Jumana Mussa

Becoming animal – becoming posthuman: Of hybridity and mutability of characters in Terry Pratchett's fiction

Stawanie się zwierzęciem – stawanie się post-człowiekiem: O hybrydowości i zmienności postaci w prozie Terry Pratchetta

Rozprawa doktorska napisana
na Wydziale Anglistyki
Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu
pod kierunkiem prof. UAM dr hab. Pawła Stachury

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Paweł Stachura, for his guidance, encouragement and patience, throughout the writing of my dissertation.

I am also grateful for my family's unconditional love, support and (again) patience, while I have been perusing my education. I am especially thankful to my mother, for her unwavering love and devotion throughout my entire life. Her belief in me continues to serve as a source of motivation as I trudge (and at times stumble) forward.

Finally, I would like to thank everyone who has supported and inspired my academic journey, both directly and indirectly; from lecturers, to co-workers, to friends and family, I am grateful to everyone who has helped "shape" me, and who has helped me grow.

OŚWIADCZENIE

Ja, niżej podpisany/a

Jumana Mussa

przedkładam rozprawę doktorską

pt. Becoming animal – becoming posthuman: Of hybridity and mutability of characters in Terry Pratchett's fiction
Stawanie się zwierzęciem – stawanie się post-człowiekiem: O hybrydowości i zmienności postaci w prozie Terry Pratchetta

na Uniwersytecie im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu

i oświadczam,

że napisałem/am ją samodzielnie.

Oznacza to, że przy pisaniu pracy, poza niezbędnymi konsultacjami, nie korzystałem/am z pomocy innych osób, a w szczególności nie zlecałem/am opracowania rozprawy lub jej istotnych części innym osobom, ani nie odpisywałem/am tej rozprawy lub jej istotnych części od innych osób.

Jednocześnie przyjmuję do wiadomości, że gdyby powyższe oświadczenie okazało się nieprawdziwe, decyzja o wydaniu mi dyplomu zostanie cofnięta.

Poznań, 10.03.2023

(miejscowość, data) (czytelny podpis)

Table of contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....IV

LIST OF FIGURES.....VI

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....1

INTRODUCTION

PRATCHETT, SHAPE-SHIFTING AND BODY IDENTITY: A LITERATURE REVIEW.....2

CHAPTER 1 : PRATCHETT, BODIES AND IDENTITY.....11

1.1. Pratchett's shape-shifters and postmodern concepts of subjectivity, identity and monstrosity.....15

1.1.1. Aspects of femininity and monstrous identities.....16

1.1.2. The grotesque and the carnivalesque.....25

1.1.3. Carnival as subversion of order and expression of discontent.....27

1.1.4. Gilles Deleuze: difference, rhizome and becoming.....31

1.1.5. Becoming post-human.....41

CHAPTER 2 : PRATCHETT IN CONTEXT: AN OVERVIEW OF FOLKLORE AND CONTEMPORARY FANTASY SHAPE-SHIFTERS.....46

2.1. Folk and fairy-tale shape-shifters.....46

2.1.1. Animal spouses.....52

2.1.2. Hidden beauty, hidden self: A Cinderella transformation.....57

2.1.3. Werewolves: The classic shape-shifters.....61

2.2. NOTABLE CONTEMPORARY FANTASY SHAPE-SHIFTERS AND THEIR FOLKLORIC INFLUENCES........65
2.2.1. J.R.R. Tolkien: The mountain and the river........67
2.2.2. Martin and Sapkowski: The weight of "reality" in a fantasy setting........70
2.2.3. Diana Wynne Jones: Sophie Hatter – an old soul in a young body........76
2.2.4. Rowling's shape-shifters: Werewolves and animagi........78
2.2.5. Angela Carter: Beastly beauties........89

CHAPTER 3 : DISCWORLD SHAPE-SHIFTERS. NOTABLE ANIMAL-HUMAN TRANSFORMATIONS ON THE DISC........96

3.1. THE DISCWORLD SERIES: THE NON-HUMAN AND THE POST-HUMAN........96
3.1.1. Discworld races and othering........98
3.1.2. Building oneself: The Igor clan........101
3.2. BECOMING ANIMAL: "TRADITIONAL" DISCWORLD SHAPE-SHIFTERS........104
3.2.1. Becoming ape – becoming oneself: The librarian........104
3.2.2. The werewolves of the Discworld: A being in-between........108
3.2.3. Becoming wolf, becoming woman: Angua von Überwald........112
3.2.4. Of dogs and (wo)men: Angua, Gaspode, and the "Pack" of dogs........119
3.3. BECOMING (HU)MAN: GREEBO AND OTHER ANIMAL SHAPE-SHIFTERS........128
3.3.1. Of wild cats and domesticity........129
3.3.2. Greebo in boots: A hybrid existence of a cat-man........131
3.3.3. Wolf in man's clothing: Lilith's animal shape-shifters........136
3.4. BECOMING MULTIPLICITY: GRANNY WEATHERWAX........151
3.4.1. On reflections and other grannies........153
3.4.2. Borrowing others, being oneself........162
3.4.3. Consuming self: from vampirization to weatherwaxation........169
3.4.4. Life in death: Granny's corporeal demise........171

CONCLUSION........175

ABSTRACT........184

STRESZCZENIE........186

REFERENCES........188

List of figures

Fig. 1. Paul Kidby, Great A'Tuin – (The Art of Discworld)...................................9
Fig. 2. Paul Friedrich Meyerheim, The Frog Prince (1889)............................52
Fig 3. Wolf-Boy, the Nuremberg Chronicles, 1493...64

List of abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used for the books' names in parenthetical citations. Full citations can be found in the works cited page:

CJ	*Carpe jugulum*
LL	*Lords and ladies*
J	*Jingo*
M	*Maskerade*
MP	*Moving pictures*
NW	*Night watch*
RM	*Reaper man*
S	*Sourcery*
TFE	*The fifth elephant*
TR	*Turtle recall: The discworld companion… so far*
TSC	*The shepherd's crown*
TSOD2	*The science of Discworld II: The Globe*
UA	*Unseen academicals*
WA	*Witches abroad*
WS	*Wyrd sisters*

Introduction
Pratchett, shape-shifting and body identity: A literature review

"I just make it up in my head; it's up to you buggers in the universities to tell me what it means." (Pratchett, quoted in Butler 2001: 5

Terry Pratchett's bibliography is not limited to the Discworld series, although it might seem that this is the case, given the extensive amount of published material related to said series. Following a career as a journalist, his first published novel was the children's story *The carpet people* (1971), followed by two adult novels titled *The dark side of the sun* (1976) and *Strata* (1981) respectively. Already in his early science fiction, Pratchett included a philosophical fable about the possibility of goodness and evil in nature, anticipating the comical and fantastic, yet deeply philosophical and ironic imagery of the Discworld novels (Clark 2004: 190-1)[1]. Even after embarking on writing the Discworld series in 1983, with the debut novel *The colour of magic*, Pratchett still managed to write other works such as The Nome Trilogy – starting with *Truckers* (1988) and the Johnny Maxwell trilogy starting with *Only you can save mankind* (1993). Most famously, he collaborated with friend and prolific author Neil Gaiman on the award-winning novel *Good omens* (1990), and with fellow science fiction author Stephen Baxter on a parallel earth series starting with the novel *The long Earth* (2012). Giving a detailed inventory of every book, essay and short story that Pratchett published would be somewhat irrelevant to (and distracting from) the purposes of this paper. Some

[1]The fable in *The dark side of the sun* is about an engineer who creates an artificial fly and an artifical spider, who painfully dismantles the fly when it enters the spider's web. The narrative raises the theodicy question of why would anyone create such a cruel mechanism, and whether it is an evil one etc.

of his noteworthy publications, however, include amongst their ranks the children's novel *Nation* (2008), and the collections of short fiction *A blink in the screen* (2012), and *A slip of the keyboard* (2014). Upon his passing in 2015, Pratchett's writing career came to an end that even a struggle with Alzheimer's disease had not managed to curtail. According to his assistant, Rob Wilkins, who gave an interview to the BBC upon the posthumous release of Pratchett's final Discworld novel – *The shepherd's crown* (2015), at the time of his passing, Pratchett had numerous unfinished pieces of writing, including 10 titles that Wilkins knew of and fragments of other works as well. However, due to Pratchett's request that all unfinished work be destroyed (by a steamroller) upon his death, Wilkins destroyed Pratchett's hard drive in a public event during the Great Dorset Steam Fair in 2017 (yes – using a steamroller). After Pratchett's death, a number of tributes from fans, book reviewers (Brown 2015; Priest 2015; Priest 2022), and scholars (Croft 20105, Simpson 2015) confirmed his eminent position in British literature.

Suffice it to say, however, that Terry Pratchett's most well-known work is the Discworld series, which spans over forty-one novels, in addition to several companion books such as the Science of Discworld series, and *The folklore of Discworld* (2008), co-written by Jacqueline Simpson. The novels contain elements of mythology, folklore, philosophy, and pop culture, neatly wrapped up in parody, humor, and pastiche, with a healthy dose of farce thrown in for good measure. In her introduction to the book, Simpson states that while folklore is by nature mutable and ever-evolving, for example with the blending of new folkloric elements devised via twenty-first-century film, comics or TV, etc.; the Discworld's folklore is much more stable.

> New symbols sometimes arise - the black ribbon recently adopted by reformed vampires, for instance (its Earthly parallel was the blue ribbon of Victorian teetotallers), and the commemorative spray of lilac which Vimes and some others in Ankh-Morpork wear on one day of the year, as explained in *Night watch* - but nothing ever seems to be discarded and forgotten. This makes the Discworld a wonderful place in which to rediscover the solidity, the depth that tradition brings to a society, and learn to cherish it. (Pratchett and Simpson 2008: xiv)

In their introduction to *Discworld and the disciplines: Critical approaches to the Terry Pratchett books*, Alton and Spruiell describe the Discworld books as "inherently multidisciplinary", going on to state that his "tendency to invoke multiple disciplines

surfaces frequently throughout his novels, both in terms of their foci – ranging from rock music to religion to economics to sports to geography to mythology to politics, to name but a few – and in the way Pratchett uses humorous paratextual devices such as foot-notes to achieve a number of ends" (Alton and Spruiell 2014: 4-5). These ends can range from comments on language to information about different kinds of groups, individuals, urban and Unseen University politics, food, and geography to name a few. In a review of this book, Bülgözdi (2016) comments on the difficulty, if not impossibility, of "disciplining" (469) Terry Pratchett's work, as the author himself engaged in a playful appropriation of critical disciplines, by subjecting them to parody in a way that seems pre-emptive.

While some may be tempted to take these stories and Pratchett's approach in them at face value, as mere works of comedic fantasy, containing "obvious" elements of folklore, hidden references and word-play, meant only to entertain, with no added value; the themes, characters, and conflicts that can be found throughout these novels speak of something much deeper than that. The integration of folkloric elements in these books may give off the impression of "common knowledge", and hence redundancy to some. However, as Pratchett says, the "Discworld series, which on many occasions borrows from folklore and mythology, twisting and tangling it on the way, must be the most annotated series of modern books in existence. And one thing I have learned is this: not many people know the things which everyone knows" (Pratchett and Simpson 2008: x). Through his works that reflect real-life dilemmas, questions regarding life and death, religion, and politics, Pratchett presents a somewhat comprehensive analysis of human nature and humanity as a whole. This is why Pratchett can be included in a list of authors who nobilitated fantasy, and facilitated its entry into classroom reading, and general mainstream reading, as "metaphor for the human condition – ripe with mythic structures, heroic cycles, and social and religious commentary" (Thomas 2003: 60).

According to Alton and Spruiell, "Pratchett marries entertaining prose with a kind of edgy humorous insight into the human condition that, in an area other than fantasy, would be regarded as high art – indeed, in many ways he could be regarded as the Chaucer of our time" (Alton and Spruiell 8). This "stigma" on fantasy, and on "popular" fantasy at that might relegate Pratchett to the background of scholarly interests. However, Pratchett's writing with its deeply philosophical and humanistic

nature holds a mirror up to humanity. The importance of Pratchett's fiction as social commentary is epitomized by a quotation from Pratchett in a non-fictional, political document on poverty and welfare in Britain, Neal Lawson's report to the All Party Parliamentary Group on Poverty (2017), mentioned by Barry Knight in his book on social policy (Knight 2017: 64).

Pratchett, as a writer, epitomizes what Hunt refers to in *Alternative worlds in fantasy fiction* when stating that "the way in which fantasy is deeply and inevitably embedded in some kind of 'realism' - bearing in mind that what exactly constitutes realism is infinitely difficult" (Hunt and Lenz 2005: 114). Fantasy has long been described as a mirror of reality, a genre through which (with the aid of defamiliarization) we are able to deal with intangible ideas, or ones that are hard for us to face head-on. In his introduction to *Smoke and mirrors: short fictions and illustrations*, Neil Gaiman writes:

> Stories are, in one way or another, mirrors. We use them to explain to ourselves how the world works or how it doesn't work. Like mirrors, stories prepare us for the day to come. They distract us from the things in the darkness.
>
> Fantasy — and all fiction is fantasy of one kind or another — is a mirror. A distorting mirror, to be sure, and a concealing mirror, set at forty-five degrees to reality, but it's a mirror nonetheless, which we can use to tell ourselves things we might not otherwise see. (Fairy tales, as G. K. Chesterton once said, are more than true. Not because they tell us that dragons exist, but because they tell us that dragons can be defeated.) (Gaiman 2013: 2)

Gaiman, who shared much of Pratchett's approaches to life, fantasy and humor, had a personal and professional relationship with him. As previously stated, together they co-authored the novel *Good omens* (1990), which, cheekily, yet deeply, raised questions regarding faith, friendship and human relations, focusing on a longstanding friendship between an angel and a demon set against the backdrop of an impending Armageddon. The novel has been descirbed as a "comic corrective" to the Biblical apocalypse, or more likely to the popular fascination with doomsday narratives: "the novel shifts its focus from the spectacle of horror to the absurdity of prophecy" (Clemons 2017: 86). For all its fantastic imagery, Pratchett's fiction is imbued with a crisp, unforgiving common sense, a down-to-earth scepticism, a never ending appeal to very basic kindness and unselfishness.

Such appeal is often frustrated, which results in its dark mirror images, the anger and dissilusionment. In the foreword to Terry Pratchett's book *A slip of the keyboard*, which was published posthumously, Gaiman writes:

> There is a fury to Terry Pratchett's writing. It's the fury that was the engine that powered Discworld, and you will discover it here: it's the anger at the headmaster who would decide that six-year-old Terry Pratchett would never be smart enough for the eleven-plus, anger at pompous critics, and at those who think that serious is the opposite of funny, anger at his early American publishers who could not bring his books out successfully.
>
> The anger is always there, an engine that drives. By the time this book enters its final act, and Terry learns he has a rare, early-onset form of Alzheimer's, the targets of his fury change: now he is angry with his brain and his genetics and, more than these, furious at a country that will not permit him (or others in a similarly intolerable situation) to choose the manner and the time of their passing.
>
> And that anger, it seems to me, is about Terry's underlying sense of what is fair and what is not. It is that sense of fairness that underlies Terry's work and his writing […]. (Gaiman 2015: xv – xvi)

So, as Gaiman states, while Pratchett's writings give off the impression of jolly humor, they harbor a sense of anger, whether it be directed at his own physical failings, society or the universe as a whole. The anger stemming from Pratchett's quest for "fairness" can be seen in many of the veiled jokes and anecdotes found throughout his writings. Gaiman continues:

> The authorial voice in these essays is always Terry's: genial, informed, sensible, dryly amused. I suppose that, if you look quickly and are not paying attention, you might, perhaps, mistake it for jolly.
>
> But beneath any jollity, there is a foundation of fury. Terry Pratchett is not one to go gentle into any night, good or otherwise. He will rage, as he leaves, against so many things: stupidity, injustice, human foolishness and shortsightedness, not just the dying of the light, although that's here, too. And, hand in hand with the anger, like an angel and a demon walking hand in hand into the sunset, there is love: for human beings, in all our fallibility; for treasured objects; for stories; and ultimately and in all things, love for human dignity. (2015: xvi – xvii)

In "Notes from a successful fantasy author: Keep it real" (2007), found in *A slip of the keyboard*, Pratchett lays down the foundation of his fantasy worlds, stating that rules have to be applied to a fantasy world, otherwise, there is no real suspense. He describes the sort of thinking, whereby the consequences of each fantastical event are

taken into consideration, and accounted for, as the "motor that kept the Discworld series moving" (91). He goes on to lament the questions that children have been trained not to ask, such as, among others, how a glass slipper can only fit one foot, or how vampires can avoid crucifixes in their daily lives, when every mundane object can carry the shape of one (questions that he endeavors to answer in *Witches abroad* (1991) and *Carpe jugulum* (1998) respectively).

> From simple questions, innocently asked, new characters arise and new twists are put on an old tale. G. K. Chesterton summed up fantasy as the art of taking that which is humdrum and everyday (and therefore unseen) and picking it up and showing it to us from an unfamiliar direction, so that we see it anew, with fresh eyes. The eyes could be the eyes of a tiny race of humans, to whom a flight of stairs is the Himalayas, or creatures so slow that they don't see fast-moving humanity at all. The eyes could even be the nose of our werewolf, building up an inner picture of a room by an acute sense of smell, seeing not just who is there now but who was there yesterday.(Pratchett 20007: 81-82)

All of these elements and those described by Gaiman can be found, to one degree or another, in the Discworld series. Said series takes place in an alternative universe; with the plot of the various novels happening on the Discworld, an aptly names planet shaped like a disc, perched on the backs of four giant elephants, who in turn stand on the back of a space turtle.

As it is a single universe, devised by a single author, with recurring characters and an established albeit convoluted timeline, as opposed to focusing on specific novels, my approach will involve analyzing characters that at times appear across a number of novels. Of course, some appearances are more "substantial", in either scope or nature, than others, and certain novels such as *Witches abroad, Men at arms* (1993), *Carpe jugulum*, and *The fifth elephant* (1999) will be more relevant to the discussion than others. Thus, for clarification, my approach will involve examining noteworthy shape-shifting characters across several Discworld novels, with particular emphasis on the above-mentioned four novels.

As mentioned before, the plot of the novels takes place in an alternative universe, on a planet that is shaped like a flat disc, set on the backs of four giant elephants by the names of Berilia, Tubul, Great T'Phon and Jerakeen, "whose bones are living iron, and whose nerves are living gold" (Pratchett and Simpson 2008: 6). They, in turn, stand on the back of the Great A'Tuin, the space turtle. A'Tuin is described as a "ten-thousand-mile-long star turtle, which is swimming through space in a purposeful

manner" (6) towards an unknown destination. The universe of Discworld is no less mysterious than our own, as is shown in the following anecdote presented by Pratchett and is co-author Jacqueline Simpson in *The folklore of Discworld* (2008), regarding the question of why the turtle would swim through space:

> A child once asked. 'Why does the Turtle swim?"
>
> A wise man replied, 'Child, there is no Why. IT…IS…SO.'
>
> And that could be said of many things. (6)

Working as a physical manifestation of the role that fantasy plays in our world, the Discworld is described by Pratchett himself as a world and a mirror of worlds, namely our own. In his chapter "Theories of Humor" in *Terry Pratchett: Guilty of literature*, Andrew M. Butler states that the Discworld can be seen "as a secondary world which gives Pratchett a comic distance from reality in order to criticise the world of the everyday" (2001: 69).

Figure 1. Paul Kidby, Great A'Tuin – (The Art of Discworld)

In his article, “Imaginary Worlds, Real Stories” (2000), Pratchett states that his Discworld is largely imaginary because no matter how fictitious and fantastic a story is, it always has elements of real life in it (2000: 160). Real-life influences abound in the Discworld itself, from depictions of actual locals, to portrayals of ideas, traditions and even mythologies. From references to pagan Solstice traditions in *Hogfather* (1996), to a modern retelling of *Romeo and Juliet* in *Unseen academicals* (2009), to a fantastical (and some might say, not so fantastical) representation of the whole continent of Australia, with all its unique lifeforms in *The last continent* (1998), the references big or small are truly too numerous to be given justice within the limited scope of this introduction. This “borrowing” however is not the stories’ weakness; it is their strong point. They are not simple thefts of material, “nor are they one-to-one mappings that operate under an exaggeration transform, so that a muted cry in the original becomes a bathetic bleat in the parody [...] His parodies never make a ’point’; their incipits are never *mentioned*. Hence the deliciousness of his first novel” (Clute 2001: 19-20). The argument in this dissertation will focus on Pratchett’s use of images of bodily transformation, unstable or unsettled body shape, which were often borrowed from folklore and fantasy.

Chapter one will discuss the importance of images of bodily transformation (shape-shifting) for Pratchett's fiction; this type of imagery is ubiquitous in his work, and consists of numerous and varied characters. Then, the chapter will present the theoretical background of the dissertation, based on Deleuze and Guattari's concept of becoming animal, on Julia Kristeva's concept of the abject. This segment of the theoretical apparatus focuses on the body, organs, bodily transformation, and on monstrosity. The social literary connotations of transformation and monstrosity will be further discussed with reference to Mikhail Bakhtin's work, to the concept of the carnivalesque. Additionally, because many of Pratchett's shape-shifting characters are women, Helene Cixous's “The Laugh of the Medusa”, and *The madwoman in the attic* by Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar, will be applied to discuss the development of character identiy through images of bodily transformation. The second chapter will present a historical background, linking Pratchett to two bodies of literary tradition: to English and American fantasy, and to folklore literature (especially in its appropriated, artistic variants). The conclusion of the second chapter also includes remarks on the

satirical quality of Pratchett's fiction. The third chapter will discuss shape-shifting characters in selected novels by Pratchett. The concluding remarks will focus on the role of transformational imagery in the literary representation of the postmodern subject, which is arguably one of Pratchett's most important themes.

Chapter 1: Pratchett, bodies and identity

Many critics, such as Daniel Luthi, would describe Pratchett's works as both humanistic and postmodern in nature, realist and fantastic, idealistic and disillusioned, serious and ironic, humanistic and misanthropic at the same time:

> Authors such as Jack Vance or Mervyn Peake use humour to give colour to certain characters or absurd situations, but the satire or irony never extends to the internal consistency of the secondary worlds themselves. Terry Pratchett, on the other hand, transgresses these boundaries, be it via meta-commentaries or footnotes or characters breaking the fourth wall. (Luthi 2014: 125)

This approach turns Pratchett into a Romantic ironist of sorts, a writer who, in the midst of fervently satirical critique of human vice, openly expresses doubts about his own creative process, and explicitly questions his own moral statements and social critque. In this way, the complex network of Pratchett's intertextual references develops from "mere parody" into a "fully-fledged secondary world" (127). This becomes quite evident in studies of Pratchett's relationship with the literary canon, especially with Shakespeare (Noone 2010). In "Terry Pratchett's Literary Tryst With Shakespeare's *Macbeth*", Jenna Miller maintains that

> Pratchett's postmodern vision both critiques and echoes Shakespeare's early postmodernity and highlights the individual as the focal point where postmodernism and humanism intersect. William Holman and Hugh Harmon explain postmodernism as indicative of existentialism, alienation, solipsism, historical discontinuity and asocial individualism, while Jonathan Dollimore explains how 'Marxist humanism has affirmed a faith in Man, the individual' (Holman & Harmon 370; Dollimore 480). Humanists maintain an 'attitude that tends to exalt the human element, as opposed to the supernatural, divine elements'[.] (2011: 3)

Following this argument, in a way, one may claim that Pratchett writes with a sense of Romantic irony, that he is also comparable to Jonathan Swift, to Tolkien (old-fashioned as he may be), and to a variety of postmodern authors. Miller goes on to refer to Pratchett's discussion of the soul in *Wyrd sisters* (1988), arguing that it encompasses both a postmodern ambivalence and a humanist optimism; for while he "shows personal certainty in regards to his humanist views on the soul, his actual textual discussion of the soul in *Wyrd sisters*, unlike in *Macbeth*, remains ambivalent" (2011: 4). An example of this can be found in the character of King Verence, who dies at the beginning of the novel, and remains an active ghost throughout the plot. Referring to King Verence's discovery that "while someone he was certainly inclined to think of as himself was sitting up, something very much like his body remained on the floor" (*WS* 5); Miller points out the dual significance of the passage: "One is that King Verence is a ghost from the moment he enters the text. The second is the distinction Verence makes between his 'self' and his 'body'. King Verence's 'self' is his soul, which he makes a distinction as being separate from his body" (Miller 2011: 5).

The Discworld novels are rampant with references to the body-soul duality, as well as the idea of identity. Thus, in *Reaper man* (1991), we follow Windle Poons, a Wizard whose time on earth has come to an end, but who is unable to die, due to Death being "unavailable". His new zombie-like existence sees him rediscovering life, after being set loose from the shackles of living. We also see his old acquaintances shun him, because they are unable to process his new existence. Poons' new Other status as a zombie allows him, and by proxy the readers, to reexamine engrained ideas of the body's relationship with identity. He retains his "soul", and to some degree his body (although the latter is falling apart, and is only being forced to function by his sheer will). And yet, Poons becomes a new person throughout the novel. This manner of representation of death has beendescribed as "magical humanism" (Lockett 2015: 193-94) by Christopher Lockett in his article on the role of death and cruelty in Pratchett's fiction.

The Discworld is also home to other similar Othered creatures, such as vampires, ghouls, golems and even Igors, a race whose members, in the most prominent example of posthumanism and cyborg-like existence, are able to constantly construct their bodies in a Frankenstein's Creature like manner, from the body parts of relatives.

Shape-shifting can also be found in a variety of forms throughout the Discworld novels; from werewolves to a were-man (a wolf that becomes a man at the full moon), and even were-ducks, to fairy-tale transformations such as a frog prince, and a cat-turned-human, and finally a librarian that permanently becomes an orangutan.

Magical shape-shifting is not the only form of transformation found in the Discworld, however; clothes can serve similar purposes in concealing, altering or preserving identity. In her chapter "The Witches" in *Terry Pratchett: Guilty of literature*, Karen Sayer quotes Claire Dwyer in stating that "bodies are marked as different within different spaces through *dress*" (2001: 136). She goes on to elaborate that dress at its "simplest level privatises/hides the body from public scrutiny; it ensures that the body's surface cannot be seen. Frayed seams, the disarray, or the absence of dress suggest the collapse of the boundary between what is 'human' and 'animal'. 'civilised' and 'savage', Culture and Nature. But as a mask, clothing also allows the wearer to explore and make use of new selves" (2001: 136). She goes on to describe how the witch Magrat is (eventually) able to transform her*self* into Queen Ynci the Short-Tempered by donning her (faked) armor in *Lords and ladies* (1992); and how Granny Weatherwax and Nanny Ogg dress up in *Witches abroad* in order to save Emberella from going to the ball. By dressing up, they are deliberately transgressing the boundaries of status and rank. On the Discworld, "we find that we are regularly presented with the power of dress and its ability to transform the person who wears it" (Sayer 2001: 136).

Bray and Colebrook (1998) point out to the body as the theme of intensive cultural interaction and struggle: "the body is then, considered as that which has been belied, distorted, and imagined" (35), a sort of bulwark which protects an autonomous subject, but which is also contested and needs to be protected. Bray and Colebrook, referring to Deleuze's philosophy, claim that the cultural image of this struggle is often an image of bodily transformation. This creates a link between Deleuze, feminist theory, and the theme of the present dissertation. This link will be further developed in the second chapter.

The ability to transform oneself through dress is considered a classic witching quality; for as Granny sees it, it encompasses "the ability to both see beyond and

manipulate masks, clichés and the obvious signs" (Sayer 2001: 136). Sayer argues that Magrat's constant failure at changing her appearance stems from her inability to

> live up to her other (feminist) ideals of inner strength and self-assurance as it is to her body's innate incapacity to take on the glamour she desires. In trying to live up to the ideals of modern femininity, she fails to see that she really ought to try to be herself rather than a pretty simulacrum. Pratchett's concept of the 'morphic resonance' therefore seems to require that the body, like the [witch's] cottage, be shaped by the personality of its inhabitant. (136-137)

If the self is mutable, then on the Discworld it is also common for the body to be so. Referring to Sulieman's concept of the (female) body as a *symbolic construct*, Sayer points out that for Pratchett bodies are not necessarily determinate; as can be seen for instance when examining the snakes in *Witches abroad* who retain their "identity" despite their bodily transformation. The novel offers another example in the form of the cat Greebo, who after being transformed into a man in *Witches abroad* becomes a spontaneous shape-shifter. "Despite the novels' often intense interest in physicality, the body's relationship to identity is therefore complicated throughout the sequence. Rather than this necessarily resulting in an inescapable biological determinism the witches' sequence requires that we recognise the plasticity of the body and the interaction between it, our-*self* and the world" (Sayer 2001: 137).

In "Faith and ethics", Farah Mendlesohn writes that "[t]rue identity remains a matter of choice even within the bounds of morphology" (2001: 241). This is true with regards to Angua von Überwald and her diverse werewolf family, and it is true with regards to the Unseen University Librarian. In essence, one may examine Pratchett's characters, which exist in a carnivalesque world, and especially those of a transformative nature through a post-humanistic lens. These characters' ability to shape their own bodies and identities speaks of a cyborg-like existence and a sense of Becoming. Selves and bodies are indefinite, changeable, possibly "fake", and ironic; which is transformative and post-humanistic (but also humanistic); it also denotes a historical moment of becoming, which suggests the emergence of a new humanity, and a new (not necessarily better) world. After exploring relevant theory, the following chapters will examine shape-shifting as it (predominantly) appears in folklore, as well as noteworthy contemporary depictions of shape-shifters, so as to examine Pratchett's

characters in context. Afterwards, I will explore a number of notable shape-shifters in Pratchett's Discworld, while focusing on his use of said characters to express his anger.

Discussing Francis Bacon's portraits. In *Francis Bacon: The logic of sensation* (2004) Gilles Deleuze writes:

> The shadow escapes from the body like an animal we had been sheltering. In place of formal correspondences, what Bacon's painting constitutes is a zone of indiscernibility or undecidability between man and animal. Man becomes animal, but not without the animal becoming spirit at the same time, the spirit of man, the physical spirit of man presented in the mirror as Eumenides or Fate. (21)

This statement emphasizes the reciprocity between body, soul and animal, and the blurred boundaries between the three, which ultimately leads to transformation. Thus, transformation imagery can be analyzed in terms of Deleuze's version of "ecstatic naturalism" (Niemoczynski 2013: 13), whose inherent elements are "creativity and process" that will define and redefine subjectivity. In a sense, human identity is not wholly his/her own. In a way, Terry Pratchett, whose works are laden with carnivalesque beings, transforming bodies and identities, as well as what might be considered "monstrous" use of language[2], could be seen as a literary equivalent to Bacon, with both men expressing anger through their work. This approach will be developed with references to theoretical works by Deleuze and Guattari.

---

[2] with even the work titles mostly consisting of homophones, puns and twisted cultural references.

1.1. Pratchett's shape-shifters and postmodern concepts of subjectivity, identity and monstrosity

1.1.1. Aspects of femininity and monstrous identities

"Or should one recognize that one becomes a foreigner in another

country because one is already a foreigner from within?"

—Julia Kristeva (*Strangers to Ouselves* 14)

When thinking of Pratchett's monstrous creatures, whose monstrosity involves forms of bodily transformation, a link can possibly be drawn these modern monsters, and those found in Greek and Roman mythology, particularly when considering the link between the human and the monster that s/he becomes. One of the most widely recognized, and simultaneously most tragic figures of said monstrosity is the character of Medusa. As will be elaborated on promptly, through this figure (and the theory surrounding her), one may see a connection between Pratchett's fiction, feminist thought and feminine writing.

In "The laugh of the Medusa" Hélène Cixous focuses on what she terms L'ecriture Feminine, or feminine writing. Unlike Descartes who in his meditation on the "mind-body dualism" discovered the body last, and who held that it is merely "an extended, non-thinking thing"[3] (Cottingham, Stoothof, and Murdoch 1984: 54); Cixous maintains that women must write the body, that the body "must be heard" (1976: 880). Cixous suggests that through her writing, woman is able to tear herself away from the superego in which she has occupied the position of the guilty.

> I shall speak about women's writing: about what it will do. Woman must write her self: must write about women and bring women to writing, from which they have been driven away as violently as from their bodies-for the same reasons, by the same law, with the same fatal goal. Woman must put herself into the text-as into the world and into history-by her own movement. (Cixous 1976: 875)

[3] This is the well known Cartesian concept of the body as a machine, as found in "Meditations on first philosophy" (Cottingham, Stoothoff, and Murdoch 1984: 1-62).

In traditional Cartesian dualism, if the mind is masculine and the body is feminine, then perhaps as men (or men who are incapable of feminine writing) cannot write the body, it becomes abject to them, and is consequently monstrous. This, of course is reminiscent of the association traditionally found between the "grotesque" and the female form, wherein the female body is othered due to its visibly constant state of flux, with ministration, birth, menopause and aging, usually having a physical effect on the body. In her essay Cixous ponders:

> Where is the ebullient, infinite woman who, immersed as she was in her naivete, kept in the dark about herself, led into self-disdain by the great arm of parental-conjugal phallocentrism, hasn't been ashamed of her strength? Who, surprised and horrified by the fantastic tumult of her drives (for she was made to believe that a well-adjusted normal woman has a ... divine composure), hasn't accused herself of being a monster? Who, feeling a funny desire stirring inside her (to sing, to write, to dare to speak, in short, to bring out something new), hasn't thought she was sick? Well, her shameful sickness is that she resists death, that she makes trouble. (876)

Lacan, in discussing the real, imaginary, and symbolic, views the mother's body as the "real", language as the "symbolic" and that which is beyond language as the "imaginary". He suggests that women are not constrained by the rules at the center of the psyche because they are at the edge. They are closer to the "real", to the mother's body. Cixous agrees with this, and suggests that women are thus free to write the body, because they are not constrained by the phallus. However, Cixous does not limit feminine writing to only women, nor indeed thinks that all women are capable of disentangling from masculine writing.

Cixous' choice of engaging the myth of Medusa is quite poignant, as the title of her essay refers to Medusa laughing, wherein the original myth she has no reason to laugh. Having been beautiful enough to entice the god Neptune (Poseidon), Medusa is chased into Minerva's (Athena's) temple and raped. The goddess in return, punishes Medusa by turning her beautiful hair into snakes, and her gaze into a petrifying force. Although not all versions maintain that Medusa was raped, she remains a symbolic manifestation of female oppression by males and females alike. While Neptune's act of physical violation is the instigating factor, it is in-fact Medusa's abandonment and subsequent punishment by the female deity, in whose temple she seeks refuge that emphasizes the tragedy of her situation. Female victimhood and monstrosity are often enabled by other women. In this case, a "powerful" female deity turns her gaze away

from the violent act, choosing to not engage with the male god who instigated it. She either sees him as more powerful than her, or does not "blame" gods or males in similar instances. Not only that, but she transforms Medusa into a physical monster, and "to frighten evil doers, [s]he carries on her breastplate metal vipers [t]o serve as awful warning of her vengeance" (Ovid 1955: 106). She even goes as far as to send the hero Perseus after her, and he ultimately kills her, and uses her severed head as a weapon, again, victimizing her. When Cixous writes about Medusa laughing, she is in fact writing about Woman taking back her power and embracing what is seen as her monstrosity. In her monstrosity, Medusa becomes powerful enough to serve as a foe to a hero. She gains agency, joining a sisterhood of monstrous gorgons. She is then killed off in order to take away said power, but even then, her gaze is still capable of petrifying. As Cixous maintains, women "should break out of the snare of silence. They shouldn't be conned into accepting a domain which is the margin or the harem" (881). Embracing the image of the Medusa, even as she becomes monstrous (and to some evil) due to her experiences, is a way of combating the margins.

