Polity Press. 2011. Print.
- De Waal, Frans. *Good Natured*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard UP. 1996. Print.
- Derrida, Jacques. *The Animal That Therefore I Am*. 1997. Ed. Marie-Louise Mallet. Trans. David Wills. New York: Fordham UP. 2008. Print.
- Dendle, Peter. "Monsters, Creatures, and Pets at Hogwarts: Animal Stewardship in the World of Harry Potter". *Critical Perspectives on Harry Potter*. Ed Elizabeth E. Heilman. London: Routledge. 2nd ed. 2009. Print.
- Donaldson, Trevor and Elizabeth E. Heilman. "From Sexist to (Sort-Of) Feminist: Representations of Gender in the Harry Potter Series". *Critical Perspectives on Harry Potter*. Ed Elizabeth E. Heilman. London: Routledge. 2nd ed. 2009. Print.

- Foucault, Michel. *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. 1967. London: Routledge. 1989. Print.
- Green, Amy M. "Interior/Exterior in the Harry Potter Series: Duality Expressed in Sirius Black and Remus Lupin." *Papers on Language & Literature* 44.1 (2008): n-pag. *Literature Resource Center*. Web. 4 May 2015.
- Gupta, Suman. *Re-reading Harry Potter*. 2nd edition. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 2009. Print.
- Haraway, Donna J. *When Species Meet*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 2008. Print.
- Heilman, Elizabeth E. "Introduction: Fostering Insight Through Multiple Critical Perspectives". Introduction. *Critical Perspectives on Harry Potter*. Ed Elizabeth E. Heilman. London: Routledge. 2nd ed. 2009. Print.
- Hurn, Samantha. *Humans and Other Animals: Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Human-Animal Interactions*. London: PlutoPress. 2012. Print.
- Lundblad, Michael. *The Birth of a Jungle: Animality in Progressive-Era U.S. Literature and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 2013. Print.
- Natov, Roni. "Harry Potter and the Extraordinariness of the Ordinary". *The Ivory Tower and Harry Potter: Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon*. Ed Lana A. Whited. Columbia: University of Missouri Press. 2002. EBSCO E-book. Web. 25 March 2015.
- Palmer, Clare. "Madness and Animality in Michel Foucault's *Madness and Civilization*". *Animal Philosophy: ethics and identity*. Ed Atterton, Peter and Calarco, Matthew. London: Continuum. 2004. Print.
- Plumwood, Val. *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature*. 1993. London: Routledge. 1997. Print.
- Rana, Marion. *Creating Magical Worlds: Otherness and Othering in Harry Potter*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. 2009. Print.
- Rowling, J.K. *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*. 1997. London: Bloomsbury. 2010. Print.
- --. *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*. 1998. London: Bloomsbury. 2010. Print.
- --. *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*. 1999. London: Bloomsbury. 2010. Print.
- --. *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire*. 2000. London: Bloomsbury. 2010. Print.

- --. *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*. 2003. London: Bloomsbury. 2010. Print.
- --. *Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince*. 2005. London: Bloomsbury. 2010. Print.
- --. *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*. 2007. London: Bloomsbury. 2010. Print.
- Sandilands, Catriona. *The Good-Natured Feminist: Ecofeminism and the Quest for Democracy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1999. Print.
- Sorabji, Richard. *Animal Minds and Human Morals: The Origins of the Western Debate*. New York: Cornell UP. 1993. Print.
- Taylor, Nik. "Introduction". *Theorizing Animals: Re-thinking Humanimal Relations*. Ed. Signal, Tania and Taylor, Nik. Leiden: Brill. 2011. Print.
- Thompson, Kirrilly. "Theorising Rider-Horse Relations: An Ethnographic Illustration of the Centaur Metaphor in the Spanish Bullfight". *Theorizing Animals: Re-thinking Humanimal Relations*. Ed Tania Signal and Nik Taylor. Leiden: Brill. 2011. Print.
- Yates, David. Dir. *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*. Screenplay by Michael Goldenberg. Perf. Daniel Radcliffe, Rupert Grint, and Emma Watson. Warner Bros. 2007. Film.
- --. *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows: Part One*. Screenplay by Steve Kloves. Perf. Daniel Radcliffe, Rupert Grint, and Emma Watson. Warner Bros. 2010. Film.
- --. *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows: Part Two*. Screenplay by Steve Kloves. Perf. Daniel Radcliffe, Rupert Grint, and Emma Watson. Warner Bros. 2011. Film.
- Westman, Karin E. "Spectres of Thatcherism: Contemporary British Culture in J.K. Rowling's Harry Potter Series". *The Ivory Tower and Harry Potter: Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon*. Ed Lana A. Whited. Columbia: University of Missouri Press. 2002. EBSCO E-book. Web. 25 March 2015.