According to Susan Dunn, "The laugh of the Medusa" and "Sorties", which were both published in 1975, are

> two of the most influential essays in contemporary feminist theory. Both works are best understood if one sees that they are concerned more with poetics than politics although the two notions are clearly entwined. 'The Laugh of the Medusa' takes on both the Greek myth and the psychoanalytic interpretation of that myth in order to challenge the orthodoxies of patriarchy. 'Sorties' expands her notions of the connections between women's desire and women's language. Cixous' theory of writing is a feminist theory because she recognizes that patriarchy is a specifically cultural and historical context with power relations that are not universal but nonetheless a real condition and that these do not exist separately from aesthetics and poetics. (Dunn 1998)

It is important to note that Cixous emphasizes female individuality, and does not fall into the pitfall of consolidating all female experiences into one. Thus, while in *The Second Sex* Simone de Beauvoir for instance suggests that "woman" is woman due to her biological difference from "man", Cixous argues that there is "no general woman, no one typical woman. What [women] have *in common* [...] is the infinite richness of their individual constitutions" (1976: 876). She adds that women's "imaginary is inexhaustible, [...] their stream of phantasms is incredible" (876), which again emphasizes the richness she sees in women writing.

Cixous suggests poststructuralism as an appropriate venue for women writing, as said writing is by nature closer to fantasies and imagination, drawing away from fixed meanings. Which in turn might be related to what is seen as female fluidity. But of course, as stated previously, Cixous herself does not think that only women were capable of feminine writing, nor does she think that all women are capable of said writing. I would suggest that Pratchett, through his treatment of the body in his writings, as well as his constant focus on marginalized and othered groups, including but not limited to women, is a male author that demonstrates what Cixous would categorize as feminine writing.

Cixous is not the only scholar who focused on bodies, or female monstrosity. In *Power and horror: An essay on abjection* (1980), Julia Kristeva focuses on the body, relating to the idea of the pure and impure or unclean. She relates to the concept of abjection, "a state of giddying instability and fear which is precipitated when the symbolic order regulating our identity unexpectedly collapses" (White 1993: 166), as neither a subject, nor an object; rather as the "me" that is not me. Taking bodily fluids as an example, humans usually eject and are repulsed by them, yet these same bodily fluids *are* or used to be a part of us. These parts of us become something alien, and a source of revulsion, once they are separated from our bodies. Thus, abjection relates to how we define ourselves, which is by what we are not, rather than by what we are. This idea can be seen as similar in nature to de Saussure's concept of binary opposition, in that understanding a sign's meaning is derived from its context, and what it is not. In order to understand "good" one must understand "evil" as well. Kristeva's theory maintains that defining ourselves through what we are not can lead to poor behavioral patterns; as through this sort of definition, we exist in a sort of narcissistic mirror phase, in which we are stuck.

> And, as in jouissance where the object of desire, known as object a [in Lacan's terminology], bursts with the shattered mirror where the ego gives up its image in order to contemplate itself in the Other, there is nothing either objective or objectal to the abject. It is simply a frontier, a repulsive gift that the Other, having become alter ego, drops so that "I" does not disappear in it but finds, in that sublime alienation, a forfeited existence. Hence a jouissance in which the subject is swallowed up but in which the Other, in return, keeps the subject from foundering by making it repugnant. (Kristeva 1982: 9)

A functioning ego possesses a sense of self; or as Kristeva states: "To each ego its object, to each superego its abject" (1982: 2). However, people know what they ought not to do, due to cultural norms (which are linked to the superego); by constantly defining oneself by what s/he is not, a person is never able to focus on what s/he wants. Another way of thinking about it would be that while the object puts one in search of meaning, the abject collapses meaning, thus drawing away from identity definition through othering. In *The monstrous feminine*, Barbara Creed writes:

> The place of the abject is where meaning collapses, the place where I am not. The abject threatens life, it must be radically excluded from the place of the living subject, propelled away from the body and deposited on the other side of an imaginary border which separates the self from that which threatens the self. (1993: 69)

Kristeva suggests that by "expelling" oneself s/he becomes an "Other", as this process indicates a kind of death of the self as it is. Thus, the "I" is placed at the border of its condition of living. "It is thus not lack of cleanliness or health that causes abjection but what disturbs identity, system, order. What does not respect borders, positions, rules. The in-between, the ambiguous, the composite" (1993: 4). But, as Creed states: "Although the subject must exclude the abject, the abject must, nevertheless, be tolerated for that which threatens to destroy life also helps to define life" (1993: 69).

Through abjection, humans are also able to separate from the parental figure. Kristeva uses the Oedipus Complex to explain that abjection exists within a liminal social stage, as a form to prepare for social functions. In a way, Kristeva attempts to describe a subjectivity in-which experience is heterogeneous:

> when I seek (myself), lose (myself), or experience jouissance—then "I" is heterogeneous. Discomfort, unease, dizziness stemming from an ambiguity that, through the violence of a revolt against, demarcates a space out of which signs and objects arise. Thus braided, woven, ambivalent, a heterogeneous flux marks out a territory that I can call my own because the Other, having dwelt in me as alter ego, points it out to me through loathing. (Kristeva 1982: 10)

But what Kristeva unravels through these notions can be seen as connected to various forms of rejection of the "Other", such as racism, sexism and bullying. It is essentially an existential fear that by accepting the Other or even the other-self, the act would become a threat to the self in its current form, resulting in the death of said self.

So, in essence, the act of bodily rejection carries within it a sense of protection, in fear of an identity crisis.

In her book *Gender trouble*, Judith Butler presents the idea of transgressing both the body and the "social body". In the first chapter, she introduces the idea that the presupposition that gender is a noun builds into a sort of confusion between grammar and metaphysics. She calls into question the preconceived notion of a substance that underlines these accidental contingencies, and that gender is such a substance. So instead of being a noun, she views gender as repeated stylizations of the body, as a series of regulated acts which over time congeal into a substantive effect, which is, in turn, misread as the substance that the person in question always was. In other words, she argues that gender is something that a person does, rather than what that person is.

> In this sense, gender is not a noun, but neither is it a set of freefloating attributes, for we have seen that the substantive effect of gender is performatively produced and compelled by the regulatory practices of gender coherence. Hence, within the inherited discourse of the metaphysics of substance, gender proves to be performative— that is, constituting the identity it is purported to be. In this sense, gender is always a doing, though not a doing by a subject who might be said to preexist the deed. (Butler 1990: 33)

Therefore, she argues that Foucault's idea of power, as is presented in his book *The history of sexuality* is necessary to understand the theory of gender performativity. In said book, Foucault states that power is not a commodity that one is able to possess, and excludes others from, it is not "something that is acquired, seized, or shared, something that one holds on to or allows to slip away; power is exercised from innumerable points, in the interplay of nonegalitarian and mobile relations" (Foucault 1978: 94). He adds that relations of power are not

> in a position of exteriority with respect to other types of relationships (economic processes, knowledge relationships, sexual relations), but are immanent in the latter; they are the immediate effects of the divisions, inequalities, and disequilibriums which occur in the latter, and conversely they are the internal conditions of these differentiations; "relations of power are not in superstructural positions, with merely a role of prohibition or accompaniment; they have a directly productive role, wherever they come into play. (94)

Moreover, Foucault puts into question whether sexuality can exist before or outside power. Butler quotes Foucault stating that: "It would be wrong to say that the soul is an illusion, or an ideological effect. On the contrary, it exists, it has a reality, it is

produced permanently *around, on, within,* the body by the functioning of a power that is exercised on those that are punished" (Butler 1990: 172). She elaborates that the

> figure of the interior soul understood as "within" the body is signified through its inscription *on* the body, even though its primary mode of signification is through its very absence, its potent invisibility. The effect of a structuring inner space is produced through the signification of a body as a vital and sacred enclosure. The soul is precisely what the body lacks; hence, the body presents itself as a signifying lack. That lack which *is* the body signifies the soul as that which cannot show. In this sense, then, the soul is a surface signification that contests and displaces the inner/outer distinction itself, a figure of interior psychic space inscribed *on* the body as a social signification that perpetually renounces itself as such. In Foucault's terms, the soul is not imprisoned by or within the body, as some Christian imagery would suggest, but "the soul is the prison of the body. (172)

The notion of relating to something inner posited as being "outer" in psychoanalytical terms relates to Julia Kristeva's "abject". Butler refers to the "abject", stating that it "designates that which has been expelled from the body, discharged as excrement, literally rendered 'Other'" (169). If as with the abject, a person may consider the "inner" to be distinct from the "outer", then maintaining the borders of either the social or human body, requires a psychoanalytic response of disgust and repulsion when faced with the "outer". Yet as with her discussion of Foucault, Butler may suggest that the "inner" is inscribed on the "outer" of the body. If we consider Pratchett's shape-shifting in the above-mentioned context, it can be seen as a struggle; a struggle of the soul and the body, a struggle of emancipation and abjection, as the very soul that takes part in this "fight" is, at the same time, a participant, a weapon, and a path to victory. These shape-shifters' "inner" and "outer" are both a part of their identity; and they both inform each other. They are neither Quasimodo-like beings nor Ugly Ducklings. Their souls do not "win" the fight by conquering their bodies; the shape-shifter who are able to "win" are the ones who achieve balance – a hybrid existence.

Human fear (and abjection) of the Other, is interlaced with a desire to separate oneself from said Other, as demonstrated by Kristeva's anecdote of the milk skin. But one of the most psychologically impactful monstrous Others is the monstrous double. In *Retelling stories, framing culture*, Stephens and McCallum discuss the monstrous double stating that:

> [I[llustrating projects, both before and after *Beowulf*, have involved the idea of doppelgänger: *The strange case of D. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1967); *The wedding ghost*

> (1985); *Frankenstein* (1988). The upshot, as Miller suggests, is that "Beowulf and the monsters are shown as remarkably alike: clownish, ugly, ungainly. The heads of the monsters... after Beowulf has hacked them from the bodies, might just as well be the heads of any of the warriors of human kind. The pictures thus call into question any simple interpretation of the story as an encounter of good, the hero, with evil, the monster" (84). This crossover effect also dismantles the sharp distinction between insider and outsider, so that the illustrations present the monsters not as the forces of chaos, or of evil or of the dark within the human psyche, but as victims of a brutish, aristocratic society which marginalizes and excludes the Other. (2013: 112)

A work of literature that encompasses the above-mentioned theories is (as briefly suggested by Stephens and McCallum), Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818). The novel requires no introduction as it is a world-classic in gothic horror literature, often accredited as the first "true" science fiction story. Shelley's *Frankenstein* is a great example of both abjection and monstrosity. Victor Frankenstein constructs a creature through his scientific hubris, never considering the ethical ramifications of his creation should he succeed. The moment he does, he is immediately filled with a sense of revulsion for his creation. Another reading would see Frankenstein gaining the ability to "give life", which in a patriarchal society would be a source of revulsion as it is the closest thing to the feminine (and abject) process of giving birth. So, instead of a celebration of this newfound fertility, abject as it may be, the product of said fertility is shunned, becoming a source of fear rather than admiration. While "male", this Other is similar to a human, but different enough so as to create a sense of anxiety in the human in front of him, and thus, a sense of abjection. Like the mythological Medusa, he is a victim of outside will, and yet he is punished – rejected by his creator in the cruelest of manners.

Cixous states that Woman should write herself with a white pen. Frankenstein's Creature or monster, who is not even given the courtesy of a name, is born as a white page, like all children. It is the world around him, the rejection of both his creator and society at large that writes his story. While this can open an interesting debate on the nature of evil (which has been discussed on numerous occasions), Shelley is perhaps doing as Cixous urges – writing herself in the image of a nameless, almost voiceless creature; perhaps making a commentary on social rules and female monstrosity.

Be it through the creature or Victor's fiancé Elizabeth, whose role is to die in order to punish him[4], and allow him to understand loneliness and revenge, the story dictates that they are a part of his story. As Pratchett writes, however, in *A hat full of sky* (2004): "Everything's got a story in it. Change the story, change the world" (391). Perhaps it even goes as far as – change the hero, change the story. Such is the case in Jean Rhys's 1966 *Wide Sargasso Sea*, which brings to the forefront an imagining of the pre-attic life of Mr. Rochester's mad wife, in Charlotte Bronte's Jane Eyre. Thus, humanizing an Other that is hidden in the attic, demonized as female monstrosity through madness (or perhaps non-conformity). *The Madwoman in the attic* is used as the name of a 1979 feminist criticism book by Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar that deals with Victorian literature through a feminist lens. Similar to Cixous, they chose to name their work after an othered "monstrous" woman, who is most likely a victim of the patriarchal society surrounding her.

While there is no "overt" Frankenstein figure on the Discworld, the influence of the story can be seen in small references through the novels, and of course, the presence of a clan of Igors is a major homage to the story (even if the "Igor" character is not a product of the original novel, but of the films based on the novel). Pratchett's Igors, who channel the classic "monstrous assistant" character, but also the ingenuity of the revolutionary scientist, are not repulsed by their relationship with life and death, and the process of handing over body parts; They embrace their life-giving gift, "repulsive" and abject as they may be. Also, the theme of gendering and refashioning was explored extensively by Pratchett in the characters of witches, whose "magical gender" (Sinclair 2015: 16) will be the focus of attention in the final sections of the third chapter.

1.1.2. The grotesque and the carnivalesque

In *Rabelais and his world* (1984a), Mikhail Bakhtin coins the widely influential terms: "grotesque", expanding into "grotesque realism" or what is known as the "grotesque

[4] In pop culture, such a character would be referred to using the term coined by comic book writer Gail Simone "women in refrigerators", a reference to the love interest of DC Comics Superhero Green Lantern in the 1994 *Green Lantern* (Marz) *#54*, who is brutally murdered and shoved into his refrigerator, in order to advance his character growth. Hence forth, the term to "fridge" a character would be used in pop culture environments to describe female characters who play the role of the male protagonist's "tragic background", be it through their death, rape or assault, etc.

body", and "carnival" and by extension "carnivalesque". The terms themselves are interconnected, as a carnivalesque text is centered on "grotesque realism", emphasizing the grotesque body. "The grotesque body is opposed to the Classical body which is monumental, static, closed, and sleek, corresponding to the aspirations of bourgeois individualism; the grotesque body is connected to the rest of the world" (Russo 1995: 63). While the classical body is static, the grotesque body is constantly in flux. It is in fact, "always in the process of metamorphosis and always unfinished, transgresses its limits and overflows into its environment. It is not a discreet whole completely differentiated from its surroundings like the classical BODY" (Patin and McLerran 1997: 21).

Thus, the link between carnivalesque convention and grotesque body leads to the emergence of literary images that can be described as uncanny in the Freudian sense, as observed, for instance, by Hennely in his analysis of Charles Dickens's *Old curiosity shop* (Hennely 1993: 67-9). Even without the Freudian connection, the role of uncanny and distressing images was also underscored by Bakhtin. To explain further, Bakhtin uses the imagery of pregnant smiling old women (hags) on the brink of death, bridging togfether the ideas of birth and death. In "The pregnant text. Bakhtin's ur-chronotope: The womb"[5] Ruth Ginsburg, presents this image as a clear indicator that "for Bakhtin the mother's body is uncanny in the Freudian sense" (Shepherd 1993: 172). Bakhtin himself describes the image as:

> typical and very strongly expressed grotesque. It is ambivalent. It is pregnant death, a death that gives birth. There is nothing completed, nothing calm and stable in the bodies of these old hags. They combine senile, decaying, and deformed flesh with the flesh of new life, conceived but as yet unformed […] Moreover, the old hags are laughing. (Bakhtin 1984a: 25)

The ambivalence of the image, and Bakhtin's perceived interest in it, is seen by Mary Russo as "loaded with all the connotations of fear and loathing around the biological processes of reproduction and of aging in women" (1995: 51). This image and associated fear bear similarities to the previously discussed idea of abjection, by Julia Kristeva, and the rejection of bodily functions some of which are associated with the female body, or with processes that involve horror and "disassociation" with matters

---

5

In *Critical Studies: Bakhtin Carnival and Other Subjects*

and parts that are no longer a part of our body. Thus, the mouth, for instance, is viewed, as grotesque, as it is one of the bodily parts that allow substances to enter, and other substances to leave, leading the body to interact with the world, and consequently lose its perceived purity.

Sue Vice explicitly references Russo while discussing Bakhtin and Kristeva's approaches to the body. She writes: "[W]hile Kristeva starts with this fear and loathing, and bases her analysis of the non-classical body upon it, Bakhtin looks back to a mythic age in which the communal pleasures of feasting and drinking, giving birth and excreting, were unproblematically recognizes" (Vice 1997: 172). Of course, the connection between the abject and the carnivalesque body is both clear and logical. Terry Eagleton emphasizes the dual nature of the grotesque, by writing:

> Birth and death, high and low, destruction and renewal are sent packing with their tails in each other's mouths. Absolutely, nothing escapes this great spasm of satire: no signifier is too solemn to be blasphemously invaded, dismantled and turned against itself. The grotesque is intrinsically double-faced, an immense semiotic switchboard through which codes are read backwards and messages scrambled into their antithesis. Through this crude cackling of an ambivalently destructive and liberatory laughter emerges the shape of an equally negative and positive phenomenon: utopia. (Eagleton 1981: 146)

This utopia, as well as what Vice referred to as the "mythic age“, can be further understood through the concept of "Carnival".

Carnival is also associated with two pre-lent celebrations, Mardi Gras and its various customs, and the Venice Carnival (which is also a form of Mardi Gras celebration) with its iconic masks, and the various more "folksy" Carnival celebrations in German-speaking countries, where Carnival is usually a regional, distinctly lower-class popular festival. Its origins can also be traced back to "the Dionysian festivities of the Greek and Saturnalia of the Romans, but which enjoyed its apogee of both observance and symbolic meaning in the High Middle Ages [where it] played a central role in the life of the community" (Stam 1992: 86). In Pratchett's *Witches abroad* there is a clear exploration of the idea of Mardi Gras, where the new ruler, eschewing fairy-tale traditions, opts out of continuing the custom of a ball, in favor of attending Mardi Gras. This is particularly potent as the citizens of the city had been made to act out their stereotypical fairy-tale roles throughout the story.

1.1.3. Carnival as subversion of order and expression of discontent

Far beyond being a mere break from work, according to Stam (1992), the concept of "Carnival" represents:

> alternative cosmovision characterized by the ludic undermining of all norms. The carnivalesque principle abolishes hierarchies, levels social classes, and creates another life free from conventional rules and restrictions. In carnival, all that is marginalized and excluded— the mad, the scandalous, the aleatory—takes over the center in a liberating explosion of otherness. The principle of material body— hunger, thirst, defecation, copulation—becomes a positively corrosive force, and festive laughter enjoys a symbolic victory over death, over all that is held sacred, over all that oppresses and restricts. (Stam 1992: 86)

Terry Eagleton, on the other hand, sees the grotesque, and by extension Carnival as an estrangement of power structures, where objects are "displaced or negated into their opposites" (Eagleton 1981: 145), and where a "ceaseless practice of travesty and inversion (nose/phallus, face/buttocks, scared/profane) rampages through social life, deconstructing images, misreading texts and collapsing binary opposites into a mounting groundswell of ambiguity into which all articulate discourse finally strutters and slides" (145). But, according to him, the fact that said "displacement" and transgressions are approved, indicates their illusionary nature. In essence, carnival is a temporary license for the low to take the place of the high, thus, reaffirming said hierarchical structure. Still, he claims:

> Carnival is more than deconstruction: in rendering existing power structures alien and arbitrary, it releases the potential for a golden age, a friendly world of 'carnival truth' in which 'man returns to himself'. […] [I]ts estrangement effects are reconstructive as well as deconstructive, dialectical images in which the parodic dissolution of the object presumes and provokes its 'normal' representation, reassembling it in the figure of that which it denies. The laughter of carnival is both plebian derision and plebian solidarity, an empty semiotic flow which in decomposing significance nonetheless courses with the impulse of comradeship. (146)

In "Metaphors and transformation", the introduction to Allan White's *Carnivals, hysteria and writing* (1993), Stuart Hall, on the other hand, asserts that carnivalesque is not simply a metaphor for invasion whereby the "low" is set "in the place of the 'high', while preserving the binary structure of division between them" (White 1993: 8). It in fact encompasses the blurring of said binary lines, and in effect

that of the hierarchical order. That said, he does describe “Carnival” as “a metaphor for the temporary licensed suspension and reversal of order, the time when the low shall be high and the high, low, the moment of upturning, of ’the world turned upside down’ “ (White 1993: 6). In essence, it functions in a similar way to some fantasy worlds including the Discworld, where it is an upside-down version of the real world, providing a mirror to said reality and allowing us to reexamine it with the use of defamiliarization. Regarding the “carnivalesque”, Hall adds that it

> includes the language of the marketplace – curses, profanities, oaths, colloquialisms which disrupt the privileged order of polite utterance – rituals, games, and performances, in which the genital zones, the ’material bodily lower strata’, and all that belongs to them are exalted and the formal, polite forms of conduct and discourse dethroned; popular festive forms in which, for example, king or slaveholder is set aside and the fool or slave temporarily ’rules’, and other occasions when the grotesque image of the body and its functions subvert the models of decorous behaviour and classical ideals. (White 1993: 6)

With the temporary suspension pf power structures, there is freedom for monsters and freaks to feel good. There is also much “disgusting naughtiness” taking place in the streets, which connects to Foucault’s view of excrements, fluids and the abject body as part of power structures. Thus, when power structures are suspended, the function of abject things becomes different; to some degree, they become more “acceptable” and are accordingly celebrated.

Discussing his concept of “grotesque realism”, Bakhtin writes: “The material bodily principle in grotesque realism is offered in its all-popular festive and utopian aspect. The cosmic, social, and bodily elements are given here as an indivisible whole. And this whole is gay and gracious” (Bakhtin 1984a: 19). Thus, the body element of said grotesque realism is deeply positive, and ultimately, universal:

> It is presented not in a private, egotistic form, severed from the other spheres of life, but as something universal, representing all the people. As such it is opposed to severance from the material and bodily roots of the world; it makes no pretense to renunciation of the earthy, or independence of the earth and the body. We repeat: the body and bodily life have here a cosmic and at the same time an all-people’s character; this is not the body and its physiology in the modern sense of these words, because it is not individualized. (Bakhtin 1984a: 19).

Referencing Ben Taylor’s “Kanaev, vitalsim and the Bakhtin circle”, Daphna Erdinest-Vulcan highlights the grotesque carnivalesque body as a hydra-like entity. As

it takes “center-staged in Bakhtin’s work on Rabelais—amorphous, protean, and incomplete - [the grotesque carnivalesque body] is endowed with the same capacity for transformation and self-regeneration that characterize a biological organism like the hydra” (2013: 109). She adds that the astuteness of said analogy is self-evident, but that it should be noted that “this is only one vector in Bakhtin’s architectonics of subjectivity: the grotesque body has no interiority, and the celebration of its constant state of becoming and flux must be counterbalanced by a centripetal vector of inner cohesion and continuity” (110).

In his other work, especially in *Problems of Dostoevsky’s poetics* (1984b), Bakhtin related carnival, and the image of the world turned upside down, to a wider study of menippean satire, and to the emergence of the novel among literary genres. The carnivalesque imagery is not just about change and flux, but it is about reversal, the “mock crowning and subsequent decrowning of the carnival king” (Bakhtin 1984b: 124), and numerous other role-reversals between the rich and the poor, children and grown-ups, animals and people, aristocracy and commoners. The carnival, and shape-shifting, is an image that equalizes people, reminding us that social hierarchy and social role is an arbitrary cultural construct, which can be quickly reversed, because people are, inherently, equal at the moment of birth (and at the moment of death). As Chiang remarks,

> [m]enippean satire then gives us a fantastic journey and thus an “observation” of the normal world from an unusual, unconventional, inverted viewpoint. It gives us what Bakhtin will call a carnivalistic world, one where we see grotesque bodies and fantastic, magical “creatures”—beings that mix together chaotically features which in normal species will be separated. This imaginary, “antipodean” world teems with sharp contradictions of the ordinary world. During their bizarre trips, travelers will find that the customary course of events and established norms of behavior in their homeland have been violated; they will experience an inversion, a symbolic “crowning” and “decrowning.” Yet this upside-down world is created in order to test, as in Rabelais, the “solidity” of our conventional ideology, our moral, religious and philosophical ideas; it will force us to rethink our most basic assumptions.... (2004: 59)

Even before *Rabelais and his world* was published in English, Bakhtin’s discussion of the carnivalesque was invoked in this sense, as satirical criticism of social order and convention, in Bob Scribner’s study of German carnival rituals (Scribner 1978: 304). According to Scribner and other historians of early modern German popular culture, in German-speaking countries, especially in times of social upheaval (such as reformation

or peasant uprisings), the carnival was a kind of mock riot, more than a demonstration of discontent, but less than an outright insurrection (Scribner 1994). As Ehrstine claims, historical evidence suggests that the meaning of German carnival festival was more complicated and varied than simply a “rite of rebelion” (2000: 677), but historical sources suggest that the imagery used was usually of satirical nature (678). In particular, many elements of the violent imagery used in carnival pageants was of fantastic nature, with the use of witches and semi-human animal figures (680-81). Thus, the radical imagery of transformation and flux, known from fantastic, carnivalesque images discussed above, assumes a special place in literary history, as one of the defining features of the evolution of modern satire, and of the modern, realistic novel:

> In modern times, while infiltrating deep into other carnivalized genres, the menippea continues its own independent development, in diverse variants and under diverse names: the "Lucianic dialogue," "dialogues of the dead" (varieties in which ancient traditions predominate), the "philosophical tale" (a variety of menippea characteristic for the Enlightenment), the "fantastic story" and "philosophical fairy tale" (forms characteristic for Romanticism-Hoffmann, for example), and others. (Bakhtin 1984b: 137)

This observation is important for the study of Pratchett’s fiction, because it places his work in a longer tradition of the menippean satire, and particularly in the evolution of the satire in English literary history, especially the role of satirical imagery, and semi-fantastic imagery, in socially critical English realistic novel; this historical angle of interpretation will be pursued in chapter 2, where Pratchett’s work will be placed in a historical context.

Shohat and Stam (2014), write that carnival embraces the rejection of “formal harmony and unity in favor of the asymmetrical, the heterogenous, the oxymoronic, the miscegenated” (302), adding that :

> carnival counterposes the mutable, transgressive “grotesque body,” rejecting what might be called the “fascism of beauty": the construction of an ideal type or language of beauty in relation to which other types are seen as inferior “dialectal” variations. The carnival esthetic exalts even “base” products of the body, all that has been banned from respectable representation because official decorum remains chained to a Manichean notion of the body’s fundamental uncleanliness. Carnivalesque art is thus “anticanonical"; it deconstructs not only the canon, but also the generating matrix that creates canons and grammaticality. (302)

Given all of the above mentioned, it can be said that Terry Pratchett's Discworld functions as a carnival and the stated "mirror of worlds". It is a world where a fool literarily becomes a king (the king of Lancre), and a witch (the well-known symbol of female monstrosity) becomes his wife. It is a world where "monsters" can join the Ank-Morepork city watch, and where no body is wholly good or wholly evil. Boundaries are constantly blurred, and social structures are subject to criticism. At the same time, the world itself can be seen as what Deleuze and Guattari term a "rhizome", a world that is in a constant state of becoming and hybridization.

1.1.4. Gilles Deleuze: difference, rhizome and becoming

Over years, Gilles Deleuze has gained a reputation of a "difficult" yet influential and prolific philosopher. While not holding by concepts such as an ultimate "truth" or "true identity", Deleuze viewed himself as a pure metaphysician. To Deleuze, ontology is a process of creation rather than discovery. According to Todd May, in his book *Gilles Deleuze: An introduction* "[o]ntology can be an ontology of difference. It can be an ontology where what is there is not the same old things but a process of continual creation, an ontology that does not seek to reduce being to the knowable but instead seeks to widen thought to palpate the unknowable" (May 2011: 171). Thus, rather than asking questions such as "how *should* one live?", Deleuze is interested in "how *might* one live?"

As May writes, in ancient philosophy, the question was: "*How should one live?*", while over "the course of the modern period, [*that*] question […] has been gradually replaced by another one. By the late eighteenth century, philosophers such as Immanuel Kant and Jeremy Bentham are addressing a different question […] Now the question is *How should one act?*" (May 2011: 5). This change has been known as "the rise of individualism or alternatively the rise of the subject in modern philosophy" (6), and embodies the idea of a life being judged on its own merits, not as part of "a larger order of which it is a part" (6). Like Nietzsche and others before him, however, Deleuze is actually interested in a third question - that of "*How might one live?*"

> Several recent French philosophers have forged their philosophical views in the shadow cast by conformity. They have sought to free us from the grip of the structures and forces that produce and reproduce conformity. These philosophers have exposed these structures in our thinking and offered paths to escape them. They have recognized that there is an intimate bond between the ways in which we think about ourselves and our world and the ways in which we construct our lives, and they have sought to address that thinking in order to reach us in our living. In doing so they have nourished the question of how one might live, clearing a space for its asking and for the living that would accompany it. Deleuze is among these philosophers […]. (May 2011: 9)

However, as May states, he is far from being the only one. Though they take different approaches and offer different routes to the question, two noteworthy philosophers who have explored it are Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida. To vastly oversimplify the differences:

> For both Foucault and Derrida any approach to the question of being that goes by means of an account of an unchanging, pure nature or essence is misguided, for either historical or linguistic reasons. Misguided, and worse than misguided: harmful. To address the question of being by means of an account of what there is would seem to constrain human behavior to a narrow conformity. It would fail to keep alive the question of how one might live. And that is the point at which they diverge from Deleuze, who approaches the question of how one might live not by abandoning ontology, but by embracing it. (May 2011: 15)

Deleuze is not interested in an ontology of discovery, however; he is interested in engaging with an ontology that responds to the question of how might one live. To him we begin ontology when we "abandon the search for conceptual stability and begin to see what there is in terms of difference rather than identity: 'difference is behind everything, but behind difference there is nothing.' To see being as difference is at once to refuse to philosophize in terms of identities and to jettison the project of ontology as discovery" (May 2011: 19).

Having had much respect for Spinoza, Deleuze subscribed to an ontology of immanence, rather than an ontology of transcendence. In fact, from Deleuze's perspective, the transcendent is a way to install hierarchies; which is why it needs two or more substances or modes of being in order to work. To Deleuze the problem with this approach is attempting to use it in order to set limits for how one should live. Instead, to him, there is one mode of being, one substance - one existence. And, as an ontology of immanence must be univocal, there is no reason to differentiate between various modes of being, which means that there is no hierarchy.

One may feel that there is an inherent contrast between Deleuze's support of a univocal approach, and his well-documented interest in differences. However, the key to reconciling those two ideas lies in his belief in a temporal mode of thinking, rather than a special one. But even his approach to time is not a linear one. Deleuze's approach draws inspiration from ideas conceptualized by Henri Bergson, which he referenced in his book *Bergsonism*. Bergson viewed the present moment as a realm, in which the past, present and future intermingle and coexist. Taking the past and present for instance - The present exists in "actuality", while the past exists "virtually". The preset moment actualizes the past, and at the same time the past has a major effect on the present. Thus, the past exists in the present.

Similarly, Deleuze viewed substance as temporal in nature, with the process of expression involving the actualization of the virtual. Substance expresses itself through attributes (or the essences of things), and attributes express themselves through modes. Thus, the universe becomes an expression of something from within. May uses the analogy of origami in order to explain expression:

> Japanese origami is the folding of paper into different recognizable figures: swans, turtles, people, trees. In origami, there is no cutting of the paper. No outside elements are introduced into it. Everything happens as an expression of that particular piece of paper. It is only the paper that is folded and unfolded into new arrangements, those arrangements being the modes of the paper, which is the origami's substance. The extension of the paper would be its attribute. If we can imagine the paper's being able to fold and unfold itself, we come closer to the concept of expression. Further, we must see each figure as part of a process, not a finished product, if we are to grasp the temporal character of substance. (May 2011: 38)

Origami encapsulates the possibility of an infinite number of shapes on a piece of paper, and in a way, it might be an interesting manner to view identity. We are mutable, ever-changing, but still "us". We have an intangible core "us" (or "substance") that grounds us and normally prevents an identity crisis, yet almost everything about us continues to change; with these changes taking on a million different forms based on each person's personality, circumstances, and lived-in experiences.

According to Adrian Parr in *The Deleuze dictionary*, Deleuze "is often labelled as a 'philosopher of difference', an assessment that highlights the critical place of 'difference' in his work. He is concerned to overturn the primacy accorded identity and representation in western rationality by theorising difference as it is experienced" (Parr

2010: 74). Todd May describes him as a philosopher of new possibilities, of "how we may think of things in ways that would open up new regions of living" (May 2011: 3). He is a philosopher of difference, and how things change over time; which is why he is usually referred to as a postmodern or post-structural philosopher.

As is the case with most post-structuralism, Deleuze is influenced by Saussure's theory of signification. For Deleuze, it is the spaces between things, the differences between them that create the possibility for newness. All things are defined by the differences between them. At the same time, Deleuze's philosophy builds upon Spinoza's monism – that everything is connected. As such, unlike other philosophers, much of Deleuze's work is filled with references to science, politics, and history. While most the western world is interested in what *is*, Deleuze is interested in how things change; and unlike philosophers such as Kant and Aristotle, Deleuze does not emphasize what is stable or eternal; on the contrary, he focuses on what is in movement or in-flux.

The possibility for change and difference means that there is in potentiality an infinite number of possibilities in the world, just as the above-mentioned origami can be folded and unfolded into (potentially) an infinite number of possible shapes. In *Difference and repetition* (1968), Deleuze writes:

> no two grains of dust are absolutely identical, no two hands have the same distinctive points, no two typewriters have the same strike, no two revolvers score their bullets in the same manner ... . Why, however, do we feel that the problem is not properly defined so long as we look for the criterion of a principium individuation is in the facts? It is because a difference can be internal, yet not conceptual. (Deleuze 1994: 26)

According to Deleuze, orgiastic representation or "infinite representation" is an attempt to incorporate difference by finding grounds for representation as such, and therefore, by exploring the absolute. This is done by extending difference to the infinity large, or reducing it to the infinity small, in an attempt to grasp both the totality and the individual.

> Difference is not between species, between two determinations of a genus, but entirely on one side, within the chosen line of descent… It is a question of making the difference, thus of operating in the depth of the immediate, a dialectic of the immediate. It is a dangerous trial without thread and without net, for according to the ancient custom of myth and epic, false claimants must die. (60)

Deleuze, through his plane of immanence and difference, creates a place for monsters and shape-shifters who are not marginalized, not reduced to inferior status as exceptions, but stand out as various possible beings that can be. Thus, an examination of his work is needed in anticipation of the upcoming discussion.

In *Difference and repetition* Deleuze theorizes on the definition of difference. At the same time, he is also interested in “repetition". The act of repetition is inherent in the thinking process. When we think about an object, for instance, we repeat said “something” in relation to said object in our heads. We might consider said object’s characteristics, which in turn leads to us “categorizing” it with other similar objects. This involves a generalization process – but in order to generalize, we must repeat. However, while repetition *does* contribute to generality, it is not in itself generality.

> Repetition is not generality. Repetition and generality must be distinguished in several ways. Every formula which implies their confusion is regrettable: for example, when we say that two things are as alike as two drops of water; or when we identify ’there is only a science of the general’ with ’there is only a science of that which is repeated’. Repetition and resemblance are different in kind - extremely so. (Deleuze 1994: 1)

In every repetition something distinct occurs; no repetition is an exact copy, just as no two grains of dust are the same, or two snowflakes for that matter. The process of repetition itself involves constant newness. Every time we think of said object the newness that is a result of all the previous times we thought of it, as well as the changes in said object and our own world view, all of it is inscribed upon the following time that we consider the object. Thus, each repetition is in itself something new. “To repeat is to behave in a certain manner, but in relation to something unique or singular which has no equal or equivalent. And perhaps this repetition at the level of external conduct echoes, for its own part, a more secret vibration which animates it, a more profound, internal repetition within the singular” (1). It is the very difference in each repetition that leads to change, development, evolution, and the possibility of creativity. Shape-shifting, as a representation of body and identity mutability can be seen as a form of repetition. With each “transformation” and subsequent “return” the person is ever so slightly altered.

The central theme of the first plateau in Deleuze and Guattari’ *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia* (1980) is that of the Rhizome. Developed by them, the Rhizome is a concept best defined as an “a-centered multiplicity”. Like the

plant after which it is named, Deleuze and Guattari's Rhizome encompasses the idea of freedom and non-linearity. A Rhizome can move in different directions, it has no beginning and no end, and it is a collection of roots that interlink in various ways. Essentially, the Rhizome can help question thinking in terms of hierarchies and binaries, and demonstrate how everything can be interrelated. "[a]ny point of the rhizome can be connected to any other, and must be" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 7).

Deleuze and Guattari describe six characteristics of the Rhizome: connection, heterogeneity, multiplicity, a-signifying rupture, cartography and decalcomania. The Rhizome is a process. It is always in the middle, and forces us to give up the idea of beginning and ending.

> The rhizome operates by variation, expansion, conquest, capture, offshoots. Unlike the graphic arts, drawing, or photography, unlike tracings, the rhizome pertains to a map that must be produced, constructed, a map that is always detachable, connectable, reversible, modifiable, and has multiple entryways and exits and its own lines of flight. (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 23)

Essentially, in layman's terms, the Rhizome is akin to the Internet – an interconnected web of hyperlinks that develop in various directions. Some links may "live" and prosper, while others die. Each one is connected to other "roots" in a variety of different ways that are not always apparent, but are nevertheless present. The ever-evolving state of the Rhizome, as is the aforementioned Difference and Repetition can also be further understood when one considers the debate of "being" vs. "becoming".

In *The will to power*, Fredric Nietzsche writes: "If the world had a goal, it must have been reached. If there were for it some unintended final state, this also must have been reached. If it were capable of pausing and becoming fixed, of 'being,' if in the whole course of its becoming it possessed even for a moment this capability of 'being,' then all becoming would long since have come to an end…" (1968: 546); and Deleuze takes inspiration from that and from Nietzsche's "eternal return". In the same manner that he perceives identity to be derivative of difference, the appearance of 'being' can only be categorized by understanding the constant process of 'becoming'.

> Becoming, of course, has a long and distinguished history in philosophy, stretching back to at least Heraclitus. More often than not, however, philosophies of becoming have found themselves in the shadow of philosophies of being – those philosophies, from Plato to Heidegger, that privilege presence over absence, identity over difference and 'what is' over the process of alteration. (Lundy 2012: 1)

Ludy refers to three kinds of treatments of becoming: becoming the abyss (becoming of the depth), the pure incorporeal Event (surface becoming), and the movement between the depth and the surface. He describes the latter as "the *unravelling* of a form and/or thing rather than the form of the infinitive or abyss of 'all things'" (2012: 3). Deleuze and Guattari discuss a number of becomings, such as becoming-child, becoming-woman, becoming-animal, becoming-intense, with a link existing between said becomings. As they state in *A thousand plateaus*: "If becoming-woman is the first quantum, or molecular segment, with the becomings-animal that link up with it coming next, what are they all rushing toward? Without a doubt, toward becoming-imperceptible" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 307-308). All becomings aim towards becoming-molecular as opposed to molar. For Deleuze and Guattari, becomings also "imply a desire to be drawn closer to a heterogeneous other, entering into a zone of proximity with that other and allowing oneself to have a molecular exchange with that other" (Newland 2020: 47). Thus, becoming is not just "a productive, virtual force for change" (Gardner 2014: 569), but also a pattern of interaction: bodily transformation can also be an image of interpersonal relationship between characters, such as a struggle, a loyalty or belonging, or any other kind of interaction that leads to identity formation.

With that said, becoming does not only involve a process of becoming-other. Thus, while a man can undergo a process of becoming-woman, it is mainly the woman who is in a constant process of becoming-woman:

> [The] indissociable aspects of becoming-woman must first be understood as a function of something else: not imitating or assuming the female form, but emitting particles that enter the relation of movement and rest, or the zone of proximity, of a microfemininity, in other words, that produce in us a molecular woman, create the molecular woman. We do not mean to say that a creation of this kind is the prerogative of the man, but on the contrary that the woman as a molar entity *has to become-woman* in order that the man also becomes or can become-woman. It is, of course, indispensable for women to conduct a molar politics, with a view to winning back their own organism, their own history, their own subjectivity. (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 304)

Elaborating on the idea that through a molar woman's becoming-woman, men are also able to become-woman, Deleuze and Guattari suggest that this is exemplified in literature, that through women writers (perhaps through woman writing herself as Cixous suggested), men unconsciously absorb the molecules of becoming-woman:

> writing should produce a becoming-woman as atoms of womanhood capable of crossing and impregnating an entire social field, and of contaminating men, of sweeping them up in that becoming. Very soft particles — but also very hard and obstinate, irreducible, indomitable. The rise of women in English novel writing has spared no man: even those who pass for the most virile, the most phallocratic, such as Lawrence and Miller, in their turn continually tap into and emit particles that enter the proximity or zone of indiscernibility of women. In writing, they become-women. The question is not, or not only, that of the organism, history, and subject of enunciation that oppose masculine to feminine in the great dualism machines. The question is fundamentally that of the body — the body they steal from us in order to fabricate opposable organisms. (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 305)

It could be suggested that Terry Pratchett with his writing that heavily reflects themes of social justice and demystification and consequently the "humanization" of the monstrous Other, is an overt example of a writer becoming-woman. He certainly appears to be reflecting becoming-minoritarian throughout his various narratives and characters. Pratchett's approach to the body in all its forms is constantly that of hybridity rather than the embracing of binary oppositions. In the Discworld series, the major city of Ankh-Morpork is both a metropolis and a melting pot of various species. In the 2011 novel *Snuff*, Pratchett continues his exploration of themes of marginalization and Othering by addressing the continued alienation of the goblins, despite the major strides that were made with regards to the inclusion of the other species. Musing on this issue commander Vimes acknowledges that while the "City Watch appeared to contain at least one member of every known bipedal sapient species [and it] had become a tradition: if you could make it as a copper, then you could make it as a species" (Pratchett 2011: 95), nobody had suggested the inclusion of goblins in the Watch, with the collective understanding that they are a vicious, cannibalistic and untrustworthy species, baring a foul odor. Yet in the same breath, Vimes continues:

> Of course, *everybody* knew that dwarfs were a chiselling bunch who would swindle you if they could, and that trolls were little more than thugs, and the city's one resident medusa would never look you in the face, and the vampires couldn't be trusted, however much they smiled, and werewolves were only vampires who couldn't fly, when you got right down to it, and the man next door was a real bastard who threw his rubbish over your wall and his wife was no better than she should be. But then again it took all sorts to make a world." (95)

This emphasizes the nuanced approach that Pratchett employs in his writing. He acknowledges the continued inherent prejudices that still abound in Ankh-Morpork[6],

6

despite continued cohabitation between the species. He also suggests that "bad" or "insufferable" individuals can be found in any group, but that ultimately like "becoming" involves heterogeneity, so does the construction of a world and society.

As stated previously, one of the becmoings that Deleuze and Guattari discuss is that of becoming-animal. To them, the process of becoming-animal does not mean imitating animals. Rather it means the embracing of multiplicity, of a pack. It does not happen through creation – a structural organizational species. Becoming animal happens through contagion – the formation of alliances.

Deleuze and Guattari reference the novel *Moby Dick* as they explore the idea of becoming-animal. To them, as Ahab peruses the whale, he is in fact stepping aside from the conventional human identity of a human whale-ship captain, and taking a different stance towards a whale. Said whale is no longer merely a source to be perused and killed rationally. Moby Dick itself is an "anomalous animal" because of its appearance and its behavior. The clash between whale and captain embodies them entering a grey area, where the normal distinctions between humans and animals do not apply. Neither of them behaves according to their predictable characteristics. In a sense, as is the case with Bakhtin's carnival, these seemingly binary opposites bleed into each other, blurring the lines between what should be two separate entities, and thus, destabilizing the hierarchical order of things. All forms of becomings in Deleuze and Guattari's writings, are in essence, becoming "minoritarian", as in, part of a minority group.

It should be noted that for Deleuze and Guattari, becoming-animal does not mean a process of mimicry, imitation, or even identification. "To become is not to progress or regress along a series. Above all, becoming does not occur in the imagination, even when the imagination reaches the highest cosmic or dynamic level, as in Jung or Bachelard" (1987: 237). Emphasizing the "reality" of becoming-animal, they write that

> if becoming animal does not consist in playing animal or imitating an animal, it is clear that the human being does not "really" become an animal any more than the animal "really" becomes something else. Becoming produces nothing other than itself. We fall

It would be interesting to explore the Deleuzian ideas of the "City" through the Discworld, with particular emphasis on the city of Ankh-Morpork (and to some degree the city of Genua). *Reaper Man*, for instance, presents an intriguing view of Ankh-Morpork as to some degree embodying the essence of a rhizome that is in a constant state of assemblage, and as it is "alive" a constant state of becoming. However, as this does not bear direct impact on the topic of the current dissertation (although a degree of relevance *does* exist), I will endeavor to do so in future writing.

> into a false alternative if we say that you either imitate or you are. What is real is the becoming itself, the block of becoming, not the supposedly fixed terms through which that which becomes passes. (237)

While as Jane Newland suggests in *Deleuze in children's literature* (2020) through the analysis of the children's book *Grain-d'Aile* that becoming-animal is impeded by the process of physical transformation, and that it is only when the girl is transformed back and loses the wings that she attained that she continues the process of becoming-animal (Newland 2020: 50). That said, in this dissertation, I will be examining characters such as the Unseen University Librarian, and Angua von Überwald's werewolf family. I would suggest that these characters embody the continuous process of becoming animal through their hybrid shapes and hybrid identities.

As previously indicated, we are constantly in the process of becoming, just as we are always in flux. Humanity, reality, identity, and subjectivity are in a constant state of being formed. It is not as if we are either "not" or we "are". The mutability of subjectivity is a constant process, which only stops with death.

> [B]ecoming-animal is a movement from major (the constant) to minor (the variable); it is a deterritorialization in which a subject no longer occupies a realm of stability and identity but is instead folded imperceptibly into a movement or into an amorphous legion whose mode of existence is nomadic or, alternatively, whose "structure" is rhizomatic rather than arborescent, that is, restless, insomniac, or in flight rather than settled, upright, at one with itself and at peace with others. (Bruns 2007: 203-204)

Deleuze and Guattari indicate three aspects when discussing becoming-animal: multiplicity, the anomalous/outsider, and transformations. They also distinguish three types of animals: individuated animals (family pets), animals with characteristics or attributes (including archetypes in a Jungian sense), and demonic animals (who form a multiplicity). At the same time, they maintain that an animal can embody all three types, as one might suggest is the case with Terry Pratchett's character – Greebo the cat.

1.1.5. Becoming post-human

A discussion of Deleuze and Guattari, in particular when related to the concept of "becoming", inevitably leads to a discussion of post-human subjectivity. The posthuman

is an umbrella term that encompasses, among other things: posthumanism, transhumanism, ani-humanism, new-materialism, and meta-humanism. These subcategories expand in turn into different schools of thought such as philosophical posthumanism and libertarian transhumanism. The "posthuman" in and of itself presents the human in the 21st century as an open notion that requires redefinition as, be it through evolution, technological advancement, or our two-way relationship with nature and ecology (Anthropocene), "human" no longer suffices to define current notions of subjectivity. These approaches also find humanism to be no longer adequate to properly reflect the world, and those living in it. In his chapter in *The Routledge companion to literature and science* (Clarke 2012), Neil Badmington asserts that "anthropocentricism, with its assured insistence upon human exceptionalism, is no longer an adequate or convincing account of the way of the world" (Clarke 2012: 381).

In her entry on Posthuman Critical Theory in *Posthuman glossary* (2019), Rosi Braidotti describes said theory as drawing from feminist theory, and Deleuze and Guattari's neo-materialist philosophy in order to meet its challenges.

> [T]he first [challenge] is to acknowledge that subjectivity is not the exclusive prerogative of *Anthropos*. This means that it is not linked to transcendental reason and that it is unhinged from the dialectics of recognition. Secondly, the challenge is to develop a dynamic and sustainable notion of vitalist materialism that encompasses non-human agents, ranging from plants and animals to technological artefacts. Thirdly, it means to enlarge the frame and scope of ethical accountability along the trans versal lines of post-anthropocentric relations. In other words, the challenge is to create assemblages of human and non- human actors. (Braidotti and Hlavajova 2019: 339)

The combination of the above-mentioned philosophies in approaching these challenges lends way to "an anti-humanist and post-anthropocentric stance, which can innovate and invigorate discussions of naturalism, the environment, ecological justice, and the shifting status of the human. This results in the rejection of dualism" (340). Braidotti then concludes by describing posthuman critical theory as "vital-materialist, embodied and embedded, and immanent" (340).

In *The posthuman* (2013), Braidotti also draws attention to the aspect of Otherness. She defines humanism as "a doctrine that combines the biological, discursive and moral expression of human capabilities into an idea of technologically ordained, rational progress" (13). In this humanist doctrine, "Subjectivity is equated with consciousness, universal rationality, and self-regulating ethical behavior, whereas

Otherness is defined as its negative and specular counterpart" (13). The Posthuman condition, on the other hand, "urges us to think critically and creatively about who and what we are actually in the process of becoming" (12).

Discussing Nordic studies, relating to the survival of local traditions and customs on the margins of Christianity, in an entry on Postanimalism in *Posthuman glossary* (2019), Tsz Man Chan writes: "The extensive use of masks, of crossdressing, in many ways practices an idea of humanity that is far from modern, that does not position itself as opposed to the animal and to the world but that seems to be in search for situating a series of bonds, knots and connections between all of the things that matter in the here and now" (Braidotti and Hlavajova 2019: 331).

Zombies, artificial people and cyborgs can present a great tool to exploring post-human subjectivity. If we take the former for instance, many representations of zombies are about a potential, different mode of life, another realization of the infinite variety of becoming. In a transcendental framework, the zombie is a monstrosity which must be marginalized, or removed, as a dead body; but in a rhizomic, immanent framework, it is a mode of becoming post-human, not entirely human, but not an entirely different species. For example, the 2013 movie *Warm bodies* explores a romance between a Zombie and an uninfected human. The movie demonstrates an eerie picture of the zombies pre and post change (in the airport), with not much change occurring as they are had been previously "zombified" by their phones. The happy ending includes the zombies regaining consciousness as they reestablish human connection with others. In *I Am Legend*, a story of a last survivor of humanity, the novel ends with the protagonist discovering that the zombies had formed a society and that to them, *he* is the monster. Ultimately, it becomes a story of evolution and acceptance of change.

In his chapter "Posthuman Bodies", in *The Cambridge companion to the body in literature*, Paul Sheehan views posthuman becomings, not just as hypothetical, but as a very-much real possibility due to recent scientific developments. On an ontological level, he postulates that "the posthuman is the other than human, where otherness is defined by the principle of transformation" (Hillman and Maude 2015: 246). The idea of a posthuman body, a product of assemblages immediately brings to mind one of the most well-known and influential literary pieces in history – Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, wherein a scientist sets about "creating" the "perfect" human by a process

of assemblage, and harvesting of the most suitable body parts from a dead body, only to turn around and be horrified by his own creation once it/he becomes alive. Of said novel, Sheehan writes: “Although nineteenth-century literature is strewn with mutants, hybrids, and monsters, it is Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein, or The modern Prometheus* (1818) that provides the richest source for mythological posthumanism. […] Shelley’s novel establishes a paradigm for the posthuman body” (Hillman and Ulrika 246). In addition to a hybrid “monster", Frankenstein’s creature can also be seen as metamorphosis of the human race; like the zombies from Richard Matheson’s *I am legend*, he can be seen as a new type of human being. This view of monstrous beings as both abject, but also a symbolic representation of the evolution of the human race is not limited to recent depictions of said beings:

> Ovidian metamorphosis details a vast range of *sui generis* becomings, in which men and women are transformed into animals, trees, stones, flowers and even stars. In her study of Ovid’s cultural influence*, Fantastic metamorphoses, other worlds* , Marina Warner suggests that the metamorphic process at work here is both ’a prodigious interruption of natural development’ and as ’an organic process of life itself’. Yet within the stringency of this aporia lies the essential posthumanist operation, a modus that, as Patrick MacCormack puts it, ’opens up potentialities rather than repeating forms ’. (Hillman and Maude 2015: 247)

Zombies, monsters, hybrid beings – they are all in essence representations of potentialities of the human race, and our view of our own subjectivity.

Discussing the idea of hybridity and monstrosity, in his book, *The postmodern and animal* (2000), Steve Baker writes:

> In various ways, that the embracing of impurity, hybridity and monstrosity could be seen as a positively creative move. Margrit Shildrick argued that ’What monsters show us is the other of the humanist subject’; she was keen to explore the ways in which ’a humanist politics of norms and identity’ might give way to ’a politics of hybrids’. Lykke contended that the postmodern world she described created particular opportunities for feminism advantageously to employ the monster, the hybrid and the cyborg as ’evocative and open-ended’ metaphors. And in the editorial introduction to a special issue of Angelaki on ’Impurity’, authenticity and humanity’, Mozaffar Qizilbash chose to designate as ’impurists’ those fearless contemporary philosophers and artists whose boundary-crossing work was both rigorous and ’antidisciplinary’. (100)

Following an examination of the above-mentioned theories, be it through Bakhtin’s grotesque bodies and carnival, Kristeva’s abjection, or Deleuze and Guattari’s

approach to ’becoming’, and other strategies, human subjectivity can be seen through a new post-post-modern lens. In essence, it can be seen through a post-human lens. Physical shape-shifting, animal transformation, hybridity and the cyborg in fantasy and science fiction can serve as a tool to reexamine said new subjectivity. These transforming and unstable bodies can be seen as grotesque, mutable and abject. Human-animal transformations embrace Deleuze and Guattari’s becoming-animal, thus embracing multiplicity and becoming minoritarian. Cixous’s “The laugh of the medusa” indicates that Woman should write herself, thus paving the way to a different view of subjectivity, while Kristeva’s abjection indicates that the sense of discomfort associated with transforming bodies, is a discomfort with the “threat” to one’s own sense of identity and selfhood. If I cannot be different from the Other, then what and who am I? In Terry Pratchett’s Discworld, we are exposed to different types of transforming characters, from the Librarian, to Granny Weatherwax, Angua and the werewolves, to Greebo the cat. We also encounter cyborg-like being in the form of the Igors. By examining mutable characters, operating in a carnivalesque reality in works of fiction, one can perhaps develop an understanding of human subjectivity, thus perhaps, helping us reach an understanding regarding our own fluidity, our own posthumanist cyborg-like existence; thus, embracing our own multiplicity, and building a bridge between people, with the understanding that accepting the other, is not an attack on our own sense of selfhood.

Chapter 2: Pratchett in Context: An Overview of Folklore and Contemporary Fantasy Shape-Shifters

2.1. Folk and fairy-tale shape-shifters

While it is, in some respects, less direct than other genres, fantasy literature has its own means of engaging the reader in “real-life issues". Since fantasy is essentially drawn from and linked to reality (or rather to the social construction of reality, which fantasy often satirizes or criticizes); what it does is to defamiliarize the different aspects of reality in order to explore and explain them. This statement may be supported by Sigmund Freud who observes that the “’creative’ imagination, indeed, is quite incapable of inventing anything; it can only combine components that are strange to one another” (Freud 1973: 206). Though his statement might be questionable on certain levels, Freud touches upon the idea that the elements found in literature, “fantastical” as they may be are all rooted in deep human thoughts, and as such, to analyze said elements is to gain insight into deep human issues.

To examine fantasy texts is to become aware of different types of dreams, anxieties and fears, deeply embedded into the fabric of the stories. Fairy tales in particular carry sets of recognized motifs; a number of them have been known to resurface again and again in different forms throughout the years. This is why fantasy can be so easily related to narrative folklore, especially to the well known drastic, grotesque, and confusing images in folk-tales. For instance, Leppälahti and Tolley (2018) argue that the very emergence of fantasy is grounded in a relatively limited set of “strange things” (179) such as the living dead, metamorphoses, animation of inanimate

objects, and premonition and similar uncanny phenomena. The reciprocity between fairy tales found in different cultures begs the question of whether this is merely the result of migration? Or is there a deep unconscious "similarity" between different groups of people? To support the latter argument would suggest the "universality" of human experience. This approach is compatible with the writings of Carl Gustav Jung who argued in favor of the existence of an inherent collective unconscious, a "psychic system of a collective, universal, and impersonal nature which is identical in all individuals" (Jung 1980: 43). The building blocks of this system are called archetypes. These archetypes are patterns of thought or symbolic imageries found in the individual unconscious; they are structural representations of the collective unconscious inside the individual's mind. Taking this into consideration gives weight to the need to analyze fantastical elements of fiction, because understanding said elements, may truly be a way to understand aspects of the very essence of humanity itself.

Analyzing shapeshifting stories could be a way to achieve said understanding. While animals and monstrous creatures, such as werewolves, might at first glance appear divorced from the human condition, they are in fact deeply related to it. As Malcolm South notes in *Mythical and fabulous creatures*, "if [a monster] is to have a profound effect on us, it must reflect something meaningful about human experience and engage our emotions in a powerful way" (1987: xx).

Shape-shifting characters have existed in literature since antiquity. To attempt to map all of them can be a life-long project. From the first werewolf that is believed to have appeared in cave drawings, to the first literary monster that some attribute to *Beowulf*[7]; from Ovidian stories of transformation, to the more recent Kafkian metamorphosis' humans have sought stories of animal metamorphosis as "a way of constructing a social reality and an ontology", and accordingly understanding the human through the non-human (Asker 2001: 2). A critical analysis of shape-shifting characters can refer back to ancient examples, but need not focus exclusively on classical metamorphic texts, or on obvious images of bodily transformation. Instead, the analysis can explore a wide range of fictional works, searching for "ways in which human and

---

7

The origin of the poem, including date of creation and author remain under question. In his introduction to his translation of the epic poem, Seamus Heaney writes: "The poem called *Beowulf* was composed sometime between the middle of the seventh and the end of the tenth century of the firs millennium, in the language that is today called Anglo-Saxon or Old English"(vii)

animal realities can be blended without one necessarily and literally changing into the other" (Eubanks 2003: 177).

Ovidian shape-shifters for instance can be humans, nymphs or gods alike. Transformations can be a form of punishment like the case of Actaeon, a prince who is punished by the goddess Diana for seeing her bathe, turned into a stag and hunted by his own hounds. Medusa[8] (the namesake of Cixous's famous essay) was punished by Minerva (Athena in Greek mythology) for the "sin" of being violated in her temple by Neptune (Poseidon); with "punishment" not necessarily correlating with "justice". Said stories transformations can also be a gift, as is the case with Daphne, who sought a way to avoid Apollo's advances and was transformed by her father Peneus into a laurel; or they can be gods simply using the covering of an animal form to hide sexual escapades – as is the case with Jupiter (Zeus), who turned into a swan, a bull[9], and eagle and even fire and a shower of gold to name a few, during his escapades.

In general, one of the defining features of fantasy literature is its strong reliance on folklore (Klapcsik 2008), so that the genre can be described as an ironic, intertextual play with the fairy tale (318). As a product of and a commentary on modern Western culture, which is, in terms of folklore, is heavily influenced by that of European origins (which does not preclude other influences), Terry Pratchett's shape-shifting characters can be mostly seen through the prism of European representations of shape-shifting characters. This does not prevent Pratchett from pocking fun at said representations and conventions, with his various characterizations. Thus, readers are introduced to a vegetarian werewolf, a female dwarf who insists on showing her femininity – beard notwithstanding, and a "recovering" vampire, to name a few. In this chapter, I will introduce a few notable shapeshifting characters and character types from folk and fairy tales that bear relevance to some of the character analyses that will be done in the next chapter, with the understanding that these character types are not the only ones capable of shapeshifting in either world mythology or even the more specific European folklore.

8

Her transformation does not involve a full shape-shifting into animal form, but the sprouting of snake heads instead of her luscious hair.

9

Stories of Jupiter's escapades also include him transforming the object of his desire (the consent of whom varies) into different animals to avoid the watchful eye of his wife, such as in the case of Io (in the Greek version); while others involve his wife Juno punishing his willing/unwilling lovers, at times through transformation, as is the case with Callisto, who is turned into a bear.

Afterwards, I will introduce notable contemporary shapeshifting characters to allow for an examination of Pratchett's work within the literary context of 21st century fantasy writing.

Fairy tales have long since been woven into the fabric of human existence; a tapestry of myth and folklore, these tales hold within them the underlying hopes, anxieties, and ideals of the cultures and societies in which they develop. As they can reflect both local and global cultures across the centuries, it is not surprising that fairy tales have been used as both the basis for and subject of numerous studies, be they psychological, anthropological or social in nature, that aim to explore human nature, and human culture. For years, researchers such as Jack Zipes, Bruno Bettelheim, Marina Warner, and Maria Tatar have dedicated extensive amounts of work to the exploration and analysis of the various aspects of folklore and fairy tales.

Fantasy in general, and fairy-tales in particular, have at times been dismissed as escapist stories that avoid "potentially disturbing, anti-social drives and retreat from any profound confrontation with existential dis-ease" (Jackson 1981: 9). A deep examination of the roots of said tales would, however, suggest a different picture. Jack Zipes asserts that "authors used the genre of the fairy tale to articulate their personal desires, political views, and aesthetic preferences" and that the "dramatic quality of the best fairy tales lies in the tension between the author's utopian longings and society's regulation of drives and desires" (Zipes 1999: x). Zipes also indicates that while they "ferret out deep-rooted wishes, needs and wants and demonstrate how they all can be realized […] folk and fairy tales present a challenge, for within the tales lies the hope of self-transformation and a better world" (Zipes 2009: xi).

And far from being an escapist form of entertainment, in her book *The interpretation of fairy tales*, Marie-Louise von Franz describes fairy tales as the "simplest and purest expressions of the collective unconscious [which] offer the clearest understanding of the basic patterns of the human psyche." She continues by arguing that "[e]very people or nation has its own way of experiencing this psychic reality, and so a study of the world's fairy tales yields a wealth of insights into the archetypal experiences of humankind" (1996: 1). Indeed, while indicating that what are considered fairy tales are many times actually folk tales[10], Zipes points out that "the tales are

10

reflections of the social order in a given historical epoch, and, as such, they symbolize the aspirations, needs, dreams and wishes of common people in a tribe, community, or society, either affirming the dominant social values and norms or revealing the necessity to change them" (Zipes 2009: 7). He adds that

> such acts which occur in folk tales as cannibalism, human sacrifices, primogeniture and ultrageniture, the stealing and selling of a bride, the banishment of a young princess or prince, the transformation of people into animals and plants, the intervention of beasts and strange figures were all based on the social reality and beliefs of different primitive societies. Characters, too, such as water nymphs, elves, fairies, giants, dwarfs, ghosts were real in the minds of primitive and civilized peoples […] and they had a direct bearing on social behavior, world views, and legal codification. (8)

In this aspect, folk tales function in a similar manner to that of myth, whereby they were used "to explain the creation of the world, the existence of evil, and natural phenomena for which they have no scientific explanation" (Johnson and Johnson 2003: 15). In Greek mythology[11], for instance, the season change was the product of the goddess Demeter lamenting the loss of her daughter Persephone to Hades (during winter) and her happiness at reuniting with her (during spring); the echo was the result of a nymph (with the same name) being punished by Hera into only speaking words that uttered to her; and unexplained natural disasters were seen as the result of the gods' anger (or even fastidious and petulant nature).

As is the case with world mythology, shape-shifting is quite common in folk and fairy tales. In the latter's case, these transformations do not usually resemble the Ovidian[12] punishments or rewards from the gods. Many of these transformations can be said to fall under categories such as the "animal spouse" which diverges to include "swan-maidens" and "demon lovers"; others involve the deceptive nature of fairy-tale witches, warlocks and enchanters, with shape-shifting being another tool of witchcraft.

Zipes writes that "what we generally refer to as a fairy tale is quite often a folk tale which has its roots in the experience and fantasy of primitive peoples who cultivated the tale in an oral tradition. And it was this oral tradition which engendered the literary fairy tale which has assumed a variety of distinct and unique forms since the late Middle Ages."(*Breaking the Magic Spell : Radical Theories of Folk and Fairy Tales* xi)

11

Creation myths and myths involving natural phenomena and geological events are not limited to Greek mythology; but said mythology bears relevance to European folklore.

12

Ovid himself was Roman, and in his stories, he used the Roman names of the gods

The ogre in "Puss in Boots" is an example of an enchanter capable of transforming himself into many creatures. His gift, however, becomes a curse, when it, along with his hubris, is used against him, and leads to his downfall; as he in his arrogance, he is goaded into transforming into a mouse and is subsequently devoured by the cat. "The six swans" by the Brothers Grimm, or "The wild swans" in Hans Christian Andersen's version, falls under plot-cycle 451 – "The brothers who turned into birds", and involves an enchantment by a jealous step-mother, whereby the sons of the king (be they six or eleven) are turned into wild swans, and are only saved through their sister's efforts, as she spends year silently[13] (and painfully) knitting coats/shirts for them made out of nettles; almost burning at the stake as a witch, before completing (most of) the coats/shorts, and helping her brothers regain their human appearance. The tribulations of a heroine, forced to silently endure pain for years, remaining steadfast, even at the threat of death, is one of the major ways that spells are broken, and transformations occur. In this story, it is sibling love that drives this devotion, but in other stories (such as "Beauty and the Beast" or even its predecessor Eros/Cupid and Psyche) the love is that of a romantic or marital nature.

As many of these transformations (and certainly the ones that are the focus of this paper) involve human-animal shapeshifting, it is worthwhile to make a note of human's relationship with animals as is represented by western folklore. In *Folklore and reality*, Lutz Röhrich writes:

> Broadly generalizing, we find positive and negative attitudes toward animals in folklore. One view sees animals as related, equal, or even superior to humans; the other sees them leading a miserable, subhuman existence purely to serve man. In either case animals are always perceived in human terms: humans measure animal physiognomy, anatomy, poise, and way of life by their own standards. It is only a small step from this conception to the idea that animals are transformed humans. In our folklore, transformation into an animal is usually a tragic fate which degrades the victim into a nonhuman. The human innocently suffers this fate brought about by an evil witch or a curse […]. (Röhrich and Tokofsky 1991: 79)

---

13 The image of a female character, forced into silence, knitting her way into liberation, is reminiscent of the Greek myth of Philomena, who after being brutally raped and having her tongue cut out by her brother-in-law, uses her weaving skills, to create a tapestry that would help her share her story with her sister, allowing them to have (a horrific form of) vengeance on the sister's husband Tereus by feeding him his son. Unlike Lycaon, who tried to trick Zeus into eating human flesh, and was thus punished and transformed into the first Lycan, the sisters are transformed by the gods into a nightingale and a swallow and allowed to escape, while the husband/brother-in-law is turned into a hoopoe. Ovid's Metamorphoses stories, show us how Greek and Roman mythical transformations are not exclusively a form of punishment or reward; they can be either or both.

2.1.1. Animal spouses

Several plot cycles in fairy tales contain the theme of shape-shifting. One of the most prominent of these plot cycles is that of the "animal spouse" (most notably the animal groom and swan maiden).

> The folklore about marriage to an animal offers an abundance of important enchantment and disenchantment motifs. Although the motif complexes are distributed among various tale types (Types 400-459), the scheme itself ("Transformation into an Animal and Disenchantment through Marriage) is quite general, and more versions of this have been recorded around the world than any other. (Röhrich and Tokofsky 1991: 83)

While swan maidens and animal grooms and brides all involve a spouse that takes the form of an animal, a notable difference is that while an animal groom (and bride) is a human man cursed into animal form, a swan maiden is a being (often a fairy) from a supernatural realm, who is forced to "marry, keep house for, and bear children to a mortal man because he retains her animal covering, an article of clothing, or some other possession without which she cannot return to the other world. When she regains her prized belonging, she flees her husband and children" (Leavy 1995: 1). "Swan maiden" effectively acts as a universal term for supernatural wives, whether they transform into an actual swan or into any other animal. Though not truly human, this character type serves to represent the forcible domestication of women by men, and also emphasizes the "common assumption […] that woman is more 'natural' than man. And so long as the 'natural' in human beings is denigrated, so will woman be seen as more irrational than man, more ready to succumb to basic drives" (82). Interestingly, Leavy notes that in legends where swan maiden stories are depicted as real events, "when the legendary captured fairy bride escapes from woman's traditional role, she rarely comes back to her human family, and that it is mainly in the fairy tale that the swan maiden will be reconciled to her husband or be disenchanted by him in order to live as a human being in his world" (2). Not unlike Hans Christian Andersen's mermaid (who does gain a soul for her efforts), the swan maiden does not remain in the human world; as "wild women" who exist outside the frame of traditional female roles cannot become domesticated, even should they want to.

As shape-shifting is a process of change and mutability; it can be associated with the female body, more so than with the male body. However, that does not preclude the existence of male shape-shifters, on the contrary. One well-known animal spouse type common in fairy tales is that of the "animal groom". "Animal groom tales have long been recognized as being connected to the swan maiden type tale, the most obvious similarity being that the brute exterior of the beast can be at times discarded, just as the swan maiden can take off the feather dress that makes her a bird or lay her animal skin aside to take human form" (103). However, said type differs from the swan maiden in that the shape-shifter is actually a human, who is cursed into becoming a monster.

One of the most widely recognized stories falling under the animal groom category, arguably belonging to the Cupid (or Eros) and Psyche tale type, is that of "Beauty and the Beast"[14], where a young woman goes into a beast's castle as a sacrifice in order to save her father's life. Zipes traced the origins of the tale to ancient times, stating that the "transformation of an ugly beast into a savior as a motif in folklore can be traced to primitive fertility rites in which virgins and youths were sacrificed to appease the appetite and win the favor of a drought dragon or serpent" (Zipes 2009: 10). The story as we know it, which in the Madame de Beaumont version (one of the most famous versions) is, in essence, an exemplary tale for young women, demonstrating ladylike behavior, humility, obedience to one's parents, and acceptance of a chosen husband despite his unsavory appearance. Maria Tatar, in *The classic fairy tales*, affirms that Madame de Beaumont's tale "attempts to steady the fears of young women, to reconcile them to the custom of arranged marriages" (1999: 27). Once the fairy-tale's young bride accepts her husband as he is, the ugly and frightful beast transforms into a handsome prince, which is framed as a worthy reward for her social conformity.

> Animal-groom stories are very popular in European folktale tradition, and Bettelheim (1977: 310) believes they teach women and men to change radically previously held attitudes toward sex in order to love. The story has meaning for men as well as women because both genders have sexual anxieties learned in early childhood. The heroine, who transforms the beast into a man by showing him compassion and devotion, is the woman

---

14 In *The Serpent and the Swan: The Animal Bride in Folklore and Literature* (1998), Boria Sax writes: "While motifs and fragments that suggest that an animal groom tale go[es] back to remote antiquity, a complete story of an animal groom first appeared as the tale of 'Cupid and Psyche' in *The Golden Ass* by Lucius Apuleius, written in Latin during the first century A.D. Many scholars regard the 'Beauty and the Beast' cycle (tale type 425A) as a literary creation of Apuleius, which entered oral tradition..."(76)

> who conquers her feelings, learned through socialization, that sex is a beastly experience. The animal, who turns into a handsome prince, is the man who learns to replace phallic aggression with heterosexual love and thus no longer sees himself as repulsive to women. (Taggart 1990: 146)

In the Grimms' "Frog king or Iron Heinrich", the most widely known (though not the first) version of "The frog prince" tale, a related yet slightly different theme emerges. The princess in that story grudgingly agrees to let a frog sleep in her bed, in turn for him retrieving her golden ball from the bottom of a well. Unlike Beauty, however, the princess, in this story does not break the frog's spell by graciously accepting him in his revolting shape, nor does she transform him "by showing him compassion and devotion" (Taggart 1990: 146); she does so by fervently and forcefully guarding her virginity from a male figure that shares her intimate space (her bedroom), but to whom she is not married. The most recognizable (and most referenced) part of the story, where the princess breaks the frog's spell with a kiss (thus cementing the popular idea of having to kiss a frog in order to find a prince) is absent from the original tale[15]. She "balks at the idea of letting the frog into her bed. Flying into a rage, she hurls the erotically ambitious frog against the wall" (Tatar 1999: 29). This act of violence leads to the frog's transformation into a prince, and the subsequent happy ending in the form of a proper marriage (with the required blessing of the bride's father). In this case, the virtue at the center of the story, and for which the heroine is rewarded, is not that of compassionate devotion to a seemingly monstrous husband, but the protection of one's virtue prior to matrimony. It is not the kiss that brings about the transformation, but the zealous protection of one's chastity. Of course, as Terry Pratchett deals widely with popular culture, *his* frog prince (who is in fact a real frog), appearing in *Witches abroad*, *does* need the famed kiss to receive his happy ending, as dictated by the rules of the story.

---

15 According to Heidi Anne Heiner in *The Frog Prince and Other Frog Tales from Around the World*, "The famous kiss is a relatively recent modification to the tale, its exact origin unknown. Many scholars believe it to be an Anglo-American addition derived from Edgar Taylor's translation. [...] Its first introduction remains shrouded in mystery for now, but it's almost certainly fairly recent. Somehow it was introduced into the tale and now it is arguably the most important, at least most recognized, element of the tale. [...] Mystery or not, the kissed Frog Prince is a well-known part of our popular culture..."(Heiner 14)

Figure 2. Paul Friedrich Meyerheim, The Frog Prince (1889)[16]

An animal bride type also exists. However, while the animal groom contains direct relevance to one of the characters that I wish to explore in Terry Pratchett's work, the "animal bride" does not. That said, it should be noted that as is the case with the "swan maiden", the animal bride's gender also plays a role in her story, with many explanations existing to "account for the negative portrayal of animal brides. One [being] a generalization of antifeminism often reflected in folklore, but a more specific argument that woman's menstrual cycle and ability to bear children emphasize her link to the natural world" (Leavy 195: 222).

Both women and animals, however, are minoritarian, in essence. Thus,

> animal groom, and animal bride stories differ in that the animal groom's disenchantment seems to be based on the assumption that the human form is the true form, the bestial shape some aberration (except in stories where a demon's human form constitutes a deception), whereas a basic assumption about woman is that her beast form defines her essential being. Moreover, natural woman frustrates man's attempt to control the wild man within, and thus woman poses a danger in his ever-constant struggle to rise above the beast. [However, said] woman may prefer the beast to the prince, may prefer, that is,

16 The illustration is in the public domain. Published in the Brothers Grimms' *Kinder- und Hausmärchen* (1812). Retrieved from: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:GmimmTheFrogPrince.gif

> debased nature to the confines of civilization: it is then she who is the animal, her beast paramour virtually an extension of herself. (Leavy 1995: 221)

Interestingly, in Angela Carter's "The tiger bride" (which will be further discussed in this chapter), the protagonist's embracing of a tiger form, as she joins her paramour in becoming an animal, involves just such a rejection of "civilization", though, unlike tales of old, said rejection is not framed as negative.

Similar to stories in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, not all shape-shifting fairy tales are about conformity, regression or punishment, several in fact, involve a process of release, with the transformation allowing the person to shed the shackles of his/her previous life. In *Folklore and reality*, Lutz Röhrich writes:

> The person transformed into an animal is usually damned to lead an idle existence while patiently waiting to be disenchanted. But in some very different cases the animal body increases, rather than reduces, the human's abilities. This latter, far more ancient view of reality appears in tales in which transformation is not a punishment but rather an ability the hero acquires through friendly coexistence with animals. (Röhrich and Tokofsky 1991: 80)

This view can be seen more clearly in cultures that are closer to nature. "transformations that occur in tribal folklore need not be undone at the story's end" (82). This is because totemic tribal world-views do not see animals as lesser than human. Thus, it is not unheard of that an animal groom story will involve a woman being married to an animal, with no curse or disenchantment in the horizon. Some stories involve the human choosing to transform him/herself into animal form. We can see the effect of these perspectives in more recent media and literature. If we think for instance of DreamWorks' *Shrek* (2001), which, at the time, revolutionary involved a happy ending where the princess transforms into an ogre, or Such is Walt Disney's *Brother bear* (2003)[17], where the protagonist, who originally forced to turn into a bear, chooses to remain as such even after being given the opportunity to become human again after creating a lasting connection of found-family in animal form. But the roots of these ideas, what is believed to be societies with "proto-totemic mentality", have narratives where "humans are not transformed, but rather they *transform themselves*

17

A similar theme is explored in its direct-to-video sequel *Brother Bear 2* (2006), with the difference being that the relationship at the center of the plot is a romantic one rather than a "familial" one.

[…] slowly as the humans constantly associate with the animals" (Röhrich and Tokofsky 1991: 81).

2.1.2. Hidden beauty, hidden self: A Cinderella transformation

Although quite common, not every transformation in folk and fairy-tales is magically based. In other words, some are "grounded" and take the form of a simple disguises, an idea which can be related to Plato's philosophy of love and beauty. Be it in our everyday life, or the philosophy of love, the concept of love is inextricably linked to the idea of beauty, (subjective as "beauty" might be). In his *Symposium*, Plato presents the argument that as the first thing that draws a man to a woman, physical beauty is in effect the "birthplace" of love; followed by a man's exploration of the beauty of the mind, and if he "comes across a beautiful, noble, well-formed mind, then he finds the combination particularly attractive" (Plato 1989: 210), which enables him to achieve a higher degree of love[18]. That said, Plato does not contemplate the next logical question regarding the existence of a "beautiful mind" in an unattractive body.

While Plato, himself, does not address the dilemma of inner and outer beauty, folk and fairy tales, as cultural reflections, have been exploring this notion for centuries, with the motif of a "truly" beautiful person concealed behind an ugly façade appearing in countless folktales around the world. Along with the lesson of not judging a person's merit by their outer "shell", animal shapeshifting stories such as "The frog prince" and "Beauty and the beast" also tap into a human need to be recognized by loved ones, even beneath the most hideous of covers. One variant of the Cinderella story has her (at times assisted by another woman) purposely try "to conceal her beauty and get the prince to recognize her in ugly form as the woman he loves" (Taggart 1990: 98). The heroine is, in effect, attempting to achieve the antithesis of Plato's theory – to have her prince recognize and acknowledge her interior "beauty", even while being veiled by exterior

---

[18] Plato's theory is extensive and delves into the stages of love that lead to immortality. In this section, I am only referencing a small portion and one aspect of his work, and am, by no means, attempting to thoroughly encompass it.

"ugliness". Only upon his success, is the prince rewarded by the reveal of the heroine's (beautiful) true form.

This plot-point intimates a maiden's fears and her need to be recognized for the person she *is*, and not for her physical appearance, which is transient; as well as her struggle "with a man who has fallen in love with her at first sight because she is beautiful and sees her as he wants to rather than how she sees herself" (Taggart 1990: 99). The "idealized image" that men might attribute to women strips them of their own identity, and forces qualities upon them that they neither necessarily have, nor desire. This, in effect, renders women as the objects and reflections of men's desire or love, rather than individuals in their own right; which is in line with Plato's view of the love of the beautiful as a love for the reflection of that beauty upon the person himself. Thus, Cinderella's struggle becomes that freedom, of a need for the recognition of individuality and personhood; and not as a mere mirror of the prince's needs, desires, and expectations. As such, her bodily transformation becomes more of a revolt against her societal image and the possible expectations the prince might have, than a manifestation of an inner self. Even though her "transformation" is not magical in nature, it nevertheless allows her to attain the release and independence that a bodily metamorphosis does; and only when said goal is reached does she (like the animal spouses) revert to her original "shape", her true "self".

In *Witches abroad*, a "Cinderella" character is bound by the power of the story to kiss a frog prince during a ball. Her struggle against doing so shows a different side to rebellion against society, as all conventions are driving her towards this end result, with her refusing to be reshaped by the story into the heroine the plot demands. In a way, she is refusing to be "gaslighted" by the powers surrounding her into believing that this is truly her "happily ever after", or that said "happily ever after" is even necessary.

Some Cinderella stories involve the heroine covering herself following a sexual attack or thread by her father (or father figure)[19]. "The Aarne-Thompson index of tale types identifies two distinct Cinderella tales: AT 510A ('Cinderella') and AT 510B

19

To extrapolate from that, one might say that the ash covering the heroine's face could be seen as a symbolic sign of purification from sin, partially similar to how Ash Wednesday is observed in Chrisitan tradition.

(’The Dress of Gold, of Silver, and of Stars,’ also known as ’Catskin’)” (Tatar 1999: 102). A story that belongs to the second type is that of Charle Charles Perrault’s “Donkeyskin"(1694), (and its corresponding Grimm counterpart “Thousandfurs"). This story, does not have an evil stepmother, but an incestuous intent on the part of the father, which is the driving force for the heroine to don a hideous disguise.

In this story, a king attempts to marry his daughter, which is a matter of great taboo. The tale “tackles the meanings of incest as reflected in fairy tales. Once widely told, now almost suppressed, this peculiar story sympathetically dramatizes an early phase in the establishment of adolescent autonomy” (Warner 1999: xxv). After unsuccessfully thwarting him by two challenges that he prevails (presenting her with a dress the color of the sky, one the color of the moon, and one the color of the sun), the princess desperately asks for the skin of his golden-egg laying donkey, thinking that he will balk at said request. After he presents her with said skin, the princess escapes to a neighboring country with the understanding that this is her only solution. For the majority of the rest of the story, the princess hides beneath the skin of the dead animal, in a way channeling the shame that should be her father’s lot. “Many ’Catskin’ narratives, among them Perrault’s ’Donkeyskin’ and the Grimms’ ’Thousandfurs’, mount two phases of action: In the first, the heroine is persecuted by her father, and in the second she turns into a Cinderella figure, obliged to spend her days in domestic servitude under the supervision of a despotic cook or a queen” (Tatar 1999: 103).

In relation to shape-shifting, one should not only be interested in the obvious cases of transformation. There are ideas related to the topic, hidden under seemingly different themes; so is the case of the above-mentioned “clothes", and so is the case of some of the fairy tales’ talking animals. The wolf in “Little Red Riding Hood” is a prime example of this[20]. Many have been the studies conducted on the symbolism of said wolf, ranging from the idea of “sexual predators” reaching even the girl’s own developing lust. In many of these interpretations, there is a consensus that the wolf is in fact a man. Some reinterpretations of “Little Red Riding Hood”, such as Angela Carter’s short story “The company of wolves” (1979), turn the wolf from a regular beast

---

20 Again, *Witches Abroad* also includes a wolf character that will be further discussed in the next chapter

into a werewolf, emphasizing the dimension of human relations and, in her case, the sexual aspect.

Shape-shifters in fairy tales can be associated with Jung's "trickster" archetype, since shape-shifting is identified as one of the trickster's characteristics:

> Like the trickster, the shape-shifter is both human and bestial and therefore shares an affinity with the part of the psyche that Jung calls the shadow. That said, the shape-shifter does not have to be bestial; it can be a supernatural magician like Malory's Merlyn and Spenser's Archimago (Stypczynski 2013: 12).

The shape-shifter differs from the trickster, since the former does not normally, or solely work through the application of pranks; rather most shape-shifting figures are either victims of other characters' cruelty, exist with the aid of a demon, or are amoral agents with little concern for society or humanity. However, both the shape-sifter and trickster are agents of change. "In archetypal terms, the shape-shifter reminds us that mutability, both replacement and evolution, is a constant in life. Depending on its manifestation, the shape-shifter, especially as the werewolf, can represent social or political change" (Stypczynski 2013: 13).

In a way, the shape-shifter functions as both an agent of nature and society. By allowing humans to tap into their natural urges without rancor, one is able (in a similar manner to Dr. Jekyll) to maintain a sense of social self, and separate him/herself from the actions that constitute social transgression, minor or severe as they may be.

> [T]he theriomorph (human-animal shifter) also functions to separate humanity from excessive violence [...] By blaming the transgressive violence and sex on the beast, the human part of the individual is absolved even as it is punished. This role as psychological release valve brings the archetype into a closer relationship with the shadow, that part of the psyche made up of all the socially transgressive impulses. The shape-shifter archetype allows the shadow to be vicariously exercised, thereby helping the individual to come to terms with the shadow and maintaining the social structure by releasing some of the pressure created by the collective shadow. (Stypczynski 2013: 14)

On the Discworld, werewolves are a species onto themselves. Examining their interactions as both agents of nature and of culture (as they maintain social norms, and an active aristocracy), while focusing on Angua, the werewolf who chooses to eschew her family and species traditions, in favor of becoming a policewoman in the city will allow for a deeper understanding of the topic. A traditionally Othered "species"

maintaining a culture that can be as excluding as the human one can offer a prism into cultural norms and expectations.

2.1.3. Werewolves: The classic shape-shifters

When thinking of shapeshifting characters, the most recognizable figure is that of the werewolf. An integral part of folklore for centuries, a werewolf is a person, as the name would suggest, who transforms into a wolf; this is the basic agreed-upon description. There are, however, many discrepancies regarding any other detail; ranging from the initial circumstances of the transformation (e.g., rubbing a witch's salve on one's body, wearing a magic belt, being diseased, being bit by a werewolf, or making a deal with the Devil), and ending with accompanying lore such as the werewolf's need for a full moon, or that he or she can only be killed by silver. It is difficult to make generalizations about the study of werewolves; this is because as Willem de Blécourt describes it, the field is fragmented and underdeveloped.

> Academic publications mostly stem from different disciplines: history, folklore, and literary and cultural studies. There is very little exchange between the three, which is understandable because each discipline is concerned with quite different werewolves. Those werewolves that feature in modern literature and films can be readily distinguished from those that are the subject of early modern trial records and nineteenth- and twentieth-century folklore texts by the mechanism of the metamorphosis. (2013: 188)

Nevertheless, as my interest in the field concerns the transformation process from a philosophical point of view, and focuses on issues of identity, I will refrain from delving further into this debate, and focus instead on the werewolves as presented in the texts dealt with in my dissertation. Of course, I cannot do that without first presenting a brief glimpse of the original werewolves of myth and folklore.

Man's fear of and fascination with creatures such as werewolves and vampires have existed since ancient times. From cave paintings depicting these monsters, to classical writings discussing them, it seems that they have always been part of the human psyche. The earliest reference to werewolves or werewolf-like creatures is arguably in one of two texts. The first, which is also the older of the two, is *The epic of Gilgamesh* (around 3000 BC), and it is one of the oldest known texts. In the story, the

hero Gilgamesh is on the receiving end of Ishtar's love interest. Though she is the goddess of fertility, love, war, and sex, Gilgamesh nevertheless rejects her, because of the way she treated her past suitors; one of whom, a shepherd, she turned into a wolf and caused him to be torn to shreds by his hounds. A parallel to this story exists in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (completed in 8 A.D.); there, however, the victim – prince Actaeon is transformed into a stag and torn to bits by his hounds, as a punishment for spying on the bathing goddess Artemis.

Though the shepherd's story is in fact one of transformation, some would argue that due to the fact that it relates to a single transformation brought about by a deity, and is of a permanent, and deadly nature, it is not precisely a werewolf story. Instead, we are referred to another ancient text the *Satyricon* (around 61 A.D.), a collection of stories traditionally attributed to Petronius, which mixes prose and poetry. Here, we are introduced to the character of Niciros who talks about an incident that occurred to him. As he tells it, while travelling the land in order to see his sweetheart, accompanied by a soldier, they come across a graveyard and the soldier decides to relieve himself there. Niciros is struck by fear when his acquaintance suddenly strips off his clothes, makes a circle of urine around them, and transforms into a wolf. The man then goes on to attack the livestock at the sweetheart's house and is shot in the neck by a slave. Niciros rushes back and goes on to say:

> And when I came to the spot where his clothes had turned to stone, I found nothing but bloodstains. However, when I got home, my soldier friend was lying in bed like a great ox with the doctor seeing to his neck. I realized he was a werewolf and afterwards I couldn't have taken a bite of bread in his company, not if you killed me for it. (Sullivan 1986: 74)

Though of completely different natures, both acts of wolf transformation mentioned above are preceded by heinous crimes or acts of social taboo. The soldier Niciros speaks of begins his transformation by desecrating a cemetery. When he later performs the ritual of shedding his clothes and urinating around them, he symbolizes his disregard for social norms and the return to nature.

In the case of the shepherd, because of his blind love for Ishtar, he "slaughtered his kids and cooked them for [her] day after day"[21] (Tablet VI). The slaughter of the herd is brought about to show how devoted to, or obsessed the shepherd is with the

---

21

goddess, for what shepherd would kill his own sheep. The fact that he kills the kids is important, for he chooses to slaughter the youngsters, those most helpless, the ones that will be the making of his future herd. Though it is not explicitly referred to as such, it does seem as if he is murdering his own children in honor of the goddess, for he is murdering his own future for her.

Werewolf lore traditionally contains much “bestiality". The transformation into a wild beast implies a hidden one inside the person; even if said person is mild-mannered and quiet. The wolf symbolizes the inner rage carried beneath our social disguises. In the case of Lycaon, King of Arcadia, and the origin of the term Lycanthropy, the outer beast is in fact only a representation of a terrible inner beast; At least according to Ovid’s version. In the *Metamorphoses*, Lycaon is a tyrant who both defies Jove, and also practices cannibalism, with both acts bringing about Jove’s wrath. Accordingly, Jove transforms him into a wolf, as a punishment. Caroline Walker Bynum defines Lycaon’s cannibalism in her 1999 lecture “Shape and story: Metamorphosis in the western tradition” as a human turning another not just into food, but into *himself*, which is, in itself, an act of change and boundary-crossing. As such, the physical transformation becomes a final and definitive reflection of an inherent one. Despite the “change” that Lycaon undergoes, however, Bynum makes a point of highlighting his “sameness”, as in, the parallel between his human and animal selves, stating that:

> Lycaon is what he was before: with his “accustomed greed” for blood he turns against the sheep, “delighting still in slaughter.” The greed he carries into wolfhood was his already by custom and practice; the delight in slaughter is “still” present. The poem not only states explicitly that traces remain, but also hammers away, “same, same, same.” “…the same grey hair, the same fierce face [the word is *vultus*, not muzzle or snout], the same gleaming eyes, the same image of beastly savagery".[22] (Bynum 1999)

The wolf appears to already be a part of Lycaon’s self, even prior to the physical transformation that he undergoes, with said physical change becoming merely the concluding representation of a process, whereby the body comes to reflect the inner core. As Bynum observed in an earlier article (1998: 987), the drastic imagery of transformation could reflect a fear of “loss of oneself through loss of the body”, which

---

Edition/translation: George, A. R. *The Epic of Gilgamesh: The Babylonian Epic Poem and Other Texts in Akkadian and Sumerian; Translated and with an Introduction by Andrew George*. London: Penguin Books, 2000. P.49

22

Transcript retrieved from: https://www.neh.gov/news/press-release/1999-03-22

she could find in Medieval source materials, but which is probably quite common in every epoch.

The idea of the inner beast, particularly when dealing with werewolves, is not limited to classic literature. Werewolves are frequently presented as mindless beasts in search of humans to kill. In his book *The essential guide to werewolf literature*, Brian J. Frost refers to said inner beast as Jung's archetype of the "Shadow", which was discussed previously. Frost's "Shadow" werewolf consists

> of a conglomerate of inborn collective predispositions, consciously abhorred and rejected by the ego for ethical and rational reasons. Instinctual, amoral, and savage, the Shadow is none other than the bestial 'Mr. Hyde' imprisoned inside all of us – an inescapable nemesis always threatening to block out the conscious principles of the ego. Also known as our 'dark twin' or 'other self', the Shadow usually manifests itself in dreams, though sometimes it irrupts into consciousness, causing irrational thoughts and insane behavior. All that is needed is a suitable catalyst, and a normally placid, well-balanced person can suddenly become a raging wolf in all but form. (Frost 2003: 19)

Thus, in essence, everyone has an inner wolf waiting to pounce.

Figure 3. Wolf-Boy, the Nuremberg Chronicles, 1493[23]

23

2.2. Notable contemporary fantasy shape-shifters and their folkloric influences

"Fantasy is hardly an escape from reality. It's a way of understanding it"
- Lloyd Alexander

In order to put Terry Pratchett's work in context, one must make a survey of other contemporary works of fantasy that heavily incorporate shapeshifting characters that bear the traces of folklore and fairy tale inspirations. Pratchett, as most contemporary fantasy artists do, writes in a network of references to well-known canonical works, using various modes of intertextuality, such as parody and pastiche, and making polemical statements for or against works by other authors (either directly or through characters and imagery). For an interpretation of Pratchett's work, it is important to identify such contexts, particularly in a discussion of his characters, who have been described as "cultural palimpsests" (Haberkorn 2007: 319), as they are virtually made of references, allusions, and parodic, implicit quotations.

From stories found in *The Ballantine adult fantasy series*[24], which included the works of authors such as James Branch Cabell[25], to even J.R.R. Tolkien, and to more recent authors such as Angela Carter, J.K. Rowling, Neil Gaiman, and Naomi Novik, many magical races and creatures are recognizable to the Western reader, albeit with each author's own unique spin on them. Thus, Stephanie Meyer's vampires cannot go out in the sun because their skin shines diamond-like, while in Deborah Harkness' All Souls series, it is humans who refuse to "see" vampires or other magical creatures, with the light of day making it more difficult for them:

> 'What's the truth in the story about vampires not being allowed inside without an invitation?' Having pressed him on his diet, I focused on the entrance protocols.

Illustrations from the Nuremberg Chronicle, by Hartmann Schedel (1440-1514). The Nuremberg Chronicle is in the public domain. Source: Beloit College's coloured English edition, retrieved from: https://web.archive.org/web/20110806202811/http://www.beloit.edu/nuremberg/index.htm

24

The Ballantine Adult Fantasy Series, began in 1969 and re-published many noteworthy works of the likes of James Branch Cabell, William Morris, Lord Dunsany, George MacDonald and H.P. Lovecraft., thus making them accessible to the wider public.

25

whose works of folklore and ironic sword-and-sorcery are thought to have heavily influenced Terry Pratchett, Neil Gaiman, and others.

> 'Humans are with us all the time. They just refuse to acknowledge our existence because we don't make sense in their limited world. Once they allow us in—see us for who we really are—then we're in to stay, just as someone you've invited into your home can be hard to get rid of. They can't ignore us anymore.'
>
> 'So it's like the stories of sunlight,' I said slowly. 'It's not that you can't be in sunlight, but when you are, it's harder for humans to ignore you. Rather than admit that you're walking among them, humans tell themselves you can't survive the light.'
>
> Matthew nodded again. 'They manage to ignore us anyway, of course. We can't stay indoors until it's dark. But we make more sense to humans after twilight […]' (Harkness 2011: 142)

The idea that humans are unable to see beyond mundane reality is present in other literary works. While in the Percy Jackson series[26] by Rick Riordan, it is a magical mist that blinds them to the supernatural world; in Terry Pratchett's work, they are capable of blinding themselves to "unpalatable" truths without outside interference, such as the manifestation of a giant dragon of legend, or the continued existence of a wizard who is supposed to die. Humans are capable of shaping their own reality to fit their narratives without the existence of magic. Whether through that defining element of humanity, or through our constant mutability, ultimately, we are all shape-shifters in one way or another; we might just not display it outwardly for the world to see.

2.2.1. J.R.R. Tolkien: The mountain and the river

J.R.R. Tolkien's Middle-earth series has been cited by many fantasy authors as a source of inspiration, so that the legacy of Tolkien's work can even be described as a defining feature of the entire fantasy genre (Attebery 1992: 14). Whether consciously or subconsciously, many contemporary fantasy authors nowadays draw inspiration from it. Pratchett provides an interesting perspective into contemporary fantasy writers' relationship with Tolkien, stating:

> J. R. R. Tolkien has become a sort of mountain, appearing in all subsequent fantasy in the way that Mt. Fuji appears so often in Japanese prints. Sometimes it's big and up close.

26 A young adult series largely inspired by and based on the events and characters of the Odyssey

> Sometimes it's a shape on the horizon. Sometimes it's not there at all, which means that the artist either has made a deliberate decision against the mountain, which is interesting in itself, or is in fact standing on Mt. Fuji. […] *The Lord of the rings*, while English to the bone, was not a typical British fantasy book. It was not part of the mainstream, even though it is now a river in its own right and has spawned numerous tributaries and has come to define "fantasy" for many people. (Pratchett 2015: 119) [27]

Shape-shifters exist in Tolkien's world as well. In *The hobbit* (1937) the prequel to *The lord of the rings*, and set in the same fictional land of Middle-earth, the characters' journey brings them face to face with one such character. Beorn[28] is, a skin-changer that appears to be the bridge between humanity and nature. Gandalf describes him to Bilbo as follows:

> He changes his skin: sometimes he is a huge black bear, sometimes he is a great strong black-haired man with huge arms and a great beard. […]. Some say that he is a bear descended from the great and ancient bears of the mountains that lived there before the giants came. Others say that he is a man descended from the first men who lived before Smaug or the other dragons came into this part of the world, and before the goblins came into the hills out of the North. (Tolkien 1995: 135)

Beyond protean his ability to shape-shift, and the ambiguity of whether he is a man who transforms into a bear, or a bear that is able to take the shape of a human, with the question becoming whether or not it matters as both shapes constitute an integral part of his identity; Beorn presents an interesting picture of living with nature and becoming a part of nature. He is non-disruptive to the world around him; he opts for natural materials such as wood in its almost rawest form, eschewing gold, metal, or any form of industrialization; he is a vegetarian, who not only coexists with animals, birds, and insects, but actively interacts and communicates with them. "They work for him and talk to him. He does not eat them; neither does he hunt or eat wild animals" (136). Living in a self-constructed Eden-like environment, not only can Beorn work as a representation of a possible missing link in human evolution, in a way, he can work as a posthuman ideal to strive for, a non-disruptive, harmonious existence with the natural world.

---

27 The book does not have page numbers. The aforementioned quote is taken from the chapter: "Magic Kingdoms".

28 While the name itself means "warrior", Beorn is etymologically related to "Bjorn" which means "Bear".

As Oziewicz and Hade argued, Tolkien initiated a redefinition of British "fantasy tradition" (2010: 39), initiating a string of bestselling novel cycles with serious religious and ethical undertones, ranging from Tolkien, through C.S. Lewis, to Philip Pullman and, arguably, Terry Pratchett, as part of the "long wave" of the "British boom" in contemporary fantasy and science fiction (Butler 2003: 376-77). One of the features of this tradition is the use of transformation imagery as moral allegory. A shape-shifting character can also be found in the writings of J.R.R. Tolkien's friend and fellow author - C.S. Lewis. In *The voyage of the Dawn Trader* (1952), the third book of the Chronicles of Narnia series, readers are introduced to Eustace Scrubb, a bratty arrogant 11-year-old, who has to be transformed into a dragon in order for him to undergo character development. At the beginning of the novel, he is introduced as such: "There was a boy called Eustace Clarence Scrubb, and he almost deserved it" (Lewis 2019: 1). Throughout his adventures with Lucy, Edmund and the crew of the Dawn Treader, Eustice comes across the body of a dead dragon. In folklore, dragons are depicted as greedy creatures, who are hoarding some treasure. This can be seen in Tolkien's *The hobbit* with the character of Smaug, in Le Guin's Earthsea stories[29], and indeed in Lewis' book as well. Eustice steals some of the treasure for himself, and is in turn, transformed into a dragon himself; whether a manifestation of his inner dragon-greed, or a punishment for stealing, Eustice's transformation becomes a way for him to improve himself throughout the novel and become a better person, with the arm-ring that he stole, tightly squeezing his foreleg, Dragon-Eustace is constantly aware of his self-inflicted plight. Although sad and lonely, instead of sinking into bitterness, Eustace's new form provides him with a new perspective, and as he works to become a better person in dragon form, Eustace becomes a better human being overall.

29

The Earthsea dragons are eloquent and learned; they neither good nor evil, but they are dangerous and interested in treasure. There is also indications that humans and dragons have common ancestry. In *Tehanu*, it is suggested that "in the beginning, dragon and human were all one. They were all one people, one race, winged, and speaking the True Language. [...] They were beautiful, and strong, and wise, and free. [...] But in time nothing can be without becoming. So among the dragon-people some became more and more in love with flight and wildness [...] Others of the dragon-people came to care little for flight, but gathered up treasure, wealth, things made, things learned. [...] And they came to fear the wild ones, who might come flying and destroy all their dear hoard..."(*The Earthsea Quartet* 492). Which suggests that the true hoarders of treasure are the human dragons.

> Becoming a dragon improves Eustace's character because he is concerned about helping his friends. And the pleasure of liking people and being liked is the most powerful antidote to the discouragement he often feels as a dragon. The fact that he is a nuisance as a dragon eats into his mind as painfully as the arm-ring eats into his foreleg. In his providence, Aslan appears to him in a dream and cleanses Eustace of his dragon-self. (Ford 2005: 136)

After undergoing hardships and an inner transformation as a dragon, Eustace is turned back into a human by Aslan the Lion, the King of Narnia (and Christ allegory). Aslan's form of transforming Eustace into a human is by peeling off the layers of dragon skin. It is a painful process. Recounting what he thought was a dream to his friends, Eustace says: "The very first tear he made was so deep that I thought it had gone right into my heart. And when he began pulling the skin off, it hurt worse than anything I've ever felt. The only thing that made me able to bear it was just the pleasure of feeling the stuff peel off" (Lewis 2019: 81). The painful "shedding" of dragon form comes after three failed attempts by Eustace to complete the process on his own (with each attempt ending with a new layer of dragon skin), making Aslan perform the task for him, this time with Eustace feeling the pain of said peeling, and ending with the image of baptism, and cleansing of sins.

A similar process can be seen in Angela Carter's "The tiger bride", which will be discussed further in this chapter, where beauty's transformation into a tiger at the end of the story comes in the form of the beast licking the layers of human skin away. In that story, the character is turning away from her humanity in favor of becoming an animal.

2.2.2. Martin and Sapkowski: The weight of "reality" in a fantasy setting

While stories such as Stephanie Meyer's Twilight series, and The Vampire Diaries books (which were initially started by author L.J. Smith) remain clear in the public consciousness, partly due to well-known TV and movie adaptations; the genre has recently seen a renewed interest in a deconstruction of fantasy tropes, with works such as J.R.R. Martin's A Song of Ice and Fire series (more widely known as Game of Thrones), and Andrzej Sapkowski's The Witcher series taking center stage. In the former's case, a popular HBO TV series pushed the book series – which had been

popular for some time, albeit in a niche manner, into the public consciousness. In the latter's case, the Netflix show only came, following a popular series of video games, based on the plot the novels and novellas.

In A Song of Ice and Fire, we are exposed to a grittier side of fantasy history, closer by far to our real-world history than to that of J.R.R. Tolkien's Middle-earth. The "realistic" history and political intrigue, mixed with elements of fantasy such as dragons, magic and nightwalkers, in order to create a world that is both grounded and fantastical at the same time. This mixture of prosaic disillusionment, scepticism, irony, with fantasy and violence in Martin's work has been compared to Pratchett's Discworld fictions (Young 2016), which is especially appropriate because both authors are roughly contemporary and usually appeal to the same audiences, so that Martin has even been described as "the American Pratchett" (290).

Physical and metal animal transformation appears in many forms in modern fantasy literature. Such forms may extend from Stephanie Meyer's Werewolves[30] in the Twilight series, to George R. R. Martin's "skinchangers" in the fantasy series A Song of Ice and Fire. In said series Martin introduces the concept of "skinchangers", which is both similar to and different from shapeshifting. Skinchangers are individuals who are able to possess the minds of animals and direct their actions. While no physical transformation occurs, the act does leave its mark on both the human and the animal involved. This is the reason certain animals are easier to use than others, such as dogs that live close to humans and are considered emotionally close to them as well. "Slipping into a dog's skin was like putting on an old boot, its leather softened by wear. As a boot was shaped to accept a foot, a dog was shaped to accept a collar, even a collar no human eye could see" (Martin 2011: 10). While wolves may appear outwardly similar to dogs, their distance from human influence dictates a different type of relationship with them.

> Dogs were the easiest beasts to bond with [...] Wolves were harder. A man might befriend a wolf, even break a wolf, but no man could truly *tame* a wolf. "Wolves and women wed for life," Haggon often said. "You take one, that's a marriage. The wolf is part of you from that day on, and you're part of him. Both of you will change."

---

30 It is revealed that they are not traditional Lycans, though those exist within that world.

> Other beasts were best left alone, the hunter had declared. Cats were vain and cruel, always ready to turn on you. Elk and deer were prey; wear their skins too long, and even the bravest man became a coward. Bears, boars, badgers, weasels … Haggon did not hold with such. “Some skins you never want to wear, boy. You won’t like what you’d become.” Birds were the worst, to hear him tell it
>
> "Men were not meant to leave the earth. Spend too much time in the clouds and you never want to come back down again. I know skinchangers who’ve tried hawks, owls, ravens. Even in their own skins, they sit moony, staring up at the bloody blue.” (Martin 2011: 10)

The different relationships with the different animals are indicative of different human character traits. In addition, the concept of the influence of the animal trait on the human mind is similar to ideas present in different fantasy creations. For instance, in *A wizard of Earthsea* (1968), the protagonist Ged is similarly warned not to take on the guise of a bird, lest he lose himself in his freedom. On one occasion Ged, due to his hubris is chased in falcon form by a creature, which is essentially his shadow. While Ged is in the form of a bird, his first master Ogion, whom he seeks, does not try to speak to him:

> knowing that Ged had no human speech in him now. As a boy, Ogion like all boys had thought it would be a very pleasant game to take by art-magic whatever shape one liked, man or beast, tree or cloud, and so to play at a thousand beings. But as a wizard he had learned the price of the game, which is the peril of losing one’s self, playing away the truth. The longer a man stays in a form not his own, the greater this peril. Every prentice-sorcerer learns the tale of the wizard Bordger of Way, who delighted in taking bear’s shape, and did so more and more often until the bear grew in him and the man died away, and he became a bear, and killed his own little son in the forests, and was hunted down and slain. And no one knows how many of the dolphins that leap in the waters of the Inmost Sea were men once, wise men, who forgot their wisdom and their name in the joy of the restless sea. (Le Guin 1993: 117)

Ged’s ultimate path towards defeating his shadow, is embracing it as an inseparable part of himself. After spending the majority of the novel fearfully running away from his shadow, at Ogion’s advice, Ged decides to confront it. Thus, the hunted becomes the hunter, and when he finally stands face-to-face with the shadow, it takes on the shape of his own darkness, personified as his uncaring father, his school nemesis, and a friend whom he feels he failed. After the shadow finally takes on a monstrous appearance, both face each other and call one another – Ged, thus merging together.

> Ged had neither lost nor won but, naming the shadow of his death with his own name, had made himself whole: a man: who, knowing his whole true self, cannot be used or

> possessed by any power other than himself, and whose life therefore is lived for life's sake and never in the service of ruin, or pain, or hatred, or the dark. In the Creation of Ea, which is the oldest song, it is said, "Only in silence the word, only in dark the light, only in dying life: bright the hawk's flight on the empty sky." (165-166)

By calling the shadow by his own name, Ged is in effect accepting it and its darkness as a part of what makes him whole, what makes any human whole. At the same time, the process of merging can be seen as a process of hybridity – of transformation; the Ged that exists now is not the same Ged as before.

Another author the work of whom marries elements of a fantasy world with the weight and consequences of the real world is Andrzej Sapkowski. In his work, the influences of Slavic folklore are apparent, and he uses elements of fairy tales and the inevitable cultural osmosis to subvert reader expectations, in a manner that challenges culturally engrained ideas of what "should" happen. This subversion also serves to show glaring flaws of human nature, and the unfairness of life to some degree. Wiktor Werner describes Andrzej Sapkowski as "a writer who has undoubtedly great significance in the Polish fantasy literature" (2018: 146). Adding that he "was one of the few writers was one of a few writers, who in the 1980s initiated the development of the heroic-fantasy genre in Poland, not copying, however, the literary output of Robert E. Howard or even J.R.R. Tolkien, but making an attempt (in the case of Sapkowski an undoubtedly successful one) to give this literary genre a native character" (146).

Sapkowski's internationally known Witcher series is filled to the brim with folkloric elements and fantasy creatures. In a subversion of the genre, as is the case with Carter, Martin, and Pratchett, the universe of the Witcher, while carrying many fantasy elements, remains weighted by gritty realism both in character portrayals and events. Gerald of Rivia, the titular character in the series – the Witcher (although other protagonists play a role along said series), is hated and feared, although his job entails the vanquishing of monsters. Ostensibly, he should be revered as a hero, but as is the case with the monsters they hunt, Witchers in this universe are grudgingly tolerated, and openly hated. Witchers are othered; they are seen as monstrous mutants. Actions have weight and consequences, and a happy ending is neither a right nor a guarantee.

Similar to A Song of Ice and Fire, the world of The Witcher is rich in lore. Also similarly, it features a greyer view of morality and human nature. Good vs. evil is never a straightforward matter; choices have consequences; and there is rarely a clear side to

be taken. Similar to some of Angela Carter's work, fairy tales and fairy tale tropes are deconstructed throughout the novels. In *The last wish*[31] (1993) we are introduced to a brutal and tortured Snow-White figure in Renfri, bent on revenge, as she was tortured by a wizard and raped by a thug hired by her stepmother to kill her, as she is persecuted due to being born after the eclipse – Black Sun, which supposedly made her a prophesized monstrous servant of Lilith that would help usher in the end of the world. Renfri's character forces Gerald to confront his own sense of neutrality and unwillingness to contemplate the idea of "the lesser of two evils".

The last wish also introduces the readers to Duny - Urcheon of Erlenwald a (hedgehog) beast, who transforms back into "prince charming", only, to ultimately, turn out to be the antagonist of the plot in later books – Emhyr var Emreis. The story contains many morally ambiguous characters, and the antagonist later lends a hand to Gerald in his battle against the Wild Hunt. Duny is far from being the only "Beast"-like character introduced in *The last wish*. The said novel also introduces Nivellen, a character that embodies more of the traditional elements associated with the recognizable French tale of "Beaty and the beast" by Madame de Villeneuve; including, among others the rose garden, the lonely castle, the curse as punishment and the ultimate transformation back to a man – brought about by a loved one. These elements, while recognizable, however, are also quite different from the traditional tale, introducing a sordid family history, with Nivellen's fortune being the result of a family history of highway crime; him gaining multiple lovers while in beast form; and his punishment resulting from the rape of a priestess, making her curse (prior to her suicide), a direct response to what she saw as his monstrous nature (though he appears to have felt pressured to commit the act by the gang that he inherited from his forebearers). The priestess' last words describing him as a "monster in a man's skin", and adding that he will become a "monster in a monster's skin" (58) draw back to the idea of transformations that act as a reflection of one's true self, with the monstrous flesh reflecting one's inner monstrosity, as is the case with Lycaon for instance. Nivellen's desire to retain his monstrous appearance after a while, realizing the advantages inherent in his new form, including strength, magical abilities, and sexual

---

31 The English Edition was first released in 2007

prowess, is reminiscent of one of Terry Pratchett's Discworld characters – the Librarian, who chooses to retain his new ape body, owing to the convenience said body affords to his job, the confidence it grants him, and his new ability to "see" beyond human eyes. Unlike the Librarian, however, Nivellen is ultimately transformed back into a human after he is forced to kill his lover while she attempts to kill Gerald, and the shedding of the blood of someone who loved him, works to lift the curse. This method of breaking of the curse is not dissimilar to the original fairy tale, if one takes into account the euphemism of bridal blood-shedding. One may note however, that be it in the case of Nivellen or the Librarian, the stories depict a character's desire to embrace a new form that is traditionally less desirable that the original form, and through it, a new identity. From a post-humanistic perspective, they are choosing to implant their old selves onto a new/old body, and that body, in turn, informs their identity.

The stories are rich in folklore, as is demonstrated by the presence of the Strega (*strzyga*) *The last wish* – which is a creature that is at once based on a vampiric monster of Slavic lore and a cursed princess the story of which carries elements that closely resemble that of "The princess in the chest"[32] – a Danish fairy tale a version of which can be found in Andrew Lang's *The pink fairy book* (1897). While it is not a one-to-one correlation, both princesses can be found in coffins, with night guards mysteriously dying, before the protagonist has to uncover the secret and finding ways of keeping the princess outside the coffins until dawn – which breaks the spells, and allows the princess to lose their monstrosity. While the princess in "The Princess in the Chest" story receives a happy ending, with her monstrosity (albeit inner monstrosity as she does not change shape) being eradicated, Adda the White (the former Strega), is left mentally impaired after her curse is lifted. Whether this is the reality of former Strega in the Witcher universe, or a result of the fact that she was cursed prior to birth and was born and grew in Strega form, reverting her into a child-like mentality after the curse is lifted, is not made clear, though the latter option seems to hold more weight.

---

[32] Tale Type ATU 307

2.2.3. Diana Wynne Jones: Sophie Hatter – an old soul in a young body

Fairy tale deconstruction is not exclusively done through gritty, violent, or sexual re-imaginings of plots. Diana Wynne Jones' *Howel's moving castle* (1986) and its sequels, also incorporate elements of fairy tale lore. Interestingly, the characters are also aware of their "roles" in said fairy tales. Similar to the starting premise of Terry Pratchett's *Witches abroad*, where it is "*impossible* for the third and youngest son of any king, if he should embark on a quest which has so far claimed his older brothers, not to succeed" (3), in Diana Wynne Jones' world, and more precisely in "the land of Ingary, where such things as seven-league boots and cloaks of invisibility really exist, it is quite a misfortune to be born the eldest of three. Everyone knows you are the one who will fail first, and worst, if the three of you set out to seek your fortunes" (Jones 2008: 1).

Sophie, one of the main characters of the novel, has no aspirations in life, as she is the eldest daughter, and by the logic of storytelling, bound to a life of mediocracy at best:

> Sophie Hatter was the eldest of three sisters. She was not even the child of a poor woodcutter, which might have given her some chance of success. Her parents were well to do and kept a ladies' hat shop in the prosperous town of Market Chipping. True, her own mother died when Sophie was just two years old and her sister Lettie was one year old, and their father married his youngest shop assistant, a pretty blonde girl called Fanny. Fanny shortly gave birth to the third sister, Martha. This ought to have made Sophie and Lettie into Ugly Sisters, but in fact all three girls grew up very pretty indeed, though Lettie was the one everyone said was most beautiful. Fanny treated all three girls with the same kindness and did not favor Martha in the least. (1)

Throughout the story, she is transformed into an old woman by the spiteful witch of the waste, which sets forth her adventure. Interestingly, by being turned into an old woman, Sophie finds the freedom to eschew norms and fears, go on an adventure, and shed the shackles of social expectations. One would presume that as her outer shape now "matches" the role that she had set herself, she would be even less inclined to do anything that defies social norms or allows her to explore her individuality and personal desires and aspiration. However, like Pratchett's Librarian, it seems that Sophie was, in a sense, freed by taking on a new shape, which would be undesirable to many. But Sophie thrives in her new shape, and gradually becomes more "youthful" in spirit that she had been in her original body.

It is ultimately revealed that Sophie, who had latent magical powers, which she never explored (as the eldest daughter, and the one who is meant to be "ordinary" and mundane" to boot), was maintaining the spell that kept her an old woman, long after the witch's original spell had worn off. It is only toward the end of the first novel, after gaining experience and confidence in herself and her agency that Sophie is transformed back into her younger self with the aid of Calcifer the fire demon[33]. Sophie's transformation into an old woman is not her only stint at shapeshifting. In a later book *Castle in the air* (1990) Sophie and her baby are transformed into a cat and kitten respectively, to protect them form a Djinn who took over the Castle.

Another interesting character in *Howl's moving castle* is Percival (called Gaston by the Witch of the Waste) who is in fact a combination of two people. There is an element of body horror in it, as the Witch of the Waste chopped up two people Wizard Sulliman and Prince Justin in order to create the perfect human; waiting to add Howl's head, the witch and her fire demon created a "leftover" version calling him Gaston, later turning him into a dog. The new being had a consciousness, albeit a confused one as the byproduct of remnants of two consciousnesses co-existing in his head. The name Percival, which he takes on after being transformed "back" into a human by Howl, and is, in fact a name used by Prince Justin before his capture, as he attempted to locate Wizard Sulliman, before his capture, and eventual mutilation. At the end of the story, both characters regain their original forms, though one may wonder at the psychological effects of sharing a person's mind for extended periods of time in two forms, that of a man and that of a dog, bit being alien to you.

The process that the Witch performs is reminiscent to some degree of Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1817) as the Creature in that book is brought about as a result of Victor Frankenstein's arrogance and desire to cheat death. He constructs it using body parts from a variety of men, carefully choosing the most appealing body parts. However, when the creature is awakened and gains a consciousness, it becomes a

---

33

In Hayao Miyazaki's 2004 adaptation, which does take deliberate liberties with some of the plot elements, characterizations and themes; Sophie's agency in her own transformation is made even more clear, with her gradually standing taller and regaining her stamina as she becomes more invested in her own existence. Throughout the film she also turns back into her younger self several times during moments of self-actualization. Ultimately, this fluctuation stops (without Calcifer's help) with Sophie retaining her younger appearance, with the remnant of white-hair to accompany her, which Howl describes as looking like starlight.

source of horror for Victor, who, experiencing what Kristeva termed as abjection, runs away from it, affording it its first interaction with rejection and abjection, and starting the process of tainting its heart through exposure to the rejection of society.

This also bears a resemblance to Pratchett's race of Igors, who surgically implant body parts of family members, and which will be discussed in the next chapter.

2.2.4. Rowling's shape-shifters: Werewolves and animagi

Going back to the idea of "traditional" shapeshifting characters, J.K. Rowling's Harry Potter series contains both werewolves, who have no control over their physical transformation, and Animagi - wizards that are able to transform themselves (purposefully) into an animal form[34]. This is, in addition to Metamorphmagi – wizards that can transform at will, taking whatever shape they please, and other fantastical beings, including Boggarts, which are creatures that can modify their appearance to reflect a person's inner-most fear, sphinxes – human-lion hybrids, and the classic vampires[35]. However, as the latter "beings" are almost exclusively mentioned as part of the lore, and go mostly unexplored within the novels themselves, we will limit ourselves to an examination of Animagi and werewolves.

Animagi are wizards that are able to transform themselves into one animal, with said animal (although not stated as such) being indicative of might be perceived as a person's "true self". Of course, the theme of an animal shape representing a character's inner self, and giving a literal representation to the idea of spirit animals is not limited to Rowling's stories. In Phillip Pullman's His Dark Materials series, Lyra, the protagonist, and people from her dimension manifest their souls as shape-shifting animals, called Dæmons[36], throughout their younger years, with those animals taking on a permeant

---

34

This paper will not address ideas introduced in the movies, while not present in the original book series, such as the idea presented in *Fantastic Beasts: The Crimes of Grindelwald* (2019) that Nagini the snake was originally a woman, who is ultimately trapped in snake form.

35

even though, unlike werewolves, they are not featured in the *Fantastic Beasts and Where to Find Them* book, suggesting that unlike werewolves, vampires are not viewed within the universe as "beasts".

36

form as the person matures. The series provides a compelling representation of identity through the extroversion of one's inner self in the form of an unstable animal that gains stability as the person's sense of self and identity begin to get defined and, in a sense, "solidify". The series also presents an interesting exploration of the relationship that one develops with said self/animal, and the excruciating pain, suffering, and eventual death that comes from forceful separation from said self.

The notion of an animal "self" is also present in Rowling's books, albeit in a different manner. As previously stated, a wizard's Animagus (animal shape) is restricted to one form, and the shape of the animal might be representative of an individual's real essence. Though this element is never overtly addressed in the novels, nor are the characters ever aware of it, (else it could become a telling plot device), an Animagus is an embodiment of the person's "inner core". As such, the inquisitive journalist, Rita Skeeter transforms into a beetle, allowing her to her spy on people and expose their secrets. Likewise, Peter Pettigrew, a former friend of Harry's father, "unsurprisingly" assumes the shape of a rat when he transforms, as he is revealed to be a traitorous spy, in service of the evil Lord Voldemort.

Although it is mentioned passingly in *Harry Potter and the philosopher's stone* (1997) that Professor McGonegle can turn into a cat, readers are actually first introduced to the notion of shapeshifting, in *Harry Potter and the prisoner of Azkaban* (1999). In that novel, the first werewolf character makes an appearance in the story, in the shape of Remus Lupin; and in it is explained that his friends learned to transform into Animagi in order to help him. like Lupin, Peter is does not appear in the story (as himself) until the third book, when it is revealed that he has spent the past thirteen years pretending to be dead and instead living as Scabbers, the pet rat of the Weasley family (Ron Weasley being Harry's best friend and therefore allowing Peter easy access to

---

Another series of books that incorporates the archaic use of Dæmons is Deborah Harkness' All Souls series where Dæmons are one of the four races - (humans, witches, vampires, and Dæmons that coexist, with prejudice and vague hostility dominating their interactions (except for the humans who are oblivious to the existence of the other races). Although no animal shape-shifters appear in said novels, the core of the stories and their culmination involves an understanding that all four races, which were thought to be distinct, are in-fact one race, and that the reason for species deterioration with the various races losing their powers over time, is the separation between them. Intermarriage between a witch and a vampire, both of whom have demonic ancestry (which is, in turn, the product of human ancestry), results in new hope for the species, with the birth of two children (which is explained through biological reasoning and in-universe logic). The idea of the interconnectivity of the world and the various species is similar to an ecological system, with all species being a part of the story; it is perhaps the perfect representation of the idea of becoming posthuman.

Harry). When the revelation occurs, and Peter's first transformation is shown, Harry, and through him the reader, is given a glimpse into the physical process of transformation: "It was like watching a speeded-up film of a growing tree. A head was shooting upward from the ground; limbs were sprouting; a moment later a man was standing where Scabbers had been" (Rowling 1999: 366). Peter does not seem to regain his full humanity, however. It appears that the long years spent in rat form have left their mark on him, giving him, even in human form, a distinct rodent-like quality, or at least, this is how it appears to Harry:

> He was a very short man, hardly taller than Harry and Hermione. His thin, colorless hair was unkempt and there was a large bald patch on top. He had the shrunken appearance of a plump man who has lost a lot of weight in a short time. His skin looked grubby, almost like Scabbers's fur, and something of the rat lingered around his pointed nose and his very small, watery eyes. He looked around at them all, his breathing fast and shallow […] Even Pettigrew's voice was squeaky. (366)

Sirius Black, Harry's godfather is also an Animagus, one who takes the shape of a large black dog. When he is first introduced to the story in that shape, several characters initially mistake him for the Grim - a demonic hound fabled to bring death to anyone who sees it. This urban legend somewhat reflects Sirius' own presence in the story. At this point in the plot, he too is shrouded in mystery, with many hearsay accounts of his horrific acts dominating the public sphere. Of course, for the majority of the novel, he is regarded as a mass murderer, who betrayed Harry's parents to Voldemort. Following the reveal of his innocence in the final chapter of *Harry Potter and the prisoner of Azkaban* (1999), both Sirius and his animal form are viewed differently by both the characters and the plot. The crazed killer becomes a warm father-figure to Harry, and the frightful nightmarish hound becomes a playful and silly puppy: "the great black dog gave a joyful bark and gamboled around them, snapping at pigeons, and chasing its own tail. Harry couldn't help laughing" (Rowling 2004: 181). Above all else, he/it is devoted to Harry. In "Harry Potter: Fairy tale prince, real boy, and archetypal hero", Katherine Grimes likens Sirius to a mythological protective animal:

> [W]hen Harry is in real trouble, Sirius appears, often in the shape of a dog. Thus, Sirius represents the animals throughout mythology who appear to protect abandoned children: the bear who nurses Paris, the wolf who nurses Romulus and Remus and the woodpecker who guards them, the eagle who saves Gilgamesh, the doe who nurses Siegfried, and the swan who feeds Lohengrin. While it is true that most of the animals who save children are

> female, the animal who comes to Harry's rescue is male, a father figure. Many children in archetypal hero myths have earthly fathers who serve as surrogates for immortal patriarchs. […] Sirius serves in a similar fashion as the earthly protector of Harry Potter, whose father's death deprives the boy of his rightful protector. (Grimes 2002: 112-113)

This image of the dog-Sirus perfectly mirrors Sirus' own character. While being capable of cruelty to his enemies, as shown by his treatment of his schooldays nemesis Severus Snape, and his willingness to enact a cruel prank that almost brings about Snape's death, his unwavering devotion to those he considers friends is his most distinctive characteristic. Such devotion to his dead friend James Potter (Harry's father), has prompted him to blame himself for his murder, and after attempting and failing to kill the true perpetrator – Peter, to embrace incarceration in the wizard prison (Azkaban) with guilt-ridden glee. This acceptance reveals his shattered mental state, as well as his self-flagellation and misguided quest for absolution. He never protests his innocence, and only attempts to flee when he realizes that Harry's life is in danger (due to Peter's proximity), and that no one else is aware of the danger.

Interestingly, Grimes creates a link between Sirius, and fairytales' most well-known animal groom – the Beast, stating in support of said argument:

> Sirius Black is like the beast in "Beauty and the Beast"; for a time, the children believe him to be evil, as their community has told them to believe this. But they learn that he is not a threat but a protector, and in the end of *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*, they also save him, as Beauty saves the beast. (94)

Beyond this, and beyond someone who is misjudged as monstrous due to illusory physical appearances, (a trait that one might claim the werewolf Lupin and others also share), Grimes also sees Sirius' transformation abilities and his connection with the animal world as fairytale-like:

> His being an animagus is also characteristic of fairy tales, in which people turn into swans, ravens, fawns, wolves, hedgehogs, and frogs. A common motif in fairy tales is animals' befriending humans, and vice versa. Often the hero who is kind to animals wins the day. We see examples of this in some versions of "Cinderella" and in "The Queen Bee," in which Simpleton is helped by ants, ducks, and bees, all of whom he has befriended. Sirius Black and fairy tale animals teach children not to fear the animal side of themselves or others and to respect nature. His being Harry's godfather is again a common fairy tale element, in which godparents represent the omnipresence of the dead parents as protectors of their children, as Cinderella's fairy godmother is the manifestation of the heroine's dead mother. Thus, Sirius Black is a comforting presence both to Harry and to young readers. (94)

Yet despite his death, Harry's father is also an active part in his life. His absence/presence helps shape Harry into the person he is. James Potter is also, like his friends Sirius and Peter, Animagus. Like Sirius he is a devoted friend, although his animal form is that of a stag instead of a dog.
Focusing on Harry's father, James, whose Animagus form is that of a stag, Grimes writes: "That Harry's father turns into a stag, a manly beast but prey rather than predator, also reminds us that the animal part of us is the mortal part, the vulnerable aspect of the human being" (Grimes 119). However, one might claim that said "prey" does not go down without a fight. Barring specific circumstances, the stag will always attempt to preserve its existence. As such, the image I would associate with it is not that of helplessness.

Although Harry’s father, James, is as devoted a friend as Sirius, his Animagus form (prior to his death) is that of a stag. An image of poise and grace, a stag is an apt metaphor for James’ best distinguishing characteristic, his steadfast sense of honor. He can be "helpless" as suggested by Grimes; he is not infallible, and in fact falls victim to the snake-like predator that is Voldemort. He dies attempting to protect his wife and son, even knowing the likely futility of the matter. His honor remains an integral part of his personality. Thus, despite participating in Snape’s bullying in his younger years, as he matures, he reevaluates his choices (even if he does not gain any more respect for Snape, who demonstrates an affinity for the dark arts); resulting in him saving Snape from Sirius’s dangerous prank – at great risk to his personal safety. It is also suggested that had he survived Lord Voldemort’s attack, he would have spared Peter’s life, even after learning of his betrayal, and prevented his friends from avenging themselves upon him. This personality trait is shared by Harry, who succeeds in preventing the deed, even after learning of Peter’s betrayal moments before. Harry justifies his dad’s (and his) urge to save Peter by claiming: “I’m not doing this for you. I’m doing it because — I don’t reckon my dad would’ve wanted them to become killers — just for you” (Rowling 2011: 376). Yet Peter’s earlier words, when he stated that “James would have understood […] he would have shown [him] mercy” (374), seem more accurate in this case, because a nobility of soul induces acts of mercy, even with a seemingly undeserving recipient. In fact, this mercy given, even when no one would fault its withdrawal, is the ultimate demonstration of nobility.

Of course, the question then arises of whether a “core self” is even really possible? Can said “self” account for the mutability of human nature? Was Peter biologically determined to betray his friends? Was there no path for redemption for him? Would James have remained noble no matter what life circumstances he encountered, and what changes he underwent? In Pullman’s His Dark Materials, the Dæmons are “unstable” while the characters are young, and “stabilize” as they mature. Even this might be seen as “limiting", as one might suggest that we continue to change throughout our lives. But the idea of Animagi goes further, and suggests a predetermined and fixed self. That said, the Harry Potter series contains an element that is somewhat similar to Animagi, and yet, gives leeway for change – the Patronus Charm. This could hint at the possibility that even though readers are not introduced to an Animagus that changes (animal shape), it does not necessarily mean that s/he is incapable of it. Perhaps it takes a truly life-changing event for him/her to do so. Or, perhaps and Animagus that achieves that simply becomes a Metamorphmagi.

The Patronus Charm is a spell (and a motif) that is somewhat similar to Animagi, and thus, warrants mention. Although it does not involve a physical transformation, this spell also demonstrates a person’s inner animal, and in a sense – their inner self. This (somewhat difficult) spell is employed in order to ward-off Dementors (dark creatures capable of sucking a person’s soul). A Patronus, like an Animagus, mirrors a person’s heart; the difference is that *this* shape can change as the heart changes. As such, when Nymphadora Tonks falls in love with Remus Lupin, who is a werewolf, her Patronus reflects that, and transforms into a werewolf as well. Similarly, Lily Evans, Harry’s mother is supposed to have had a doe Patronus, the female counterpart of her husband’s stag; Severus Snape, who spends his entire life in love with her memory, likewise casts a doe (while her husband’s is a stag); Severus Snape, who remains in love with her long after her death, likewise casts a doe Patronus – demonstrating an everlasting and unwavering devotion despite the passage of time. Like Lily, Harry’s Patronus also mirrors his connection with his father, taking the form of his Animagus.

As such, and as previously stated, James proves to be a constant presence (while absent) in Harry's life, be it in the form of a "ghost" (through the resurrection stone, the "ghosts" that appear after Harry and Voldemorts' wands connect), illusions and desires

(through the mirror of Erised), an animal (his Patronus manifestation to Harry), and Harry's own physical resemblance to him. Grimes sees his various representations in Harry's life as follows:

> Harry's father has three manifestations: the animal Prongs, the spirit, and Harry's identification with him. Archetypally, he represents the animal part of our nature, the spirit or soul, and immortality through future generations. He is both the father who deserts the child and the one who protects him, the god who puts us in this dangerous world filled with death, including the knowledge of our own at an unknown time, and the god who sustains us and gives us renewed life. Finally, he is the creator who lives on in us. (Grimes 2002: 111-112)

However, with the stag being symbolically associated with Christ, said choice of animal can also be interpreted as a symbolic representation of Harry's role as a savior, a chosen one, a Christ-like figure who in the last novel "dies" for the people around him, and is resurrected. This association is lent more credence when taking into account the fact that Voldemort, the villain of the story, is associated with snakes, and can be seen as an Anti-Christ figure. In her article "J. K. Rowling's medieval bestiary", Gail Orgelfinger quotes John Grange's *Looking for God in Harry Potter*, writing: "That Harry's father appears in the form of a Christ symbol (the stag), and that Harry's deliverance (as son) comes at his realization that he is his father (in appearance and will), are the poetic expression of the essential union of Father and Son for our salvation" (Orgelfinger 2009: 148). However, it is not James' "stag" that truly signifies, but rather that of his son through him; with Harry being the one who is a Christ-like figure. He models himself and draws strength from a father who is absent, yet present in every aspect of his life.

In "Posthuman power: The magic of hybridity in the Harry Potter series", Jen Harrison shifts the focus from what she describes as "liberal humanist constructions of heroic identity", which dominate the series, to a posthumanist prism through which the series can also be explored, as "it frequently disrupts any stable sense of the 'human' as an ontological category; even where they do not reference posthumanism directly, numerous critical studies have indicated this destabilization […as] animals, humans, and objects frequently morph and blend into one another, rendering any stable sense of embodiment at best problematic and at worst impossible" (Harrison 2018: 327). In both of Rowling and Pratchett's works, the posthumanist readings are best examined through

characters that are able/forced to undergo a physical transformation; a transformation that is accompanied by a mental one.

One of the most notable hybrid creatures found in both Pratchett and Rowling's works is the werewolf. Like in Pratchett's Discworld (as will be shown in the next chapter), Rowling's werewolves draw the readers' attention to issues relating to social class and prejudice. In the case of Rowling's werewolves, however, the focus is on the fear-based alienation and disenfranchisement of said creatures. In the 2001 *Fantastic beasts and where to find them*[37] it is stated that werewolves "have been shunted between the Beast and Being division for many years" (Rowling 2001: xiii). James Potter's other best friend – Remus Lupin suffers first-hand from the community's prejudice and fear, although he, himself is a victim of his circumstances. Rowling's werewolves adhere to recognizable mythological tropes, by undergoing an involuntary and painful transformation process and loss of self. Yet, as Renée Ward writes, Rowling's werewolves are "characters of ingenuity, of difference; they upset readers' expectations and force them to question their assumptions and beliefs, especially those about identity and difference" (Ward, 3). This is clearly outlined by the two major werewolf characters present in the novels – the aforementioned Remus Lupin and the villainous Fenrir Greyback. These two characters present two models of werewolves in the Harry Potter universe.

As previously mentioned, Remus Lupin makes his first appearance in the third Harry Potter novel - *Harry Potter and the prisoner of Azkaban*, and is the first werewolf that Harry encounters. Arriving to Hogwarts in order to act as the "Defense Against the Dark Arts" teacher, Lupin quickly befriends the young protagonist, who is unaware of his secret. Although Lupin's nature is revealed to readers and protagonist alike only towards the end of the novel, this revelation is foreshadowed throughout the novel, with his name representing the clearest clue of all. His first name – Remus is derived from the name of one of Rome's twin founders, who, tradition has it, was bred by wolves; and his last name is derived from the term "Lupine", which means "pertaining to or resembling the wolf [or…] related to the wolf" ("Lupine", def.2.)[38]

[37] A companion book released for charitable purposes, which, along with *Quidditch through the Ages* (2001) is an in-universe Hogwarts school book. Not to be confused with the subsequent film series baring the same name, which the "author" of the aforementioned book "stars" in.

[38]

As Roni Natov observes, the werewolf character combines contradictory features and creates a cognitive dissonance resulting in a narrative tension that affects the reception of the text:

> In *Prisoner of Azkaban*, Lupin, who is a werewolf, turns out to be a paradoxical figure: a force of good that can be dangerous as well. Rowling's use of the werewolf as metaphor for the split self here is astute and in keeping with the earliest known Red Riding Hood variant, in which it is not a wolf but a werewolf—a fusion of animal and human—that tries to seduce the young girl. What is most interesting here is that the potentially destructive part of the werewolf is humanized and offered with understanding. Rowling establishes his innocence and evokes compassion for him, as he tells his story. Lupin talks about the pain of turning into a werewolf, how isolated he became from others, how in utter despair he turned and bit himself. He says that though his parents tried everything, there was no cure. As Lupin becomes a werewolf when he doesn't take his potion, madness and self-destructive impulses are depicted with a kind of psychological truth. Rowling attempts to humanize the demonic, rather than demonize the human. (Natov 2002: 136)

In stark contrast with the "nature of the beast", Lupin is shown throughout the novels as a compassionate and gentle character. Having been bitten as a young child, he spends his subsequent years hiding his condition for fear of rejection. This fear is justified, as the wizarding world is ripe with prejudice towards other beings, from elves (whom they treat as slaves) to vampires, and even muggles – non-magical humans in some cases. Indeed, werewolves, who, in essence, used to be "human" are constantly met with fear and prejudice. They are unable to function in regular wizarding society, and as such prefer to form "packs", not out of some wolf nature that they possess, but out of a basic human need for belonging. Although Lupin is blameless of any wrongdoing in his "illness", as one may view it, being afflicted as a part of a revenge plot against his father, he nevertheless spends his life suffering from prejudice and fear. Lupin's father was angered to the point of describing werewolves as soulless and evil, deserving of death, in the presence of a werewolf (*Remus Lupin | Wizarding World* Website). The fact that said werewolf – Fenrir Greyback - is a brutal child murderer does not take away from the notion that in his agitation, Lupin's father chose to conflate the entire werewolf "race" with one individual, and parroted widespread ignorant and hurtful comments about them as a result. As the cycle of hate continues, Greyback bites his son, who, thereafter becomes the very being that his father stated was deserving of

---

"Lupine, Adj. (2)." Www.Dictionary.com, https://www.dictionary.com/browse/lupine. Accessed 19 March 2022.

death. Although the father himself is described as a gentle soul, who seems to have been caught up in circumstances that led to one heated spontaneous comment, this can, in fact, represent the nature of prejudice. Under normal circumstances, it is not really the overtly evil that keep the flames of prejudice alive, but normal “good” people who banally take for granted certain ideas regarding those who are different from them that allow Othering to continue to occur. And if said cycle continues, they, or those they love, are bound at some point to be on the receiving end of its hurt. Lupin is a prime example of that. He suffers throughout his childhood and adulthood alike, only able to gain a brief sense of normalcy when he is allowed (with the help of the headmaster - Dumbledore) to attend school, and his friends accept him, even going to the length of researching and achieving the ability to become Animagi, in order to keep him company throughout his painful transformations. Lupin’s case emphasizes the theme of Othering explored in the Harry Potter novels, telling Harry at one point: “You have only ever seen me among the Order, or under Dumbledore’s protection at Hogwarts! You don’t know how most of the wizarding world sees creatures like me! When they know of my affliction, they can barely talk to me!” (Rowling 2007: 213)

Despite his resentment, Lupin is not spiteful. His honesty is highlighted by his attempted rejection of the romantic advances of Nymphadora Tonks, because of his unwillingness to bring her into his dark and solitary existence. The numerous examples of Lupin’s “humanity” also include his willingness to forgive the anonymous werewolf who turned him, mistakenly believing him to be a witless victim to his “animal nature” like himself. However, Lupin’s willingness to forgive said individual ceases as his identity is revealed, along with accounts of his active and conscious efforts to transform young children after stealing them from their parents, in order to raise them to hate the human race.

Remus Lupin and Fenrir Greyback are as dissimilar as it is possible for two characters to be. While Lupin “peacefully” suffers from his status as an Other, a perpetual in-between character who can neither fully integrate into the human world, nor into the animal world, his attacker Fenrir Greyback chooses a different route, and takes a militant approach to his Othering. Brent Stypczynski sees Greyback and Lupin as representing of an archetypal approach to the nature-nurture debate. As Greyback embraces and even relishes in his werewolf “nature", he commits acts of violence well

beyond the norms accepted by society. But through his inherent violence, he creates a forbidden and vicarious release of the shadow (Stypczynski 2013: 99).

In her article, “Harry Potter and the (Post)human Animal Body", Holly Batty posits the Harry Potter series as exemplifying a posthumanist paradigm through Harry’s encounters with shape-shifters, hybrids and other creatures that defy species boundaries, alike. She adds that Harry, himself experiences instability in his ontological identity, as his body (and through it, his subjectivity) undergoes animal metamorphosis in *Harry Potter and the goblet of fire* (2000) when he briefly develops gills in order to be able to breathe underwater, as he attempts to complete a magical task. These transformations “destabilize Harry’s ontological identity, making it increasingly difficult to locate the locus of difference between human and animal” (Batty 2001: 26). Harry’s identity lacks stability since his infancy, with part of Lord Voldemort’s soul being attached to him during a botched murder attempt, harry develops the ability (through his fusion with said soul-particle) to speak to snakes. Parseltongue basically allows Harry to, as Charlemagne would suggest, possess another soul. He is able to communicate with animals, and in essence “Become-animal". Batty discusses Harry’s possession of another tongue as follows:

> Lacan would argue that, if Harry had never been given the ability to speak Parseltongue, he would have formed a more stable subjectivity when acquiring the English language. However, his ability to speak both a human and animal language suggests a posthuman subjectivity. Harry’s identity has always been fluid. He holds a linguistic sign system, snake language, even before he reaches consciousness, causing his sense of self to become unstable. Harry exhibits something like what Julia Kristeva calls the “subject in process/on-trial,” a reaction against the idea that human subjectivity can ever be fully realized (458). Kristeva’s analysis of the instability of subjectivity provides a lens through which to consider Harry’s fluid, posthuman identity as well as our own muggle subjectivities that are constantly in flux. (Batty 2001: 35)

Thus, similar to a number of Pratchett’s characters, it is Harry’s unstable identity that becomes the means through which he is able to become posthuman.

2.2.5. Angela Carter: Beastly beauties

Reinterpretations of fairy tales in general, and the animal groom cycle, in particular, are ubiquitous in both literature, and other media[39]. Each story attempts to be unique with its own "twist" on the plot. A constant focus of scholarly studies, Angela Carter's substantial body of work as a feminist, journalist, and acclaimed fantasy author was only brought to an end by her premature death at the age of 51. In his introduction to Carter's poshumously published *Burning your boats: The collected short stories*, Salman Rushdie states that she had gone from being "dismissed by many in her lifetime as a marginal, cultish figure, an exotic hothouse flower, [to] become the contemporary writer most studied at British universities". Also adding: "She hadn't finished. Like Italo Calvino, like Bruce Chatwin, like Raymond Carver, she died at the height of her powers" (Rushdie 1995: xiv). In the aforementioned *Burning your boats: The collected short stories*, as well as *The bloody chamber and other stories*, in particular, Carter focuses on reintroducing known folk and fairy tales, giving them a feminist perspective, and more often than not, infusing them with erotic imagery.

Carter's novels and short stories "take on some of the master narratives that continue to construct femininity in Western culture - giving us, for instance, in *The Bloody chamber*, reconstructed fairy tales that transform the original tales' helpless virgins into active sexual subjects" (Wyatt 1998: 60). Like Pratchett, Carter uses her "version" of the story to comment on stereotypes that help build "The master-narrative" that ultimately becomes reality. By changing fairy tales which Wyatt refers to as "among the 'mind-forged manacles' that circumscribe female identity" (Wyatt 1998: 60), Carter is able to both point up "the age-old patriarchal preference for certain kinds of heroines - passive, inert - and [set] an alternative model of womanhood in place of the old" (Wyatt 1998: 60).

---

[39] Among others, the last two decades saw TV series such as *Beauty and the Beast* (2012) a modern interpretation of the story, where the beast is a product of government experiences, and *Once Upon a Time* (2013) a series that revolved around the premise of Disney characters living in a town in the United States, and where the characters of Bell and the Beast are also an amalgam of said story and that of Rumpelstiltskin. The extremely popular Grimm (2011) also sees a detective – a "Grimm" being able to see folk, fairy tale and mythological creatures known as Wesen, through their human disguises.

Carter’s writing shares a common ground with Pratchett, whose writing may be generally described as humanistic in nature. She has been considered by some postmodern, particularly due to her use of “intertextual frames, her critique of western (and patriarchal) representational practices, and her view of her own fictions as ’a kind of literary criticism’” (Tucker and Hall 1998: 4). Indeed, Linda Hutcheon emphasizes Carter’s “interest in the ’ex-centric’ subjects and her engagement in a ’complicitous critique,’ that is, a way of writing that exposes its own position within the cultural hegemony at the same time that it undermines it” (Tucker and Hall 1998: 4).

Beyond cultural hegemony, Carter is particularly concerned with the element of mutability, with several characters undergoing transformations throughout her stories. Like Pratchett, however, these transformations do not necessarily adhere to the hierarchical position of the human form over the animal one. Her interest in destabilizing similar norms, blurring boundaris, and embracing hybridity extends to and focuses on the female body.

In *The female grotesque*, Mary Russo writes in reference to Bakhtin: “The images of the grotesque body are precisely those which are abjected from the bodily canons of classical aesthetics.” While the classical body is “closed, static, self-contained, symmetrical and sleek [...] the grotesque body is [...] multiple and changing [...] it is identified with [...] social transformation” (1995: 8). In other words, the grotesque body, a “category” that encompasses the mutable female body, crosses boundaries and blurs distinctions, while constantly reinventing itself. In some of her works, particularly *The bloody chamber and other stories* Carter revisits classic fairy tales, retelling them with a feminist slant, frequently eroticized undertones. She is especially interested in the examination of “change” and transformation, via werewolves and werewolf-like creatures. Lindsey Tucker writes in the introduction to *Critical essays on Angela Carter*: “Carter’s interest in and deployment of the grotesque in terms of both content and form suggests that she shares with Bakhtin an interest in […] the grotesque body, which, says Bakhtin, functions as a violator of boundaries and as resistance to closure” (Tucker and Hall 1998: 1).

In “Desire and the female grotesque in Angela Carter’s “Peter and the Wolf””, Betty Moss states that while “any of her tales can be approached through the lens of the grotesque, her wolf stories offer one of the most elemental of grotesque figures: the part

human, part animal" (Moss 1998: 175) She goes on to point out that Carter's "wolf-narratives both deconstruct received assumptions of gender and desire, and offer alternative possibilities for understanding and constructing desire and sexuality" (175).

The deconstruction of gender is not limited to the wolf narratives, though it does feature prominently there. According to Sally Robinson, Carter's novels frequently employ a double feminist perspective by moving "between the 'inside' and the 'outside' of normative gender constructions, including the construction of Woman as Other to Man's self - whether that other be denigrated or celebrated" (1998: 159). Carter's parodies, which point to what Teresa de Lauretis refers to as the "chinks and cracks" in dominant representational practices, make use of mimicry, parody, and masquerade in order to allow her to negotiate between a series of oppositions, which include the

> construction/deconstruction of 'natural' sexual difference; compliance/resistance to the ideologies of gender difference as offered through hegemonic discursive systems; and, inscription/subversion of the fit between Woman and women, between metaphorical figures constructed according to the logics of a desire encoded as masculine and social subjects who position themselves through processes of self-representation. (Robinson 1998: 159)

In Hutcheon's terms, the text uses traditional conventions of first-person quest narrative in order to "seduce" its readers into certain constructions of Woman. As Self can only be realized in opposition to others, the "conventions ensure that Man's self-representation is achieved through his objectification, appropriation, and exploitation of feminine figures". However, by exaggerating and lateralizing these conventions, Carter is able to "deconstruct the process by which narrative engenders the subject as male through a violent negation of female subjectivity" (Robinson 1998: 172).

The villain of Carter's "The company of wolves", a retelling of "Little Red Riding Hood", is a werewolf rather than a wolf, introducing a layer of humanity and hybridity to the narrative, while setting the stage for violent rape and brutal murder. This is similar to older versions of the tale. Zipes writes in *The trials and tribulations of Little Red Riding Hood*: "Delaure is quite right when he points out that Perrault decided to change the werewolf into a simple wolf because werewolves had lost their significance after the decline of the witch hunts. Nevertheless, Perrault's audience still identifies the wolf with the bloody werewolf, the devil, insatiable lust, and chaotic nature, if not with a witch" (1983: 75). The werewolf's identity is, thus, muddled as he

is both human and non-human. As with Pratchett's werewolves, who will be discussed in the next chapter, clothes (or more precisely the lack thereof) play a significant part in separating "animal-humans" from "normal" humans in Carter's story:

> Seven years is a werewolf's natural span but if you burn his human clothing you condemn him to wolfishness for the rest of his life, so old wives hereabouts think it some protection to throw a hat or an apron at the werewolf, as if clothes made the man. Yet by the eyes, those phosphorescent eyes, you know him in all his shapes; the eyes alone unchanged by metamorphosis.
>
> Before he can become a wolf, the lycanthrope strips stark naked. If you spy a naked man among the pines, you must run as if the Devil were after you. (Carter 1993: 113)

The idea of the eyes being the only part that is unchanged by the metamorphosis speaks to the notion that a core self exists; one which cannot be changed by superficial changes. This certainly seems to be suggested in Pratchett's transforming characters, with people being aware (on a primal level) that Greebo, an ostensibly (albeit dangerous) man, is a feral animal underneath; and with the Duc – a frog who was transformed into a prince, needing to keep his eyes shaded, lest it be known that he is not really a human.

Although, on the face of it, Carter's stories are fairy-tale reimaginings, with more often than not "happy endings", yet, as Caroline Walker Bynum writes in *Metamorphosis and identity*, it is "Carter's trademark to disturb profoundly both our expectations of what should follow what in such tales and our customary moral and aesthetic response to them, whether the disrupted template is from classical myth or the Brothers Grimm" (2001: 174). Carter's heroine makes the decision to come to terms and even embrace her new circumstances. At first fearful of the man/wolf awaiting her inside her grandmother's house. Disregarding the presence of several wolves outside the cabin, she appears to be more concerned with the one inside it, the one who looks human. Despite her young age, "she [knows] the worst wolves are hairy on the inside" (117). That said, when she meets with the wolf, and he tells her to shed her clothes, she does so, thus, shedding away fears, social conventions, and even morality. She then proceeds to kiss the werewolf of her own volition. The narrative concludes with the girl laying naked in her deceased grandmother's bed, entwined with the werewolf, and the suggestion of a future (savage) marriage ceremony. The process of shedding, itself,

which dominates the end of the story, can be said to involve the eschewing of hierarchical society with its various norms. It can also be seen in Carter's "Tiger bride" (as well as in Pratchett's werewolves – to be discussed in the next chapter).

Two re-imaginings of the classic tale of "Beauty and the Beast" may be found in Carter's *The bloody chamber*. While "The courtship of Mr. Lyon" is a parody featuring a "cigarette-smoking Beauty [and is an] overt expose of the contrived gender differences and positionalities that inform the original tale"; in "The tiger bride," Carter "takes her re-visioning a crucial step further, subverting 'that old story' by repositioning and redefining women's desire on her own terms" (Bryant, 85). In these stories as well as in the wolf stories, Carter subverts what Ellen Cronan has succinctly observed as the possible positionalities available to the female: "madonnas and whores, saints and witches, good little girls and wicked queens" (Bryant 1998: 84).

Like "The company of wolves", "The tiger's bride" also includes a process of "shedding". In this story, however, the heroine does not shed clothes, but more like a werewolf, she sheds her skin. The narrative begins with the beast winning the bride in a card game against her father. The bride represents feminine fragility and victimization by the males in her life; lacking agency and weighed by social norms, she stands on the sidelines, helplessly watching her father gamble away her inheritance. However, this changes, once she is won by an aristocratic-looking "person" donning a mask of a handsomely drawn face – which might symbolize the beautiful, frozen, and false visage of societal norms and the social order. This individual is ultimately revealed to be a tiger, and he proceeds to request to see her naked form. She resists, as she clings to her "social" worldview. The story subsequently discloses her inner thoughts regarding nakedness: "I was unaccustomed to nakedness. I was so unused to my own skin that to take off all my clothes involved a kind of flaying. I thought The Beast had wanted a little thing compared with what I was prepared to give him; but it is not natural for humankind to go naked, not since we first hid our loins with fig leaves. He had demanded the abominable" (Carter 1993: 66).

The bride's remark about being uncomfortable in her own skin hints at her realization that while society "clothes" her in a certain form, assigning her a specific role, her actual identity lies within her own "skin", and that this identity has been repressed by years of homogenization by culture, to the point that the "clothes" become

her "second skin". By exposing his own nakedness, the Beast sets in motion the bride's process of returning to nature, and removal of social constraints; a process that concludes with her consenting to unveil her own naked body. He then proceeds to lick her skin: "And each stroke of his tongue ripped off skin after successive skin, all the skin of a life in the world, and left behind a nascent patina of shining hairs. My earrings turned back to water and trickled down my shoulder; I shrugged the drops off my beautiful fur" (Carter 1993: 67).

Pratchett, like Carter, has the predisposition to twist old narratives, and to set up his readers, toying with their expectations of established moral, ethical, and philosophical standpoints, only to then provide them with something new, and often unexpected. Like Carter (and indeed, Martin and Sapkowski), Pratchett frequently incorporates and utilizes mythical and folkloric elements as raw material in novel and surprising ways; in his stories, villains become victims, and heroes become killers[40]. Pratchett and Carter both twist the central and mainstream narrative into new and unexpected shapes, exposing fresh points of view in the process. That said, while Carter's focus on the feminist themes in a substantial portion of her work is quite evident, Pratchett manages to gently weave numerous arguments and elements (including, but not limited to, those of a feminist bent) throughout his works. He also has the tendency to write multiple plot layers within his novels, layers that reflect and address the underlying diversity of life itself. While the concept of shape-shifting or animal transformation may appear in many modern works of fantasy literature, is Terry Pratchett stands above the rest with his diverse and often unique approach to the age-old concept. Through the concept of "borrowing", the different races, and the different forms of transformation and hybridity, Pratchett uses his writing to question personal and social identity. One point of similarity between Pratchett's and Rowling's work is that, as some could argue, both can be viewed through a posthumanist lens, even with all the humanistic readings that are also applicable (and have been applied) to these

---

40

Pratchett's style is echoed by his character Susan Sto Helit, in *Hogfather* (1996). Her version of "Jack and the Beanstalk", which she reads to her charges is as such: "… and then Jack chopped down the beanstalk, adding murder and ecological vandalism to the theft, enticement and trespass charges already mentioned, but he got away with it and lived happily ever after without so much as a guilty twinge about what he had done. Which proves that you can be excused just about anything if you're a hero, because no one asks inconvenient questions." (24)

works. Thus, one may claim that Pratchett occupies a place between Carter and Rowling, due to the significance of shape-shifting for all three authors.

Chapter 3: Discworld shape-shifters. Notable animal-human transformations on the Disc

3.1. The Discworld series: The non-human and the post-human

As stated previously the Discworld is a Disc shaped world perched on the top of four elephants that stand on the back of a space turtle, swimming through space towards an unknown destination. This image in itself is reminiscent of real-world (or Round World as it is referred to in-universe) mythology and legend. It also brings to mind the problem of infinite regress, and at the same time, the idea of unavoidable intertextuality – which the Discworld series is certainly ripe with. From references to ancient and recent history, mythology, classic literature, fairy tales, to philosophy, astrology, gaming, and pop culture at large, the series is a treasure trove for seekers of hidden contextual gems, not always identifiable on the first reading.

Accordingly, and as a fantasy world, the Discworld, fittingly, "runs" on the element of "Narrativium". Due to the excessive presence of said element, the Discworld functions as a world of stories, with wider and lesser-known story elements taking shape again and again throughout the novels. As a world and a mirror of worlds, this suggests that the Discworld is not unique in its reliance on stories. Throughout the novels, Pratchett demonstrates, again and again, a belief in the human need for stories in order to *be* human.

> Our minds make stories, and stories make our minds. Each culture's Make-a-Human kit is built from stories, and maintained by stories. A story can be a rule for living according to one's culture, a useful survival trick, a clue to the grandeur of the universe, or a mental hypothesis about what might happen if we pursue a particular course. Stories map out the phase space of existence. (TSOD2 327)

The existence of Narrativium leads to a phenomenon known as "Narrative Causality", whereby a third son is always bound to succeed where his older siblings failed, and a one-in-a-million chance actually means that the event is bound to happen. This phenomenon somewhat echoes the logic upon which Diana Wynne Jones's previously mentioned *Howl's moving castle* functions, with the protagonist Sophie initially being resigned to her fate as "the older sister". Like in said novel, however, the existence of story tropes does not necessarily mean their acceptance. In *Witches abroad* in particular characters resist the "inevitable" artificially created "Happy-Ending", which fails to take into account the characters' actual happiness about the planned eventuality. By creating such narrative rules and criticizing them through the text, Pratchett winks at the reader, and declares that he is writing about the inner world: aspirations, ambition, sense of failure, sense of harmony and others. He presents a mirror to the reader, and emphasizes the difference between our narrative – how we see ourselves, and what "reality" may be.

The concepts of "Narrativium" and "Narrative Causality" are quips at scientific discourse, and particularly at popular-science narratives in terms of pedagogical "lies-to-children" (Sawyer 2000: 155). Lies to children are simplified, narrative constructs used in scientific training in popularization of science; they tend to dominate and obfuscate the understanding of science by the general public (174). Pratchett, especially in *The science of Discworld*, includes an ironic but appreciative commentary on the activity of imagination, which is the source of both science and fiction, and which in both ways contributes to "making us human" (174). Thus, shapeshifting, the theme of this dissertation, is only one of the aspects of humanity-definition explored by Pratchett in his work.

Although it might appear that the mention of stories only serves to provide context to the Discworld in general, stories in this case are quite relevant to the discussion of shape-shifting characters. For one, deconstructing and subverting fairy-tale (and folkloric) tropes also extends to the shape-shifting characters themselves, affording a new perspective into their inner world as characters. Can werewolves form clans, and a vibrant society? What are the nuances of said society? Does the fact that a "prince" is under a spell automatically make him a good marriage prospect? More than that, stories are relevant to shape-shifting as *both* involve process, change and

mutability. In *Metamorphosis and identity*, Caroline Walker Baum draws a connection between the two, because as she sees it, a "story involves *metabol*ê, the replacement of something by something else. Story spreads out through time and behaviors or bodies – the shapes – a self has been or will be, each replacing the one before" (180). Even in stories involving repetition, she asserts, stories have sequence. Pratchett's *Witches abroad* focuses on the ability of stories to shape lives and shape bodies, as throughout this novel, several characters are transformed physically into new shapes, in order to comply with the story's rules. Even as characters try to defy the Story, they find that their only means of success is to first engage with it.

3.1.1. Discworld races and othering

As a world built on stories, where belief or lack of, can dictate the continued existence of a being or concept[41], the Discworld is populated by several species recognizable through fairy tales and pop culture alike. There are trolls, dwarfs, vampires, werewolves, dragons, zombies, gnomes and even a clan of Igors. The presence of these various races and others is used throughout the novel to touch upon issues of equality, prejudice, and racism. As stated in a footnote in *Witches abroad*: "Racism was not a problem on the Discworld, because—what with trolls and dwarfs and so on—speciesism was more interesting. Black and white lived in perfect harmony and ganged up on green" (201). This quote speaks to the human need to create a dichotomy of "us" vs. "them", with the former being the riotously superior of the two categories. Of course, the above quote is not completely accurate, as the Discworld is not wholly devoid of "traditional" forms of prejudice, with *Jingo* (1997) for instance presenting an almost text-book study and critique of what Edward Said terms Orientalism and exoticized, demonized and Othered "Oriental" figure. As Said writes, "European culture gained in strength and identity by setting itself off against the Orient as a sort of surrogate and even underground self'" (1979: 3). In essence, the "Orient" plays the role of the shadow-self.; and a shadow-self Klatch and its capital "Al Khali" indeed are to

41 Hence the inhabitants' strict refusal to doubt the existence of the space turtle the Great A'Tuin, lest they find themselves floating through space.

Ankh-Morpork (the Discworld's London). After playing with stereotypical (racist) imagery, which is part of popular culture, and satirizing it to the extreme, the novel ends with a satisfactory resolution, and protagonists such as Commander Vimes and Captain Carrot being able to see beyond differences and connect with others.

However, despite the above-mentioned, the majority of Othering that occurs on the Discworld is directed at other species, as well as Undead humans. Trolls in particular bear the brunt of human (and other species) prejudice. Like everything else in Pratchett's universe, which very much feels "lived in", there is nuance to be considered, as no species is completely villainous or innocent on the Disc.

> Troll skin, which is as flexible as leather but much, much tougher and longer-lasting, is still occasionally used for clothing by the less socially sensitive, and there is a particularly disreputable tavern (and this is Ankh-Morpork we're talking about) which is not only called the Troll's Head but has a very old one on a pole over the door. On the other hand, trolls have been known to eat people (for their mineral content) and the troll game of aargrooha, in which a human head is kicked around by two teams wearing boots of obsidian until it either ends up in goal or bursts, is almost certainly still played in its classical form in remote mountain regions. (*TR* 23)

Thus, as is the case in real life, addressing issues of systemic "racism" is complicated, and nuanced. As Edward James writes in his chapter "The city watch", "Pratchett approaches this topic sensitively, without preachiness, and with an awareness of some of the contradictions of an unthinking politically correct approach"; Adding that Pratchett does not choose the simple route of having his repulsive characters be the ones who display racism. Some of his most moral characters are also unknowingly susceptible to it (213). From Vimes to Carrot, inadvertent prejudice towards those who are different seems to be an issue that the characters have to work through and they develop throughout the various novels. Carrot himself was raised by dwarfs, and is in a relationship with the werewolf Angua, who technically belongs to the undead species; and yet, in *Men at arms*, when he learns that she lives in a house with a zombie, a ghoul and a banshee, expresses discomfort at the idea. His final pronouncement that the undead should "go back to where they came from", and Angua's subsequent reply that "[m]ost of them came from round here" serve to emphasize, a possible approach lacking in consideration towards the Other, and a human disregard for said Other's history and identity; neatly categorizing him/her into a being that is different from oneself, and thus

does not belong in the person's "home"; not taking into account that this could also be said "being's" home.

Zombies, as the one group of beings that is literary "undead" (though werewolves, vampires[42] and golems have been categorized as such as well), have been known to receive their fair share of Othering by the living. One prominent example is that of the Wizard Windle Poons, who becomes a Zombie, after Death stops performing his job for a while. Although they are magical scholars, and as such more "knowledgeable" than others, the rest of the wizards at the Unseen University are unable to deal with Poons who is no longer a part of them. Even the Librarian, who shall be discussed in this chapter, and whose animal self affords him a unique perspective, is unable and unwilling to accept Poons' presence.

Yet, it is because of his death that Poons, in essence, learns to live, and becomes whole. Thus, when death resumes his work, he does not choose to linger through an insistence on unfinished business (an option that is available, and the "traditional" method of becoming either a zombie or a ghost), but rather chooses to go to his death satisfied and content.

The Discworld races are in flux, and they sort of *become* each other. Even genetics are not the be all and end all on the Disc. Constable (later Captain) Carrot Ironfoundersson[43] is a human who was raised by dwarfs, and is for all intents and purposes a dwarf himself. His commanding officer – Captain Vimes even notes at one point that his lack of nervousness in the face of danger stems from his dwarf-like lack of imagination. As the races are in flux, it might be said that they ultimately accept death as their final becoming[44]. This could be seen as Pratchett's platform for the construction of individual identity and group identity. It could also be seen as a political statement, as

---

42

Though some vampires used to be human, thus earning a truly "undead" status, most belonging to the race seem to have been born vampires, and thus are in effect not technically undead humans as they were never human to begin with.

43

The open secret regarding Carrot is that he is the true heir to the throne of Ankh-Morepork, but he is perfectly content to leave the running of the city to the Patrician and not claim it for his own, as he recognizes it to be the best path. This is interesting as, for all intents and purposes, he would be a king of legends; he displays the chivalry, charisma and honor of literary kings like Tolkien's Aragon. Still, he feels that the city with its various guilds and diverse existence needs someone like the Patrician who is cruel yet logical, and in his own way – fair.

44

there is not global division of light and dark, good and evil; everyone is capable of good and everyone is capable of evil, and hailing from a certain place or belonging to a certain race does not inform that; even when characters "believe" that and make judgements based on it, this belief is constantly challenged be the narrative itself.

3.1.2. Building oneself: The Igor clan

One interesting group of individuals occupying the Discworld is that of the Igor clan. Residing primarily in Überwald, and acting as servants for everyone "who is (or was) anyone" (*TR* 196), the Igor clan represents a fascinating combination of traditions and innovations. In terms of family tradition, every male clan member bears the name Igor and every female is named Igorina, in order to avoid confusion. But even beyond that, they also actively choose to keep "constructing" themselves using body parts that belong to deceased family members or friends (from whom they inherited said parts); which is a ghastly image. Thus, as is the case with identity, the Igors' bodies are constantly in flux, constantly in a state of becoming, while having deep roots and a connection with their heritage. It can be said that this depiction of Igors is satirical as they strive to maintain their traditions (working for insane geniuses and maintaining a subservient attitude), and their "tribal markings" (the lisp and the stitches), while dedicating their lives to science and medicine. In *The fifth elephant* the characters are met with a young Igor who eschews family traditions (to the point that some do not recognize him as an Igor), does not maintain a lisp, nor does he believe in having a master, and would like to move to the city – where the future lies.

But looking on the image of the Igors, we can say that in a sense, we are all a collection of our lived experiences, our heritage, and our aspirations. The Igors represent the physical embodiment of said idea, with their bodies acting as a tapestry of their pasts and futures. They are also unbothered by the idea of their own mortality or the future use of their limbs. "The Igors effectively treat their bodies as the common property of all Igors and they would hope that any useful bits they have will be passed

---

On the Discworld, belief has the power to shape the characters' death as well. Each individual is met with the after-like based on his/her belief system, and is punished/rewarded based on what s/he believes s/he will be met with.

on to their relatives; Igors do not so much die as get broken down for spares" (*TR* 196). This lack of concern might stem from their practical nature, and their desire to constantly recycle their bodies in the most useful ways. Another reason could be that they feel that as long as their bodies are of use to someone, they do not die.

Even beyond that, as a clan that instead of myths and legends, "passes on the secrets of incredibly skilled surgery [except in the area of cosmetics)" (196), Igors can be said to epitomize the idea of posthumanism through their process of body-construction. With their constant body enhancements, they are, in effect, cyborgs.

Of course, one might ponder at this clan's sense of identity. In essence, they are all called "Igor" (or Igorina) denoting a sense of collective identity and collectivist philosophy. They all practice the family profession (surgery and servitude), they look similar, employ the "tribal markings" of unnecessary visible stitching (196), and use the circulating body parts in order to enhance their own bodies. Yet one might say that each Igor is still unique. Each chooses to construct him/herself in their own way. They might attain new body parts through the people they meet in their lives, but the stories behind said parts, and how they go about "using" them is personal. In *Carpe jugulum*, for instance, the de Magpyr Igor is said to have been bequeathed his second heart from Mr. Swines, and his feet from Mikhail Zwenitz whose parents wanted Igor to have something he could remember him by. In this case, Igor's body "documents" his life and the lives of those who had an influence on him. This body is uniquely his. And even should others use the provided body parts at a later date, they will not be used in the same way; they will be "added" to other existing body parts, to other existing life experiences and identities. The Igor who received the feet at a later date, will not remember Mikhail Zwenitz through them, but the de Magpyr Igor. Still, perhaps, in a sense, becoming part of another being is one way of attaining immortality, as a small part of oneself remains alive through (and in the aid of) others.

Although the Igors bodily transformations are extreme and "fantastical", are they *that* distinct from "normal" humans? Are we not all a sum of our lived experience? A product of our connection with other people who have left their mark on our lives and our identities? In a sense, the Igors transformations are mere physical embodiment of processes we all go through in life.

But it is not only our inner selves that interact with and are affected by our lived experiences and the people in our lives, our physical bodies are affected as well. Recent scientific research indicates that chimerism – bodies that contain cells that are genetically distinct from each other are not as rare as previously perceived. In fact, many mothers are what is referred to as microchimeras, as their bodies retain a small number of their children's cells. In essence, they, like Igors, partially carry a genetic identity of other family members (Chan et al.). But even beyond that, as our cells mutate throughout our lifetimes, we ourselves become mosaics – a form of chimerism. Although in most cases our mosaicism is not as extreme as in the infamous case of the tragic "elephant man", we nevertheless become different versions of ourselves throughout our lifetimes. Thus, mutable bodies are not the exclusive realm of fantasy transformations and science fiction enhancements. Our bodies are in constant flux, even beyond aging. And so, the question arises, who are we if neither our bodies nor our "identities" are fixed? Are we, as Deleuze and Guattari assert, in a constant state of becoming? In this chapter, I will focus on four of Terry Pratchett's transforming characters (and a few secondary ones associated with them), who can be seen through the prism of different aspects of becomings. Some of these transformations are magically-based, some genetically based, and still others are "will"-based, which is perhaps the strongest magic of all.

3.2. Becoming animal: "Traditional" Discworld shape-shifters

The Discworld is teeming with creatures, monsters and fantasy beings. When considering cases of "transformation", we should at first examine those creatures that supposedly adhere to the folklorically "conventional" forms of shape-shifting; i.e. human beings who through a curse or a gift are forced/able to transform into animal shape. Of course, in Pratchett's subversive world, nothing is as simply as that; and even though some beings are more recognizable than others, and even though they can follow pop-culture tropes, these characters' presence can be more layered, and can work to address social issues, while simultaneously playing into character tropes that have existed for many years. In the following sections, the character tropes will be classified

according to the mode of transformation and interpreted as a variant of the process of becoming, as outlined in the theoretical chapter.

3.2.1. Becoming ape – becoming oneself: The librarian

"If the abnormal goes on long enough it becomes the normal" (*MP* 31)

In *Hogfather*, Pratchett's most beloved character – Death explains the human need for fantasy to his granddaughter by stating: "Humans need fantasy to be human. To be the place where the falling angel meets the rising ape" (408), a multifaceted statement that among other things, presents humanity as a bridge (or a hybrid) between science and belief. Interestingly, and while the notion of a "rising ape" both denotes evolution and progress, contextualizing the human condition as superior to the animal form, one of the most well-known and memorable characters in the Discworld series is a human who embraces his transformation into ape form, actively refusing to be turned back into a human.

The first major shape-shifter that readers are introduced to in the Discworld novels is the Unseen University Librarian, whose transformation occurs in the second Discworld novel – *The light fantastic* (1986). While following a semi-traditional method of transformation for a wizard, i.e., a magical accident occurs, and a wizard is stuck in Orangutan form, this is where the similarity to folktale transformation ends. After an initial sense of shock and sadness, shown in said novel, the Librarian beings to embrace his new shape and new self, developing self-confidence and a new perspective at life that sees him actively resisting any attempt to be turned back into human form. He goes so far as to erase records of his identity, and threaten the wizard Rincewind (who remembers it) into silence. His human existence is forgotten by all, to the point that no one aside from Rincewind even remembers his name, or is bothered about not recalling it. To other wizards, he is a being that is not governed by shape but by function. "[I]f someone ever reported that there was an orangutan in the Library, the wizards would probably go and ask the Librarian if he'd seen it" (*NW* 42).

While the brief introduction to the Librarian's human form (and temporary remnants of his old personality immediately following the transformation) denotes a shy, timid and introverted character; his new "self" not only develops assertiveness and confidence, but also a sense of practicality that dominates his approach to life thereafter. His confidence might stem, in part, from his "trust" in his animal senses, as demonstrated by his encounter with a hitherto unseen nightmare dragon in *Guards! Guards!*:

> It had seemed amusing and instructive to follow the Watch into the Shades, an urban jungle which held no fears for a 300-lb ape. But now the nightmare he had seen while brachiating across a dark alley would, if he had been human, have made him doubt the evidence of his own eyes. As an ape, he had no doubts whatsoever about his eyes and believed them all the time. (Pratchett 1997: 83)

And the Librarian's senses do play a major role in his approach to the world and those occupying it; at times in a detrimental manner, as they encourage his sense of "essentialism" (to some degree), when he himself defies said essentialism through his own mutability.

Among other things, the Librarian views his new reality as a release from the constant state of "questioning" that plagues the human existence. He likes the fact that "all the big philosophical questions resolved themselves into wondering where the next banana was coming from. Anyway, long arms and prehensile feet were ideal for dealing with high shelves" (*ER* 207). This statement also serves to demonstrate how he sees his new form as a practical tool for better performance of his librarianship duties. In a sense, he, like the other wizards, associates his identity with his function as a librarian, and once he sees the benefits of his new form to his job, he wholeheartedly embraces his 300lb red-haired orangutan shape. He embraces his new identity to the point that when his shape becomes unstable in *The last continent*, due to an illness, the various shapes that he takes throughout the novel always contain physical remnants of his ape shape (usually in the form of red fur), and when he is ultimately cured, he reverts back to ape shape permanently. Remarkably, although he takes on several "interesting-looking" shapes throughout his illness, including an armchair a book and a seashell (as well as his orangutang shape briefly), he is never transformed back into human form.

The Librarian's newfound disassociation with the human condition sees him becoming dismissive of emotional issues that usually occupy people's thoughts: "It wasn't that he was unaware of the despair and nobility of the human condition. It was just that as far as he was concerned you could stuff it" (*S* 13). It is as though by becoming an animal, he is able to, in a sense, observe humanity from the outside, and be critical of it. In *Unseen academicals*, even though he, like others is sucked into the football game[45], he is even more drawn into observing the "bigger" game:

> It is said that the onlooker sees most of the game. But the Librarian could smell as well, and the game, seen from outside, was humanity. Not a day went past without his thanking the magical accident that had moved him a few little genes away from it. Apes had it worked out. No ape would philosophize, 'The mountain is, and is not.' They would think, 'The banana is. I will eat the banana. There is no banana. I want another banana.' (*UA* 104-105)

Interestingly, despite the fact that he used to be human, he transformed into an ape[46] of all animals, and he maintains his mental faculties even in animal form, the Librarian becomes a being that is close enough to a human so as to understand humanity, yet distant enough so as to be critical of it.

Ironically, while other stories of transformation denote mutability and flexibility, once the Librarian embraces his new identity, he gains stability, and in a sense, also develops an animal-like rigid world-view. While his new form permits him to better trust his senses, allowing him to see what humans "refuse" to see, he also actively refuses to acknowledge beings that he feels defy what he sees as the natural order. In *Reaper man*, he rejects Windle Poons, a dead wizard who was zombified courtesy of Death taking a vacation, refusing to interact with him, and attempting to eject him from

---

45 "Something about the shouting and the fighting appealed to his ancestral memories. And this was fascinating, because, strictly speaking, his ancestors had been blamelessly engaged for centuries as upstanding corn and feed merchants and, moreover, were allergic to heights" (*UA* 104).

46 Which, according to Darwin's *The descent of man, and selection in relation to sex* (1871), shares a common ancestor with humans. Interestingly, it is suggested in *The Science of Discworld* (1999) that the Librarian meets Charles Darwin (or at least an author in the process of writing, whose beard would put the wizards' to shame, and who should have used the word "Ascent" in his book on evolution). During said meeting, the Librarian is asked whether man is an ape or an angel, "The Librarian knew this one. 'Ook,' he said, which meant: ape is best, because you don't have to fly and you're allowed sex, unless you work at Unseen University, worst luck" (205).

the library, even as they both work towards a common goal. In *Unseen academicals*, he refuses feels discomfort toward Mr. Nutt who is an orc who, for the majority of the novel, believed himself to be a goblin. "And there was another smell now, one he'd learned to recognize but could not quite fathom. It was the smell of Nutt. […] Nutt was important. He was also wrong. He had no place in the world, but he was in it, and the world was becoming aware of him soon enough" (*UA* 105-106). That said, he does learn to reluctantly accept these beings, which speaks towards a human flexibility that animals are not capable of.

Although the Librarian constantly revels in his new state, and sees it as preferable to the human condition, it should be stated that no matter what he may think of it, his process of becoming animal is still a process of hybridity and not a complete transformation. He still maintains the mental faculties o a human being, which are now merged with his newfound animal senses that see him "smelling" the game as well as seeing it. He also maintains his memories, so although he completely disowns his old self, there is still a plethora of old memories and experiences that have left their mark on him. In *The beast within: Animals in the Middle Ages*, Joyce Salisbury suggests that tour fascination with shape-shifting might stem from the idea that animals "do not abide by social expectations that bind humans. They do what they want, go where they want" (5). This is true when it comes to the Librarian to some degree; but although he is mostly freed from the shackles of social expectations, it is not complete freedom. In *Turtle Recall*, it is stated that he "is generally naked but he does wear an old green robe when he's had a bath or modesty really requires it" (227). Why would modesty require it? Would an ape have a sense of modesty? And why should the Librarian *care* about modesty if he completely "disowned" the human condition?

There are no clear answers to the above-stated question, except to say that he is a being that draws from all his life experiences, that encapsulates both an ape self and a human self, creating a new self. There are no examples of the Librarian interacting with "natural" apes, so it is difficult to say if he would feel as an outsider among them. But the example that will be discussed next, that of the Discworld werewolves, heavily suggests that he would, in fact, be an outsider; that unlike humans who would (despite possible discomfort) accept hybrid beings and individuated animals into their midst, animals have rigid species "categories" that do not allow for hybridity or

transformation. The Librarian's own initial attitude towards Windle Poons and Mr. Nutt heavily supports that, although his human flexibility balances that out.

3.2.2. The werewolves of the Discworld: A being in-between

"Undead yes – unperson no!" (*RM* 130)

As stated previously, the Discworld, which combines elements of fantasy and science fiction, is ripe with beings associated with folklore and mythology. As such, many recognizable fantasy creatures populate the Disc. From the more obscure creatures, such as golems and ghouls, to the more "mainstream" ones such as vampires, dwarfs, and yes, werewolves.

Like other folkloric figures, werewolves inhabit the Discworld, and are an integral part of the fabric of its local communities. However, while the Discworld's werewolves borrow heavily from popular werewolf tropes, as is the case with many creatures on the Disc, they are not a monolith. For one thing, traditional lycanthropes are not the only were-creatures that exist on the Disc[47]. For another, most Discworld werewolves are born as such, and are not "made", as is the case with many Discworld vampires. As such, werewolves are not technically human, as they belong to a hybrid species, with its own history, culture and customs, in which both human and wolf identities intermingle. As hybrid creatures, werewolves are in a constant state of becoming, with both human and animal selves "becoming" each other. That said, and while this hybridity would supposedly create a bridge between species, both humans and wolves alike despise werewolves. According to *The folklore of Discworld*:

> Most humans and dwarfs find werewolves both frightening and disgusting, so werewolves do all they can to keep their condition secret, and most of the time they can pass as human. But if when in wolf shape they were to meet real wolves, they could never pass as wolf – the scent is quite different. And for the most part real wolves *detest* werewolves. So, one way and another, werewolves lead a lonely life. (Pratchett and Simpson 2008: 113)

---

47 Legend has it that there are even wereducks in Überwald (the Transylvania-like part of the Discworld).

So, as in-between beings[48], werewolves are rejected by all. This might stem from a sense of abjection associated with the "me" that is not "me". In human form, although werewolves might pass for human, they are not so; and in animal form, wolves can "smell" the difference. They are close enough to both forms, and yet "not-quite-right", so as to elicit discomfort, or fear. Instead of these groups "expanding" in order to accommodate what constitutes a human/wolf, they reject the outliers, at times subtly, and at others, overtly.

Notwithstanding the "shame" that some werewolves experience, forcing them to hide when undergoing the transformation (not altogether dissimilar to traditional attitudes to female menstruation), as previously states, werewolves themselves are diverse (even if one does not take into account other were-creatures). Some are born proper biomorphs[49], as is the case with the family members of Angua von Überwald (who will be explored in the next section). Those werewolves are able to shape-shift at will, in addition to their full-moon forced transformation. In these werewolves, the human-wolf hybrid identity is most pronounced, as they are free to embrace any and all elements of either identity[50], and have the freedom to "migrate" between them at will. Other biomorphs might have inherited the gene from a distant relative making the

48

The werewolves' "in-between" state that is somewhat unique in the context of the novels, as other species have "stable" identities. Even the Librarian becomes stable in his new identity once he acquires it. The only comparable, constantly changing character we encounter is Greebo the cat (who will be discussed in this chapter), but as an "individuated animal" that transforms into human form, his condition is also unique to him.

49

Pratchett uses the word "biomorph" mainly in association with classic werewolves, and does not refer to other possible meanings of the word. Of course, in a world of intertextuality, one may associate the term with Dali's work, with surrealism, or with architectural shapes inspired by nature. It could also be a subtle reference to Richard Dawkin's 1986 book *The Blind Watchmaker*, which discusses among other things, computer shapes resembling genes in their rhizome-like "nature", but which he (as stated) hopes to evolve as animal-like shapes and not "trees". Dawkins himself writes that the "name [was] coined by Desmond Morris for the vaguely animal-like shapes in his surrealist paintings [...] Desmond Morris claims that his biomorphs 'evolve' in his mind, and that their evolution can be traced through successive paintings (Dawkins 55)

50

Which in itself takes a toll on their sense of self, as shall be explored in the next section.

manifestation of their lycanthropy somewhat different. This is the case for Ludmilla Cake, whose mother (who is not a werewolf herself) suspects might have werewolf blood in her ancestry (based on family anecdotes). Ludmilla is bound to the "traditional" form of transformation during the week of the full-moon, while being in human form for the rest of the month. Although tall and "impressive" in appearance, Ludmilla is meek and sweet, a residue of her desire to blend into the background and hide what she, and more importantly her mother, see as an unpalatable truth. Ludmilla is unable to embrace her hybrid identity, as she is taught to strive for the appearance of normalcy, with worries of people's opinions playing a role, even though her mother herself is able to see the future, and is far from "normal" herself. Ludmilla is only able to step out of the shadows when meeting the recently deceased Windle Poons, and what she believes at the time is his dog Lupine[51], and helping them along their adventure.

Lupine, who eventually becomes Ludmilla's love interest, is an inverted form of werewolf – a wereman. He appears in wolf form for three weeks of the month, and takes on human form for the remaining week. Their relationship works both to serve the plot's sense of farce, but also to address issues of compromise and finding common grounds in seemingly impossible circumstances. Ludmilla and Lupine are so similar, and yet so different. They both have human and wolf selves; both suffer from the stigma of their dual identities (albeit in different manners), both know the loneliness of their situation. When directly asked[52] regarding his experience as a wereman, Lupine replies that it is a lonely existence, attributing said loneliness to experiences that no one else has:

> 'You don't fit in, you see. When I'm a wolf I remember what it's like to be a man, and vice versa. Like... I mean... sometimes... sometimes, right, when I'm wolf-shaped, I run up into the hills ... in the winter, you know, when there's a crescent moon in the sky and a crust on the snow and the hills go on for ever… and the other wolves, well, they feel what it's like, of course, but they don't know like I do. To feel and know at the same time. No-one else knows what that's like. No-one else in the whole world could know what that's like. That's the bad part. Knowing there's no-one else …' (*RM* 135)

---

51 It is stated that the reason everyone believes Lupine to be a dog was that wolves do not live in the city, and this "knowledge" trumps all, even what one sees with his/her very own eyes. This even extends to Ludmilla, who as a werewolf, should be able to distinguish a wolf from a dog.

52 by Poons who develops an interest and understanding in the world around him after death.

To Lupine, possessing a human consciousness as a wolf is almost like a curse. Wolves are able to "feel" experiences, relying on their animal instincts, but he is also able to "know" said experiences like a human; yet, as no other human is able to experience them as well, he is stuck in-between the human and animal world, feeling isolated. While, Lupine is able to make connections[53], mostly in the form of the undead, or liminal beings; and while he remains close to the human world by taking on the attributes and identity of what Deleuze and Guattari deem an "individuated" animal (a dog); his experience is uniquely his, driving forward his sense of loneliness, *until*, that is, he meets Ludmilla Cake, the werewolf. Although, they "approach" their transformation from the opposite side of each other, they are still able to meet "in-the-middle" as in-between creatures that have both human and wolf selves. Finding a human connection with people who seem our polar opposite is perhaps easier, when one focuses on what unites us, rather than what makes us different, shared experiences, and in some cases (as in this) shared trauma can help people make connections that they otherwise might not have thought possible.

3.2.3. Becoming wolf, becoming woman: Angua von Überwald

While shame and loneliness are not limited to Ludmilla and Lupine, other forms of lycanthropy carry with them different baggage, different life experiences and different burdens. Sergeant, (later captain) Angua von Überwald of the Ankh-Morpork City Watch comes from a background that, on the face of it, will allow her to discard feelings of shame at her "condition", yet as we are first introduced to her in *Men at Arms*, we come to realize that this is not completely the case. In some regards, Angua displays more confidence and agency in her day-to-day interactions, even when integrating into the night watch as its first female (and as it happens werewolf) recruit. At the same time, she hides her lycanthropy long after she needs to, and her internal musings convey volatility and insecurity regarding her condition.

---

[53] unlike a character that shall be discussed later - the "Little Red Riding Hood" Wolf who is incapable of building any relationships

As such, her family background, in itself, warrants some consideration. Angua's family is a part of "werewolf aristocracy", residing the Transylvania-like area of Überwald, and tracing their lineage several generations (like any self-respecting aristocratic family). Their position and attitudes as they are introduced in *The fifth elephant* denote a sense of entitlement that dangerously spreads to a disregard to others' lives, to the point that their son Wolfgang displays supremacist attitudes that extend to him becoming a vicious murderer.

Angua's family are werewolves by birth, and their form of lycanthropy allows them to transform between human and animal shapes at will (in addition to the forced transformation during a full moon). This provides them with agency in deciding their preferred shape, and in embracing both parts of their identity. Although this could lead to an organic and balanced hybridity; Angua's family is not an example of that. The aforementioned Wolfgang, who appears to bask in his lycanthropy, always prances around naked, proud in his muscular physique. He enjoys playing a "traditional" game, whereby he chases players with the rest of his gang throughout the wood in wolf form. He uses "civilized" as a derogatory term, intoning that his connection to "nature" is superior, and beyond social rules and boundaries. He goes as far as to murder his sister Elsa, and chase away his brother Andrei, because both are yennorks[54], and perceived to be "impure" due to their apparent inability to shapeshift between human and wolf forms. The Discworld companion *Turtle recall*, however, asserts that this is not the case. While some, like Elsa always appear in human form, and others like Andrei always appear in wolf form, they remain werewolves, and neither human nor wolf. "Technically, the yennork does change at full moon, but because its biological make-up lacks a cogwheel somewhere, it changes from the shape it is into *the same shape again*, and doesn't notice" (Pratchett and Briggs 2015: 413). So, while yennorks do not appear any different, their hybrid identity remains, and they are still in-between creatures, the only difference is that they are marginalized by the majority of their own group (that is *itself* marginalized) due to their lack of overt shapeshifting. The fact that said shifting still occurs on a molecular level, and that they still carry a dual identity pales when confronted by what constitutes a "true" werewolf. And thus, the spiral descent of

---

54 Yennorks who intermarry without realizing their werewolf selves are thought to be the source of the numerous variants of werewolves in existence.

othering continues, with those who are othered, victimizing and othering those that do not fall into a neat category of what constitutes being a part of the collective.

When Andrei runs away in fear of meeting the same fate as Elsa, he does not join a pack of wolf; he does not belong with the wolves, who would recognize and chase him away in a heartbeat. He becomes the closest creature to his true self that he can be – a shepherd's dog. With dogs being what Deleuze and Guattari would describe as individuated animals, they are the closest link that Andrei has to his dual self – nature and culture, wolf and human. In a sense, they are in-between creatures like him; but they are creatures that are accepted in the human world as part of said world, even in animal form; and thus, he becomes a dog, and is happier for it.

Wolfgang, who is supposedly secure in his werewolf identity, chooses to embrace cruelty as a "natural" right. That said, he also displays signs of a lack of stability, which become more overt as the novel progresses. The inner lack of stability is further emphasized by an outer one:

> He was different this time. Wolf ears sprouted from a head that was still human. His hair had grown around him like a mane. Patches of fur were tufted on his skin, and were mostly streaked with blood.
>
> The rest of him… was having trouble deciding what it was. One arm was trying to be a paw. (*TFE* 423)

This lack of stability, and as the readers come to know towards the end lack "control" lead to his ultimate downfall (and death). Wolfgang is unaware that having a naturally hybrid identity does not necessarily mean that it is an inherently stable one. In the werewolves' case a delicate (and difficult) balance between human and animal. Wolfgang does not maintain this balance; he overindulges in embracing his bestiality, mistaking it for a source of power and superiority, and is thus stumped by it.

Fear of a loss of control turns out to be one of the reasons that drove Angua to abandon her family and their traditions, and build a new life with the City Watch. It transpires that while the Überwald family wholeheartedly embraces their dual selves, said dual selves do not necessarily coexist in harmony for them or for other werewolves. At the same time, spending too much time in one shape, makes a werewolf "forget" his/her other self. Thus, it becomes a delicate dance of balancing out different aspects of

one self, and not everyone is successful at it. Wolfgang is an extreme example of basking in all (negative) aspects of his dual identity without checks or balances (combining animal instincts with human thought and potential for cruelty), his father the Baron seems uncomfortable in his human shape, spending the majority of his time in wolf forms (which is in itself a downwards spiral as he becomes less and less human), and wearing the bare minimum (a loose nightgown) when forced (by his wife and station) to be in human form; and while the mother the Baroness seems more adjusted, one mention of "bath" causes her major discomfort, and leads her to verbally lash out at her "guest" (or hostage) Lady Sybil who requests one:

> She flashed Lady Sybil a brief, brittle smile. 'We do not, in fact, have a… have such a, a device in the castle.' A thought occurred to her. 'We use the hot springs. So much more hygienic.'
>
> 'Out in the forest?'
>
> 'Oh, it's quite close. And a quick run around in the snow really tones up the body.' (*TFE* 370)

The internal conflict that is represented in this statement by the Baroness, does not only relate to her dual human/wolf identity, but to her struggle as both a "vulgar" animal and an aristocrat. Her justification for eschewing baths, which are feared by her and her family, is that it is done in favor of something more "sophisticated" – hot springs. She cannot bring herself out to admit to a peer that she and her family members do not bathe, even though said peer is someone she loathes and looks down upon, and even though Lady Sybil is married to her daughter's boss, and is aware of and accepting of others' preferences. While the family's wolf selves take precedence where it comes to hygiene, it seems that for the Baroness at least, maintaining appearances is equally as important, if not more so.

That said, the Baroness seems to be the most "in-control" member of her family, aside from Angua herself. Perhaps the key lies, in part, in their female identities. In the first chapter, I suggested that Pratchett could be embodying what Deleuze and Guattari termed becoming-woman in his writing, and his approach to female characters and female identities certainly seems to corroborate that. The books contain numerous examples of Pratchett's progressive approach to women. He does not limit himself to

the overused “girls can do anything boys can", although he exemplifies that in one of his earlies novels – *Equal Rites*, which sees a young woman on a path to becoming a wizard, and not a witch, and the hurdles she overcomes. But for the most part, Pratchett’s female characters do not have to “lose” themselves, embody male characteristics, or be the well-trodden “not like other girls” stereotype in order to garner respect[55]. They are altogether human. They do not have to be perfect in order to be heroic, nor do they have to discard their feminine traits should they not choose to, in order to be “worthy". One of the most poignant examples found in the series is that of the female dwarfs, who are not supposed to be distinguishable from male dwarfs – with overt signs of femininity being treated as grotesque. When Angua, who is able to distinguish a dwarf’s gender through her developed sense of smell, makes it known to the new recruit – Cherry that she realizes that she is female, she is met with anxiety.

> Cheery sagged on to a seat. ’How could you tell? Even other dwarfs can’t tell! I’ve been so careful!’
>
> ’I don’t know why you’re so upset,’ said Angua. ’I thought dwarfs hardly recognized the difference between male and female, anyway. Look, there’s plenty of women in this town that’d love to do things the dwarf way. I mean, what are the choices they’ve got? Barmaid, seamstress, or somebody’s wife. While *you* can do anything the men do…’
>
> ’Provided we do only what the men do,’ said Cheery.
>
> Angua paused. ’Oh,’ she said. ’I *see*. Hah. Yes, I know *that* tune.’ (*FOC* 113)

Angua recognizes that female “empowerment” often involves the eschewing of feminine traits in order to survive in a male-dominated world. She understands that as long as feminine traits are treated as inferior, and less desirable, the “equality” that is achieved is, in fact, illusory. Thus, “doing anything” and fulfilling one’s potential as it would be seen, becomes a cynical bastardization of the idea of freedom, choice and to some degree – human excellence.

Angua herself is both feminine and “strong” (both physically and mentally, courtesy of her dual-minoritarian “condition). She embraces her womanhood and her

---

55 The novel *Monstrous Regiment*, which involves a recruit (or as it turns out a whole regiment) dressing up in male clothes in order to join the army contains interesting, and relevant commentary on gender norms and gender roles.

beastly nature, while keeping her human/wolf selves in-check. As such, she is better equipped for her hybrid existence than the other members of her family. It can be suggested that Angua's constant process of transformation between wolf and female forms provides a unique insight into a being in a constant process of transformation between two minoritarian shapes, which affords her an escape from the above-mentioned limiting state of being able to do "anything that men do".

All becomings revolve around multiplicities. Thus, becoming woman is not a simple process of a man or a different being turning into or embracing female traits. In fact, as stated in the first chapter, becoming-woman is primarily a becoming of woman herself, who undergoes a constant process of becoming, through which (and through contagion) man is also affected, and implicitly experiences becoming-woman. In Angua's case we have a wolf in a constant state of becoming woman, and a woman in a constant state of becoming animal (wolf), through a constant process of transformation. Both are a part of her identity, which is, in itself, mutable and everchanging. If becoming highlights power dynamics, then we also have an aristocrat, someone in a position of power, actively choosing to leave her life of privilege and power (limited as it may be through her role as a woman – even an aristocratic one), and building her own power from the bottom-up by going into a new city and joining the city guards.

Angua and her mother are better able to handle their dual identities and hybridity than the other notably male figures in their family. Where Wolfgang becomes lost (in an in-between shape) prior to his death, and Baron von Überwald is barely hanging on to his humanity, the Baroness is able to function as a full human (albeit with a fear of baths), even towards the end of *The fifth elephant*; Angua is even better equipped, and appears more at peace with her identity, despite a constant fear of meeting the same fate as her brother. Her fears might not be necessary, as his state seems to be partially derived from a constant embrace of majoritarian traits and ideas, even when ostensibly becoming minoritarian. Although his mother holds similar ideas (hence the remnants of animal traits even in human form), and although her wolf self carries a separate name from her, her transformation is constantly between animal form and woman form. Angua is even better able to embrace her hybridity, with her wolf not having a separate name from herself, as she does not carry majoritarian ideals of superiority, even while herself belonging to a minoritarian group. That said, Angua admits that loss of control is

still a real danger to her, as is the case with other werewolves. Adept as she is at governing the different aspects of her inner self, as demonstrated by her statement to her mother when the latter derogatorily asked what she gained in the city (while subtly losing control over her human shape), with her reply being “Self-control"; Angua also admits throughout the novel, that she, like the other werewolves, is in a constant fight to balance out her complex and multilayered identity. Towards the end of the novel, she asks her partner (and colleague) Carrot to promise to essentially kill her, if she loses control the way her brother does. Of course, while Wolfgang does not try to have self-control, mistakenly seeing it as a source of power, Angua is both conscious and at peace with her woman and wolf selves, with both minoritarian identities playing an equal part in her daily life, which gives hope to her continued ability to exist with a complex hybrid identity. Pratchett does not strive to present a “neat” solution, whereby accepting oneself can solve all problems. While accepting one’s hybrid self is important, a hybrid existence is still fraught with challenges and pain; and Pratchett does not shy away from that.

In *Dreamtime: Concerning the Boundary between Wilderness and Civilization*, Hans Peter Duerr writes:

> werewolves are persons who are able to dissolve 'within themselves' the boundary between civilization and wilderness, who can step across the fence separating their 'civilization side' from their 'wilderness side', their 'wolf’s nature'. These are people who can look their 'animal nature' in the eye, something usually kept under lock and key in their culture, and in this way can develop a consciousness of their 'cultural nature' (Duerr 1985: 87)

Pratchett's werewolves have a culture unto themselves, but when it comes into clash with "human" or the wider culture it loses. The werewolves' hybridity, like other hybrid beings in Pratchett's world, is not necessarily harmonious; nor are their special "identity" and unique culture able to (normally) provide them with a stable sense of self.

3.2.4. Of dogs and (wo)men: Angua, Gaspode, and the "Pack" of dogs

One of the first creatures/characters that Angua meets upon joining the city watch in her debut novel, *Men at Arms*, is Gaspode the Wonder Dog, and throughout the novel, they

form an unlikely (and to some degree unwilling) friendship. Gaspode is first introduced to the readers in the novel *Moving Pictures* (1990), which explores the power of a place called "Holy Wood" (a clear reference) in shaping people[56], and he is first made sentient in said novel, only to return back to normal at the end of it[57]. Gaspode's second appearance happens in *Men at Arms*. In *that* novel, it is revealed that due to the magic of the Unseen University, he regained his awareness, human-like intelligence, and ability to speak. He explains to Angua:

> I've got chronic intelligence. Is that any use to a dog? Did I ask for it? Not me. I just finds a cushy spot to spend my nights along at the High Energy Magic building at the University, no one told *me* about all this bloody magic leaking out the whole time, next thing I know I open me eyes, head starts fizzing like a dose of salts, oh-oh, thinks I, here we go again, hello abstract conceptualizing, intellectual development here we come… What bloody use is that to me? Larst time it happened, I ended up savin' the world from horrible wossnames from the Dungeon Dimensions, and did anyone say fanks? Wot a Good Dog, Give Him A Bone? Har har." It held up a threadbare paw. "My name's Gaspode. Something like this happens to me just about every week. Apart from that, I'm just a dog." (*MAA* 68)

Of course, although it is not clearly stated in Gaspode's case, the Discworld is built on the foundation that once something has been achieved (no matter how "impossible" it had been before), the "pathway" back to it would be easier to find. This is why the cat Greebo (which will be discussed in the next section) develops the ability to take on human form without the aid of the witches who facilitate his first transformation. Thus, Gaspode's development of human consciousness the second time around also makes sense in this context. Although Gaspode does not physically transform[58], nor believe himself to be human, it would be interesting to briefly examine

---

56

A theme that also dominates *Witches Abroad*, which we will discuss in the following section; although *there* the focus is on Story/fairy tales dominating people's lives, and shaping them. In both cases, one may note Pratchett's emphasis on the controlling nature of the Narrative; how it shapes thoughts, opinions, and even identities. In fact, one may go as far as to claim it as the ultimate form of shapeshifting, one that is reflected in real life, whereby society and its narrative shapes people.

57

Once the Patrician prevents further movies, which were bringing about Dungeon Dimension creatures from being made; which results in Holy Wood being put back to sleep, covered in sand dunes.

58

his character as a bridge between humanity and the animal kingdom, both as an individuated animal - a dog, and as a sentient animal.

Gaspode's character is quite interesting. For one, he appears to take his newfound abilities in his stride. He takes advantage of them, "planting" thoughts into people's heads, in a manner that usually benefits him (such as suggesting that they give the little dog a biscuit). Said "planting" is him simply saying the words, but as it is a well-known fact that dogs cannot speak, people's brains cannot process the anomaly, and as such, his words become subliminal (or more accurately explicit) messaging.

> It was true that normal people couldn't hear Gaspode speak, because dogs *don't* speak. It's a well-known fact. It's well known at the organic level, like a lot of other well-known facts which overrule the observations of the senses. This is because if people went around noticing everything that was going on all the time, no one would ever get anything done*[59]. Besides, almost all dogs don't talk. Ones that do are merely a statistical error, and can therefore be ignored.
>
> However, Gaspode had found he did tend to get heard on a subconscious level. (84)

This point regarding the human tendency to ignore uncomfortable or illogical truths echoes the Librarian's insight in *Guards! Guards!* regarding him believing his eyes, even when what he sees is unbelievable because he is no longer human. The idea being that humans do not trust their senses as animals do; but also, that humans, with their imagination, are capable of creating such believable illusions to themselves that they no longer trust their own eyes.

Gaspode is also practical and street savvy, stating at one point (if a bit embarrassedly): "Pride is all very well, but a sausage is a sausage" (72). Throughout *Men at Arms*, he maintains the narrative (and wishful thinking) that he has a loving family that awaits him and that he chooses to stay in the streets for days on end, in order to take a break from his life of leisure; a lie that is clear both to Angua and to the reader.

The existence of a sentient street dog is reminiscent of Mikhail Bulgakov's *Heart of a Dog* (1925), whereby a surgent implants a criminal's pituitary gland and testicles into a dog, causing him to undergo a process of transformation into human form. After the dog-man devolves into cruelty and criminal tendencies (which the surgeon at first ignores and attempts to rationalize), the surgeon and his student are forced to reverse tahe operation, fearing for their lives; which turns him back into a dog. Among other things, the novella ends with the suggestion that Sharik – the dog, retains partial human-like awareness.

59

The footnote states: This is *another* survival trait.

However, at the end of the novel, when he is rewarded for the help he provided throughout the plot with the life of his dreams, he *does* end up abandoning it, running back to his street life; embracing his hard yet free existence. Whether it is a case of "beware of what you wish for", or a case of him being overwhelmed by his new life, Gaspode actively chooses to go back to a seeming life of poverty and loneliness. Perhaps stemming from his sentient state, Gaspode is both aware of his need as a dog to please people, but also independent enough to attempt to distance himself from any form of overt ownership:

> Gaspode encapsulates the essential schizophrenia of all dogs. On the one hand, he desires nothing more than to be owned, to have a master and in general have a very secure warm place in front of the fire of life; on the other hand, he rebels against the very idea of ownership and any restriction on his freedom to roam Ankh-Morpork, eating and rolling in whatever he likes. Gaspode's tragedy is that, unlike other dogs, he is aware of this conflict. (*TR 165*)

He goes on demonstrate this dichotomy by almost unwillingly wagging his tale when Carrott notices and acknowledges him in the street during *Men at Arms*. The idea of freedom vs. domesticity partially dominates the story. During Gaspode and Angua's first encounter he advises her to get a collar[60] when she is in werewolf form, telling her: "By the way, you want to get a collar, miss. No one bothers you if you've got a collar"[61] (124). The idea being that the appearance of domestication, will allow Angua to roam "freely" in the streets. A collar, which both figuratively and literarily indicates the shackling of individuals (in this case dogs) by society, can be utilized to allow a wolf to walk the streets of the city, with no one batting an eye. Appearances are everything, and so long as dogs (or wolves) appear to belong, they are not given a second thought. Ironically, this is similar to how people many times treat each other. Someone who appears rich may get gifts or discounts that those less fortunate (and in more need of said boons) are not afforded; on the contrary, in some urban communities, if someone

---

60

A collar is also featured in the previously-mentioned *Heart of a Dog*, whereby upon his domestication (prior to his transformation), Sharik is put in a collar and walked along the street, with other street dogs looking at him with contempt.

61

Immediately after, Gaspode makes a point of asking Angua whether she rips hearts out, emphasizing the continued and widespread prejudice that werewolves experience from humans and animals alike.

appears poor or homeless s/he is hounded out of the area, be it through hostile architecture or aggressive interactions. Many real-life stories even feature people being unable to get a job as a place of residence address is required for job applications, yet they are unable to get a home without stable work and a down payment. Thus, people become caught up in an endless loop of poverty and victimization, partially due to stereotypes and expectations associated with their social status.

The idea of a collar makes an appearance again when Gaspode and Angua come face to face with the dog Guild and its leader Big Fido (the poodle). Fido's background is quite interesting:

> He had been a normal dog. He'd begged, and rolled over, and heeled, and fetched. Every night he'd been taken for a walk.
>
> There was no flash of light when It happened. He'd just been lying in his basket one night and he'd thought about his name, which was Fido, and the name on the basket, which was Fido. And he thought about his blanket with Fido on it, and his bowl with Fido on it, and above all he brooded on the collar with Fido on it, and something somewhere deep in his brain had gone "click" and he'd eaten his blanket, savaged his owner and dived out through the kitchen window. In the street outside a labrador four times the size of Fido had sniggered at the collar, and thirty seconds later had fled, whimpering.
>
> That had just been the start. (*MAA* 331)

It is told that Fido goes on to kill the leader of the city's largest gang of feral dogs through sheer will, determination, and madness:

> [M]ost animals don't fight to the death, only to the defeat, and Fido was impossible to defeat; he was simply a very small fast killing streak with a collar. He'd hung on to bits of Barking Mad Arthur until Barking Mad Arthur had given in, and then to his amazement Fido had killed him. There was something inexplicably determined about the dog—you could have sandblasted him for five minutes and what was left still wouldn't have given up and *you'd better not turn your back on it*.
>
> Because Big Fido had a dream. (331)

And Fido's (manic) dream was to discard the shackles, and dog's servitude to man. He does that by militantly leading other street dogs into discarding their collars, tearing clothes that humans may have provided them with, shredding ribbons, and by viciously killing any dog that may act upon its instinct to try and please humans. Even beyond that, Fido inspires his guild members to look to wolves for inspiration, seeing dogs as

wolves that have been domesticated and trying to recapture their "heritage" by imitating the wolves of the wild. The problem is that like other cases of surface-level imitation, these dogs do not understand true wolves, as made clear at several points throughout the novel. Having had no exposure to real wolves (at one point mistaking Angua for a wolfhound and admiring her for her resemblance to wolves), Fido and the dog Guild act in the way they assume real wolves act, which mostly proves to be wrong.

> Angua listened to the other dogs howling, and thought about wolves.
>
> She'd run with the pack a few times, and knew about wolves. These dogs *weren't* wolves. Wolves were peaceful creatures, on the whole, and fairly simple. […] Dogs were brighter than wolves. Wolves didn't *need* intelligence.
>
> They had other things. But dogs… they'd been given intelligence by humans. Whether they wanted it or not. They were certainly more vicious than wolves. They'd got that from humans, too. (335-336)

No matter what Fido and his followers may want to be true, their identity is partially if not mostly shaped by their continued interactions with humans. They have more in common with said humans than with the wolves that they aspire to be. Fido's dream of the "Natural Superiority of the Canine Race" is illusory, and does not allow him nor his followers to embrace their in-between status, which results in a confusion of identity among them, and a constant state of unrest.

Going back to Deleuze and Guattari, if becoming animal is done through a process of alliance, and embracing of "pack", then one may see the dogs in this case as human-like beings attempting to become animal through the creation of their own pack, and imitation of wolves – non-individuated animals. However, they go about the process in the wrong way. They are caught up in the glory that the image of a wolf invokes; but as most know, reality is rarely as glorious as legend. The dogs do not attempt to understand the very beings they admire and wish to affiliate (and filiate) with.

> "Good grief," said Angua, when they had put several streets between them and the crowd of dogs. "He's mad, isn't he?"
>
> "No, mad's when you froth at the mouf," said Gaspode. "He's insane. That's when you froth at the brain."

> "All that stuff about wolves—"
>
> "I suppose a dog's got a right to dream," said Gaspode.
>
> "But wolves aren't like that! They don't even have names!"
>
> "Everyone's got a *name*."
>
> "Wolves haven't. Why should they? They know who they are, and they know who the rest of the pack are. It's all…an image. Smell and feel and shape. Wolves don't even have a word for wolves! It's not *like* that. Names are human things."
>
> "Dogs have got names. *I've* got a name. Gaspode. 'S'my name," said Gaspode, a shade sullenly.
>
> "Well…I can't explain why," said Angua. "But wolves don't have names[62]. (337)

Yet Fido and his followers hold on to an image of ferocious creatures, carrying fear-inducing names, and dream of becoming like them. The dogs' perpetual state of in-betweenness does not allow them to understand creatures that are firmly in their element - the wild; ones who do not need "names" (or what we would perceive as names), but who are firmly secure in their identities. Fido and his Guild do not understand what a true "pack" is. "A pack is an association of free individuals. A pack doesn't leap because it's told—a pack leaps because every individual, all at once, decides to leap"[63] (376). The free choice to be a part of the collective; this is what Fido and the dogs do not understand, and this is what brings about their downfall.

> Dogs are not like cats, who amusingly tolerate humans only until someone comes up with a tin opener that can be operated with a paw. Men made dogs, they took wolves and gave them human things—unnecessary intelligence, names, a desire to belong, and a twitching inferiority complex. All dogs dream wolf dreams, and know they're dreaming of

---

62 In *The Fifth Elephant* it is stated that wolves *do*, in fact, have names; but they are more like long descriptions than what we know names to be; or at least, this is what Gaspode indicates to Carrot when they attempt to interact with a wolf. This emphasizes the different "culture" and different perspective that wolves possess, as opposed to humans and individuated animals, such as dogs.

63 In the section discussing Granny Weatherwax, we will also delve into bees, and the mind of the hive, which similar to some degree to a pack – operates as one.

biting their Maker. Every dog knows, deep in his heart, that he is a Bad Dog… (377)

This comparison with cats is quite interesting, as both cats and dogs are ostensibly "individuated animals". Yet it seems that cats, unlike dogs, are self-assured. They do not draw their identities from their masters. Dogs are caught up between the world of humans and the world of nature, in a manner not dissimilar to a wolf character that will be discussed in the next section. But Gaspode, again, being "aware" of his schizophrenic state, actually draws a comparison between dogs and werewolves, stating to Angua:

> "That's the thing what Big Fido can't get his mind around, see? You looked at the dogs in the Guild, right? You heard 'em howl. Oh, yes, Death To The Humans, All *Right*. But under all that there's the *fear*. There's the voice sayin': Bad Dog. And it don't come from anywhere but inside, right from inside the bones, 'cos humans made dogs. I knows this. I wish I didn't, but there it is. That's the Power, knowin'. I've read books, I have. Well, chewed books."
>
> The darkness was silent.
>
> "And you're a wolf and human at the same time, right? Tricky, that. I can see that. Bit of a dichotomy, sort of thing. Makes you kind of like a dog. 'Cos that's what a dog is, really. Half a wolf and half a human. You were right about that. We've even got names. Hah! So our bodies tell us one thing, our heads tell us another. It's a dog's life, being a dog. (369)

Interestingly, his point regarding the similarity between dogs and werewolves holds merit, even where it comes to names. Unlike wolves, werewolves *do* have names, at times even having separate names for their wolf parts, as stated previously. These wolf names are also somewhat reminiscent of those Fido and his followers believe wolves would carry. Werewolves and dogs alike are stuck between humanity and nature, and thus, even if unintentionally and unknowingly, bear more resemblance to each other than to any of the groups they wish to belong to.

Gaspode utilizes the dogs' own sense of insecurity against them; giving them orders using "speech" as they jump to attack him and Angua, which causes half their bodies to falter, as they internally battle their dual nature (which proves to be a losing battle). Fido himself is defeated by his own hubris, and belief in his wolf nature, as he attempts to leap after Angua atop rooftops, while she is in wolf form. He is unsuccessful and almost falls to his death, only for Gaspode to hold on to him using the remnants of

his collar. Upon discovering this fact, Fido fights against Gaspode's hold and falls to his death; whether he actively embraces death, in lieu of being saved by the sign of his domestication, or whether he truly believed that he would manage to survive on his own, Fido remains steadfast in his rejection of all things human to his dying breath. Ironically, when he is confronted by DEATH, he is ordered to "heel". He is unable to discard his dog self, even in death.

After Fido's death, like any awe-inspiring and cult-like leader, he takes on legendary status, among his followers:

> There were, eventually, two theories about the end of Big
>
> Fido.
>
> The one put forward by the dog Gaspode, based on observational evidence, was that his remains were picked up by Foul Ole Ron and sold within five minutes to a furrier, and that Big Fido eventually saw the light of day again as a set of ear muffs and a pair of fleecy gloves.
>
> The one believed by every other dog, based on what might tentatively be called the truth of the heart, was that he survived his fall, fled the city, and eventually led a huge pack of mountain wolves who nightly struck terror into isolated farmsteads. It made digging in the middens and hanging around back doors for scraps seem…well, more bearable. They were, after all, only doing it until Big Fido came back. His collar was kept in a secret place and visited regularly by dogs until they forgot about it. (381)

Like humans, Fido's followers prefer to "believe"[64] in a more palatable "truth", even if deep down, it does not make any sense. At the same time, like animals, they eventually forget; the difference being that wild animals forget and move on much faster, as demonstrated in *The Fifth Elephant* (and the pack of wolves). Wild animals cannot afford to hold on to sentimentalities, and thus even awe-inspiring leaders are quickly forgotten and replaced, as a means of survival.

As previously stated, while there are a number of "becomings", including becoming woman, becoming animal and becoming child, one notable exception is that of becoming man. The reason behind this is that according to Deleuze and Guattari, a becoming ultimately involves becoming minoritarian. The above-mentioned groups are minoritarian by nature, and can be Othered as a result. It is thus interesting to examine an animal character, a cat, that *in fact* becomes a man, and in a sense becomes majoritarian in the process. Then, at one point, the character participates in a masquerade in human form donning the mask of a cat, in a carnivalesque performance, which doubles down the transformation. This blending of the cat and human identities into one is a bit different from becoming animal, and it will be discussed below.

64

In *Hogfather*, Death explains to his granddaughter the human need for fantasy and belief as a coping mechanism, whereby they believe the "small" lies as practice. Susan (the granddaughter) then asks:

> 'So we can believe the big ones?'
> YES. JUSTICE. MERCY. DUTY. THAT SORT OF THING.
> 'They're not the same at all!'.
> YOU THINK SO? THEN TAKE THE UNIVERSE AND GRIND IT DOWN TO THE FINEST POWDER AND SIEVE IT THROUGH THE FINEST SIEVE AND THEN *SHOW* ME ONE ATOM OF JUSTICE, ONE MOLECULE OF MERCY. AND YET- Death waved a hand. AND YET YOU ACT AS IF THERE IS SOME IDEAL ORDER IN THE WORLD, AS IF THERE IS SOME... SOME *RIGHTNESS* IN THE UNIVERSE BY WHICH IT MAY BE JUDGED.
> 'Yes, but people have *got* to believe that, or what's the *point*-'
>
> MY POINT EXACTLY. (408)

This speaks again towards Pratchett's "anger" regarding lack of justice, but also towards the idea of a lack of ideal way by which the universe should operate. Like the dog guild, humans (and the universe at large) are messy; and they create "fantasies" in order to survive in a perpetually grey world.

3.3. Becoming (hu)man: Greebo and other animal shape-shifters

In ancient times, cats were worshiped as gods; they have not forgotten this.
– Terry Pratchett

Some of the most prominent characters (and protagonists) of the Discworld novels are the Lancre witches; a witch coven comprised of Esmeralda (Granny) Weatherwax, Gytha (Nanny) Ogg, and a third “maiden” witch, starting with Magrat Garlick, replaced by Agnes Nitt when the former marries and becomes queen. In the second Discworld novel starring the Lancre witches, *Wyrd sisters*, readers are introduced to Nanny Ogg’s tomcat – Greebo. The term “Greebo” is defined as “an unkempt or dirty-looking young man” ("Greebo", def.1.a)[65]. And, indeed, this definition suits the cat Greebo, Nanny Ogg’s familiar and constant companion, to a tee. Greebo is “a huge one-eyed [technically grey] tom who divided his time between sleeping, eating and fathering the most enormous incestuous feline tribe” (*TR*, 175). The witches have been described as vehicles of Pratchett’s reflection on ethical themes, as images of self-control and strength (Croft 2015: 152), representing “three ways of responding to one’s moral right and responsibility to make choices” (161).

In *Witches abroad*, the third Discworld novel starring the Lancre coven, the witches travel to the city of Genua to stop Granny Weatherwax’s sister Lily (or Lilith as she prefers to be known) from using the power of Story to control and shape people’s lives. She does so, among other ways, by treading on fairy-tale tropes and “forcing” people to be a part of the story; from “Sleeping Beauty", through “Pinocchio”, to “Little Red Riding-Hood", the plot of *Witches abroad* is littered with victims of Lilith’s attempt to create Happy Endings; not for the sake of helping people, but as a way of exerting her power over them. The main “plot” that concerns Lilith when confronted is a Cinderella story that involves a Frog Prince (or Duc) as the love interest; a plot that she brought about by killing the previous ruler of the city and sending his daughter to live with two evil step-sisters (who are in reality transformed snakes) awaiting the opportune moment to complete the story. The story presents a number of animal-human

65 “Greebo, N. (1).” Www.Dictionary.com, https://www.dictionary.com/browse/greebo. Accessed 22 February 2022.

transformations performed by Lilith in service of the Plot. She provides a Wolf with a human consciousness (which destroys him), transforms the above-mentioned sisters from snakes into humans, albeit mostly on a physical/superficial level only, transforms human coachmen into beetles and cruelly treads on them[66] , and finally a frog into a Duc.

All of the above-mentioned transformations precede that of Greebo in the story; in fact, the Lancre witches choose to bring about Greebo's transformation as a way of combatting Lily and her stories (though whether said act was justified remains a point of contention among them in later books – particularly due to the lasting effects). And yet, Greebo appears to have a different experience with becoming human than all of the other animals who transform throughout the story. The question is: could this be due to the manner and "lack of cruelty" involved in his transformation, his own personality, the fact that he is a cat while all other creatures are of the wild, or could a combination of all three reasons account for his relative comfort with the process[67]?

3.3.1. Of wild cats and domesticity

Real cats are not simply self-possessed. Nor are they simply neurotic. They are both, at the same time, just like real people. – Pratchett and Jolliffe, *The Unadulterated Cat*

When examining Greebo's personality and transformation, one should first note the type of animal that he is. Cats have always occupied both the domestic and wild space. Historically they were not domesticated until long after they started to cohabitate with humans, and in-fact even then, *they* domesticated themselves (Ottoni et al.). It is not surprising, thus, that even in myth and folklore they occupy a different position from other animals.

66 As they are "useless" to her Cinderella plot, and as "balance" needs to be maintained with her "needing" to replace them with mice as the story dictates.

67 Though not complete "comfort" as will be noted later.

Although shapeshifting characters have appeared in many forms in the legends and folklore of different cultures across the world, the monstrosity of cats differs from that of other creatures, because of their dual "identity" of both a creature of nature and a creature of culture. The cat is at once domesticated and wild, loved yet also suspicious. In *The Book of Yokai: Mysterious Creatures of Japanese Folklore* (2015), in discussing the *Bakeneko*[68], a form of a supernatural cat (or *Kaibyo*) that changes its form, it is stated that in many places in the world, including Japan, "cats seem to occupy an ambiguous position in human lives; they sit calmly, purring, on our laps one minute and go off chasing rats the next. They are both domestic and wild, comfortable in either urban or rural environments, simultaneously an intimate part of the human world and part of the natural world" (Foster and Shinonome 2015: 213). Essentially, a cat embodies the essence of both domesticity and wilderness; one may even go as far as to say that it is a hybrid creature representing a blending between culture and society.

This liminal state, and possible hybridity perhaps allow Greebo to embrace becoming human far more easily than if he had been a different animal. Greebo is closer to the world of man than any other animal that is transformed throughout the story. He has no issue blending into the human world, because he is in fact already a part of it. The self-possessed nature that is traditionally associated with cats is present in abundance in Greebo. He sees his surroundings as his own personal domain; views the world as his oyster (or mollusc on the Discworld). Thus, it is not surprising that despite a basic confusion regarding differences in anatomy and social relations between cats and humans, not only does he accept his transformation into a man, but he wholeheartedly embraces and relishes in it; albeit with some "technical" difficulties[69].

That said, Greebo does display certain characteristics that are uniquely his. For one, his sexual appetite is so extensive that he is thought to be the progenitor of every feline in Lancre for the next thirty generations. Throughout the novels, he also manages to seriously surprise a she-bear and chase a female wolf up a tree. He is feared by most

---

68

The most widely known tale of a *Bakeneko*, the story of the vampire cat of Nabeshima, tells of a cat that takes the shape of a princes' wife (Princess O Toyo) after killing her, in order to avenge the unjust death of its master at the hands of said prince (Prince Hizen), and uses its new shape to suck the blood of prince on a nightly basis.

69

His inability to use door handles, for one

creatures he encounters, be they of the rodent or monstrous variety, with his favorite pastime being that of fighting wild animals. “He’d trotted into the woods and found some wolves and had sat and grinned at them until they got uncomfortable and went away” (*WA* 74). He is even able to catch and eat a vampire (while the latter is in bat form), while he and the witches are travelling to Genua. “The bat squirmed under his claw. It seemed to Greebo’s small cat brain that it was trying to change its shape, and he wasn’t having any of that from a mouse with wings on. Especially now, when he had someone to play with” (74). But most of all, Greebo displays a confidence that is lacking, even in most other felines. “Most cats are nervous and ill at ease when taken out of their territory [...] But Greebo travelled well, purely because he took it for granted that the whole world was his dirtbox [...] Greebo also had a cat’s approach to possessions, which was simply that nothing edible had a right to belong to other people” (*M* 77).

All of these qualities, both feline and uniquely Greebo’s, serve to, perhaps, indicate why he is able to take to the process of becoming human, where other animals struggle to.

3.3.2. Greebo in boots: A hybrid existence of a cat-man

"For wolves and pigs and bears, thinking that they’re human is a tragedy.
For a cat, it’s an experience” (*WA* 268)

First, let us examine the manner through which Greebo’s transformation was brought about. In order to do that, a brief context should be provided for the novel *Witches Abroad*, which sees Greebo’s first transformation into human form (with a number of transformations taking part in other novels thereafter).

As briefly mentioned previously, in *Witches Abroad*, the Lancre witches: Granny Weatherwax, Nanny Ogg, and Magrat Garlick, are called upon to travel to the city of Genua, where Magrat is tasked with becoming one of the two fairy-godmothers to a “Cinderella” figure. As previously discussed, on the Discworld stories have the

power to shape people's lives[70]. Lilith de Tempscire[71], the other aforementioned fairy-godmother, utilizes the power of mirror magic, and her knowledge of stories, in order to control other people's lives, forcibly creating fairy-tales and cold "happy endings" that fail to take into account people's desires or needs. And as ruler, she becomes a tyrant to whom, the most egregious crimes are those committed against "narrative expectations". From her perspective, she is better equipped at managing people's lives for them: ""People didn't seem to know how they should behave. Lilith held a mirror up to Life, and chopped all the bits off Life that didn't fit…" (*WA* 85). Through this, Pratchett demonstrates, and criticizes "the shaping effects of Story as rooted in human desire for narrative neatness, for events that follow comfortingly familiar patterns"(Langford 9). But this need for "neatness" strives to streamline people's lives, rewarding sameness, and punishing difference. It also acts to take agency away from people, and suppress their free will.

The witches encounter a number of fairy-tale remnants along their journey, as they strive to save Emberella from her "fate" as the bride of a frog-prince. It is in this context that the witches are forces to transform Greebo into a man, as they attempt to fight against the power of the "Story" and fairy-tale tropes. Unlike the previously discussed transformation, which are more "traditional", in the sense that they involve humans becoming animals; *Witches Abroad* contains a number of animals that transform into human (or human-like) shapes through a process of belief, which is a powerful force on the Discworld. "[C]hanging the shape of an object is one of the hardest magics there is. But it's easier if the object is alive. After all, a living thing already knows what shape it is. All you have to do is change its mind" (*WA* 252). Thus, all the animals that transform into human form in *Witches abroad*, actively believe that they are human. However, there is a marked difference between Greebo and the other animals. For one, unlike the other animals, Greebo is aided through this process by

70

A manifestation of the manner in which stories shape our perceptions of the world, and thus people around us. Stories, particularly those that endure, are reflections of society and social narratives that are engrained into people's consciousness, and might inadvertently shape their actions or beliefs. The more a story is repeated, the more generally accepted it becomes, and the more likely it is for people to follow its lead. This is also the case on the Discworld, where stories are parasites that feed on people, taking away their agency, and getting stronger through repetition.

71

Lilith will be further discussed in the section focusing on Granny Weatherwax, as she turns out to be her sister Lily.

Granny Weatherwax and Nanny Ogg, who act with a moral compass. Thus, although he still experiences some confusion and disorientation from (and following) the process, Greebo is nevertheless able to “accept” and even relish his transformation on a psychological level. One might say that he is better equipped than other animals to undergo the process. Another contributing factor to his quick adjustment to his new form is that as a cat is more domesticated than other types of animals, his cat-like behavior, even in human form, while somewhat odd, is not so alien to humans around him as to raise issues. Essentially, it can be suggested that cats’ cohabitation with humans on a species level allows them to become human (or is it that the human race has become cat?), and thus, cat-like behavior assimilates into the human world almost organically, making others around Greebo better able to subconsciously accept certain behaviors as merely “odd” yet familiar, rather than alien enough so as to be “abject".

As the Discworld operates on the principles of “Belief", the witches utilize that in order to bring about Greebo’s transformation:

> Through the pathways of his feline brain surged a tide of belief. He suddenly believed he was human. He wasn’t simply under the *impression* that he was human; he believed it implicitly. The sheer force of the unshakeable belief flowed out into his morphic field, overriding its objections, rewriting the very blueprint of his self.
>
> Fresh instructions surged back.
>
> If he was human, he didn’t need all this fur. And he ought to be bigger.. (WA 253).

And as a human, Greebo takes the shape of a gruff-looking scarred man, with rugged good-looks. His scars do not disappear upon his transformation, perhaps due to the fact that they are an ingrained part of his identity; perhaps due to body memory. “As a human, his nose was broken and a black patch covered his bad eye. But the other one glittered like the sins of angels, and his smile was the downfall of saints. Female ones, anyway” (254). He gains the ability to speak, although notably his speech pattern remains cat-like in nature. His transformation also does not affect the sense of loyalty he possesses to the only creature that loves him unconditionally – Nanny Ogg; as despite the drastic transformation, and his new-found personhood, he nevertheless, immediately obeys when the first thing Nanny does is ask him to stop a coach. This stems, perhaps, from the fact that cats are independent creatures by nature; thus, his humanity does not

afford him any further sense of independence than what he had before; and having actively chosen to obey Nanny in cat-form, he continues to do so in human form.

The transformation is not devoid of difficulties, however, as he spends the better part of the night getting acquainted with his new shape, its advantages, as well as its limitations. Thus, he realizes that he is not as flexible in human shape, as he is in animal shape. Therefore, while gaining the advantages of a human social existence, gaining the ability to speak, and interacting with other humans as an equal footing; Greebo nonetheless is limited by said new existence, both physically and socially, as among other things, he discovers that people do not take kindly to an undressed man. Thus, in subsequent novels, when Greebo spontaneously transforms[72] into human form, he quickly hides, as he learns that the sight of a naked man is unacceptable to those around him. He does not do so because he develops a sense of shame, or because he is now socialized; he does so to avoid the reaction that will inevitably follow his appearance in said format. But one might claim that this is not different from many social rules that are collectively accepted. Not everyone follows them out of a sense of belief in them; many simply attempt to avoid the social repercussions of not doing so. As Rousseau writes in *The social contract*: "man was born free, and everywhere he is in chains" (1999: 45). And a human (even if he was previously a cat), existing within the confines of a culture and cultural norm, needs to conform or be shunned to the outskirts of society.

Of course, while Pratchett acknowledges the existence of social norms and cultural conformity, he does not hide his tendency towards shunning them, particularly where they serve to marginalize and ostracize people through what he views as seemingly arbitrary rules. Ostensibly preaching cultural reform, in *Equal rites* (1987) for instance, one of his female characters learns that in order to breach the male domain, she needs to eschew trepidation and actively do as she pleases. More importantly, though, she "was already learning that if you ignore the rules people will, half the time, quietly rewrite them so that they don't apply to you" (114). And with the entirety of

---

[72] According to *The Folklore of Discworld*: "one of the laws of magic that no matter how hard a thing is to do, once it *has* been done it becomes a whole lot easier, and will therefore be done a lot. For the rest of his life, part of Greebo's soul knows that he has one extra option for use in a fight, and that is: Become Human. He has become a spontaneous shape-changer, even if the effect never lasts long - fortunately for him, and for others" (166)

Witches abroad, possibly being read as people pushing back against social narratives and cultural norms, Greebo is no exception. He does not suddenly become socialized by his new surroundings; on the contrary, he actively embraces elements of his animal self in human form, even going as far as donning a cat mask when attending the ball.

> Damn odd, the butler thought. I mean, it's not the kind of mask the men choose. They go for skulls and birds and bulls and stuff like that. Not *cats*.
>
> The odd thing was that the mask had just been a pretty ginger cat head when it was on the table. On its wearer it was ... still a cat head, only a lot more so, and somehow slightly more feline and a lot nastier than it should have been. (WA 267-268)

Despite his newfound "humanity", far from abandoning his animal identity, he chooses to "flaunt" it, actively seeking a cat mask when he had countless options of forms to embody. This suggests a core self that is at peace with its identity, which is unshakable even by the extreme circumstances that envelop Greebo. And when he wears the mask, far from being transformed by it, *it* begins to take on his qualities in the observer's eyes. And, in a masque, which traditionally acts as a venue for people to eschew social chains and "let loose" (as is the case with carnivals), Greebo sees no reason to hide who he is; but this identity is ultimately that of a cat.

Even with his new shape, which presumably carries endless possibilities, Greebo continues to act upon his nature, even going as far as scaring a group of coachmen, footmen and horses (who used to be rodents) simply by grinning at them. While Greebo is mostly immediately comfortable with his new shape, Lilith's animals are not. With the abrupt and almost violent form that her transformations take, the animals in-question remain unstable, and when confronted with Greebo, are brought to the edge with fear and confusion. "Behind the frightened eyes man and mouse fought for supremacy. But they needn't have bothered. They would lose either way. As consciousness flickered between the states it saw either a grinning cat or a six-foot, well-muscled, one-eyed grinning bully" (255).

This confidence in his identity, coupled with Greebo's reality of being a domestic animal that is in a symbiotic relationship with humanity, almost makes his transformation that of an embracing of hybridity rather than a full metamorphosis; these elements allow him to undergo the physical transformation into human form without

much of the psychological damage that other animals undergo in the story. Perhaps Granny and Nanny's choice to transform Greebo in order to aid them was helped along by their knowledge that unlike that animal transformed by Lilith, his unique position as a creature that exists in-between the human and animal world would help him be better equipped to undergo said transformation. Lilith, on the other hand, is careless with the subjects of her experiments, and the damage is most clearly evident early on in the story, when the witches encounter her first animal victim – the wolf.

3.3.3. Wolf in man's clothing: Lilith's animal shape-shifters

> "Genua was a fairytale city. People smiled and were joyful the livelong day. Especially if they wanted to see *another* livelong day" (*WA* 84)

The first transformed animal[73] encountered throughout *Witches abroad* is that of Little Red Riding Hood's wolf. This character, however, does not undergo a full bodily transformation. While Greebo's belief in his humanity allows him to become human, the wolf, as the story dictates, remains in its[74] original shape, while developing a human consciousness. This is particularly cruel as the witches (who are still travelling towards the city of Genua, and the "main plot" at this point), encounter a broken creature; one that exists in-between humanity and bestiality, and is unable to take part in either world. Be it due to the fact that it is a wild animal, and not a domestic one (as is the case with Greebo), or because it is unable to undergo a full physical transformation, and thus cannot exist as either human or wolf, it becomes a starving creature that lives on the outskirts of the forest – quite literally, existing on the margins of society. Worse than that, as wolves are pack animals by nature, this character's separation from both animal and human "packs" only serves to aggravate the sense of loss that it is already experiencing due to its transformation.

---

73 aside from a vampire in bat form that meets an unfortunate end at Greebo's hand

74 Unlike the Duc, who is also one of Lilith's creations, the narrative always refers to the wolf using "it" pronouns.

When the witches are able to interact with it, as they rush to save the grandmother, who the story dictates should be the "collateral damage" of this fairy-tale plot, they are met with an unexpectedly pathetic sight; instead of an evil villain to be defeated, they find a broken creature that yearns for death, and an end to its lonely suffering. After an easy capture, Granny Weatherwax utilizes her magical abilities to enter the wolf's mind and obtain its memories. She then discovers that the wolf's state stems from someone (Lilith) making it believe it was human, years ago, and leaving it to its fate. The wolf, having been "gifted" a human consciousness, could no longer live in its natural environment, and had to abandon it in favor of living on the fringes of the forest, which would allow it to be in close proximity to humans (as well as animals). But, as it was still in the shape of a wolf, it was feared and rejected by people, after being ostracized by other wolves.

When exploring its mind, Granny notices that it contained "cracked and crippled attempts at cogitation peeling away from the sleek arrowhead of predatory intent. This was a predatory mind trying to think. No wonder it was going mad" (151). This suggest a contrast between a natural predator's mind and one containing human thinking processes, with the underlying understanding that being a predator is a matter of natural instincts, rather than any conscious intentionality. Which in turn, allows Granny, and by extension the reader, to sympathize with the wolf, despite its intent to eat the grandmother. This "lenience" is not afforded to human or human-like creatures carrying a human consciousness by Granny, as shall be further explored in the next section, which discusses, in part, a confrontation between her and a group of vampires that attempt to use the "excuse" of "nature" to justify them treating people like cattle and a food source.

Unlike Greebo, who already exists as both a predator and a domestic animal, and who undergoes a full bodily transformation, the wolf is left to its own devises as an animal, with an animal body, believing it is human. This denotes a possible hybrid existence, but the wolf is unable to cope with it, as it is an unnatural process of hybridity, one that is imposed on the body without preamble. And unlike Melville's Ahab and the whale, whom Deleuze and Guattari discuss extensively, the wolf has no human with whom to undergo a mutual process of becoming[75]. It is alone, stuck in a

---

75

limbo-like existence that does not allow it to be one, nor the other, nor really an in-between creature. Despite not being able to exist as a human, the wolf tries to do so repeatedly, which further alienates it from its animal self; to the point that even Granny is unable to help it regain its identity. The wolf's liminal existence had become an unshakable habit, and no intervention on Granny's part can help: "'It's gone on for too long. It's habit by now. And it's starving. It can't go one way, it can't go t'other. It can't act like a wolf, and it can't manage being human. And it can't go on like it is'" (153). Like the crow in one of the *Panchatantra* fables, who attempted to emulate a peacock's walk, only to forget its own, thus being stuck in-between, the wolf is lost between humanity and bestiality. It is starving physically, mentally, and emotionally, as it is rejected by both "packs". Thus, when confronted with the possibility of an "end" at the woodcutter's hand, it welcomes the possibility without fail.

Although it attempts to devour her, Pratchett's wolf can be said to have a connection with the grandmother – both can be viewed as being two sides of the coin of othering; which is ironic, as in the traditional fairy tale said wolf attempts to "become" the grandmother in the eyes of her granddaughter. In Perrault's version the girl is distinctly unable to distinguish the two from each other. Even more than that, with a cautionary tale (tragic) ending, Perrault's wolf endeavors to consume both the grandmother and the child, thus having them become a part of "him". In *From the beast to the blonde* Marina Warner addresses this point, drawing a connection between the two by stating: "The wolf is kin to the forest-dwelling witch, or crone; he offers us a male counterpart, a werewolf who swallows up grandmother and then granddaughter. […] Both dwell in the woods, both need food urgently (one because she is sick, the other because he has not eaten for three days) and the little girl cannot quite tell them apart" (Warner 1999: 181-182). So, both beings are in need of sustenance, the only difference being that in the case of the wolf, attaining said sustenance requires the death of the grandmother.

The connection one might see between the two in Pratchett's version of the tale is not different; the *Witches abroad* narrative simply dwells on it, and allows the reader

---

This is further supported by the existence of Gaspode, the sentient dog, on the Discworld. A dog that gained a consciousness, and appears to function perfectly well. Though similar, Gaspode as a domestic animal – a dog is able to exist within a human sphere, without issues, allowing the process of becoming to take root. He is also smart enough not to expose his abilities in front of humans, for the most part acting like a "normal" dog.

to process the similarly marginalized position of these two beings. In Pratchett's version, the wolf is unable to become human, neither by imitation, nor by consumption (as it is thwarted early on). Yet at the same time, there is a stark resemblance between it and the grandmother, particularly in the function they serve. Both are victims of the story, both are secondary characters that are brought in to serve a purpose, and promptly discarded and disregarded. The wolf is a victim of marginalization and fear, brought about by its animal appearance, coupled with a semi-human consciousness that makes it more "monstrous" that a normal wolf. The grandmother is left to fend for herself in a lonely and decrepit house, seen by people as a possible witch[76] (due to her old age and physical appearance). Sadly, one of the "signs" of her witchery is the fact that she speaks to herself; be it due to loneliness or old age, as is the case with many patterns of behaviors that deviate from the "norm" and as such seen as monstrous, the grandmother's "monstrosity" stems from people's fears. As mentioned in the previous chapters, older women are associated with grotesque imagery in folk and fairy tales, with one of the only examples of an old woman being the heroine of a story involving her shedding her old appearance and becoming young with the help of a magical being (with her sister dying brutally while attempting to take agency and achieve a similar transformation on her own). And what would happen had Granny not been involved in "changing the story" would be the grandmother being further victimized for being a victim of society. Pratchett thus, as he does in other cases, chooses to explore marginalized groups, and subtly criticize the process of othering that these characters undergo – this time in the form of old women and animals.

But these two are far from the only othered beings who suffer from othering. This fact becomes immediately evident, when after exploring the wolf's broken mind, Granny, who is a conscientious person, is shaken by the experience, despite her strong inner core, tells Nanny: "You can't imagine how it feels […] Wandering around for years. Not capable of acting human, and not able to be a wolf. You can't imagine how

[76] Ironically, the fact that the grandmother lives alone in the forest, a state that is presumably imposed upon her, is seen by the woodmen as "proof" to her being a witch, thus justifying not visiting her, or offering her help. They, in essence, impose a state of being on the old women, then use said state as proof of female monstrosity. Ironically, the head woodcutter is explaining this to an actual witch – Granny Weatherwax, who proceeds to admonish him for not helping the grandmother, nor attempting to "talk" to the wolf, and threaten him into taking care of the grandmother.

that feels". Nanny, however, promptly replies: “I reckon maybe I can … In your face. Maybe I can” (129). Of course, as a woman and a witch at that, perhaps Nanny is capable of understanding the wolf. Although she appears as a confident individual, with a healthy sexual appetite, and with a lively and outgoing personality, one who does not allow social norms dictate how she lives her life; she too would have been subjected to the social chains, codes of behavior, and even identities (stories/narratives) imposed on all who exist within a cultural sphere. And unlike Granny, who remains celibate by choice, Nanny experienced motherhood, and she experienced the end of her reproductive phase. Thus, she would, more strongly than Granny, feel a sense of loss of self, with her bodily changes. This is further supported, in a later plot, by her fear of Magrat no longer playing the role of the “maiden” in their coven, becoming a “mother” instead, which might force *her* to take on Granny’s role of the “crone” (or as they prefer to refer to it - “the other one"). Like the wolf, like the grandmother, Nanny as both a woman and a witch that operates both within nature and culture stands “both under and over (but really simply outside of) the sphere of culture’s hegemony” (Ortner 86). And yet, Nanny, unlike the wolf and the grandmother, fights against her role, and has personal agency. As such, when she comments that the grandmother looks older than her, attributing it to her doing exercise, Granny quickly counterparts, negating this statement and saying that Nanny never does anything she does not wish to. To which Nanny replies: “That’s what I mean” (148). Nanny’s agency helps her fight against social expectations, which the grandmother (whose role dictates that she be “old” and “decrepit") is unable to. And ironically, due to her appearance, it is *she* who is thought to be a witch.

The demonization of those who are different has prevailed for centuries, from “dwarfs” and “giants", to the “elephant man", to women with certain features such as red hair and green eyes, or a strange birthmark, society’s “arbitrary” rules of what is acceptable and what is not create monsters and then proceeds to ostracize them, due to a fear of the “other"; which in turn leads, as Kristeva would maintain, to a sense of abjection and consequent rejection. Edward Said classifies the construction of the “others” as integral to the construction of a collective identity, a process that involves the continuous “interpretation and reinterpretation of their differences from ’us’ “ (*Orientalism* 332). An “Other” can never win, because there will always be a reason

why s/he is different, and thus abject. The goal post will keep getting moved by those whose sense of identity is prevalent upon them being different from the Other(s).

A Discworld quote that perfectly encapsulates the human fear of the “other", its relation to identity construction, and Kristeva’s perspective of the “me” that is not “me” can be found in *Jingo*. Although focusing on warfare between (human) nations, and the narratives of war, the quote highlights the place of “identity” in any form of acceptance/rejection of other groups. People create binary opposites of “good” vs. “bad” people, “us” vs. “them", in order to maintain a sense of stable self:

> You had to cling to this sort of image, because if you didn’t then you might have to face the fact that bad things happened because ordinary people, the kind who brushed the dog and told their children bedtime stories, were capable of then going out and doing horrible things to other ordinary people. It was so much easier to blame it on Them. It was bleakly depressing to think that They were Us. If it was Them, then nothing was anyone’s fault. If it was Us, what did that make Me? After all, I’m one of Us. I must be. I’ve certainly never thought of myself as one of Them. No-one ever thinks of themselves as one of Them. We’re always one of Us. It’s Them that do the bad things. (J 221)

And so, witches, old grandmothers and wolves alike, fall in the category of an “othering” that stems from a sense of self-preservation of established identity and social order; and as such, fall victims to it, save those in a position of power to maintain agency and control the narrative – as is the case with the Lancre witches. This control of the narrative, and strong inner core, will allow Granny to triumph over Lilith further along the story, even though the latter is the fairy-godmother, and should in her twisted perception, as social rules dictate, triumph over the “evil” witch, not realizing nor caring that she is, *in fact*, the one harming people and other beings alike; not the least of which, by creating categories in which she “shoves” them.

Although Pratchett manages to shift the narrative, showing the wolf (monstrous other) in a sympathetic light, he does not shy away from the ramifications of the process of othering. The wolf’s isolation, social rejection, and continuous distance from both animals and humans alike causes irreparable damage to its sense of self, to the point that the only course of action *would be* to kill it, as an act of mercy, and ironically – humanity:

> The woodcutter never understood why the wolf laid its head on the stump so readily.

> Or why the old woman, the one in whom anger roiled like pearl barley in a bubbling stew, insisted afterwards that it be buried properly instead of skinned and thrown in the bushes. She had been very insistent about that.
>
> And that was the end of the big bad wolf. (J 154)

In “reality", there is no possible “happy ending” for the wolf. Perhaps because it is forced to become human-like, perhaps because unlike Greebo, it is not a creature of two worlds already, perhaps it is because wolves are pack animals, and this forced process of becoming has violently ripped said wolf from its previous existence, forever rendering it a damaged creature that begs for death in leu of spending any more time in an agonizing existence of liminality, on the margins of society, on the margins of nature, being unable to be either human or animal, and being rejected by both groups.

The fact that the wolf was only “mentally transformed” into human form is far from the only reason for his suffering. A physical transformation might have saved him from the outright rejection of those around him, but with Lilith’s creations, be it due to her inhumane employment of magic, without caring about the consequences for those she use is on, or her use of mirror magic, whereby she reflects and amplifies magic that is not innately hers, thus leading to “unnatural” results; all of Lilith’s creations are easily identifiable as “wrong", even if people less magically inclined than Granny and her group, would not be able to pin-point what feels wrong about said beings. Case in point, the animals that are transformed by Lilith into “full” humans throughout the story are still unable to interact “naturally” with the people around them, and as much as they wish to be human (as is the case with the frog Duc), still make those around them uncomfortable with their unnatural “air".

The fact that the wolf was only “mentally transformed” into human form is far from the only reason for his suffering. A physical transformation might have saved him from the outright rejection of those around him, but with Lilith’s creations, be it due to her inhumane employment of magic, without caring about the consequences for those she use is on, or her use of mirror magic, whereby she reflects and amplifies magic that is not innately hers, thus leading to “unnatural” results; all of Lilith’s creations are easily identifiable as “wrong", even if people less magically inclined than Granny and her group, would not be able to pin-point what feels wrong about said beings. Case in point, the animals that are transformed by Lilith into “full” humans throughout the story

are still unable to interact "naturally" with the people around them, and as much as they wish to be human (as is the case with the frog Duc), still make those around them uncomfortable with their unnatural "air".

To start with, any good Cinderella story requires two evil step-sisters. Lilith achieves this by transforming two snakes into the form of the aforementioned sisters. Unlike the wolf, the snake-sisters *do* take human shape, but remain snake-like in every aspect that matters; and unlike the Duc, which will be mentioned next, their physical transformation does not extend to the development of human-like feelings, nor the desire to truly become so (human). For all intents and purposes, their core remains that of snakes. Characters who interact with the sisters are always left uneasy, with a perpetual feeling of incomprehensible (at least to them) dread and danger. The sister's continued silence only adds to the uncanny atmosphere that surrounds them. But said silence, ultimately, stems from the fact that they lack a voice[77]. While one may be tempted to draw a connection between the snakes and Medusa, and between their lack of voice and other voiceless women in mythology, such as Philomela, thus associating said lack of voice with lack of female power and victimhood, in this case they are not victimized by another woman (perhaps because they are not really women), as Lilith is far more dismissive of her male creation – the Duc, though ostensibly, he is closer to her. As noted by the narrative, the reason for the sister's silence is choice. It *is* possible for them to have a voice, as Lilith offers it; yet they are disinterested in attaining one, preferring to creep about and remain their true selves of silent predators. It is interesting to note that Lilith chooses to respect the sisters' desires, wherein she does not do so with other characters.

Upon meeting the "sisters", managing to escape their clutches, and understanding Emberella's living conditions, Nanny Ogg is disturbed. She urges Granny to act in order to free Emberella from said creatures. She is mistaken however in thinking that these are snakes that believe they are human; prompted perhaps by the pattern established previously by Lilith's other creations, or perhaps mistakenly assuming that a human shape automatically leads to a belief in one's humanity. Granny Weatherwax immediately corrects her stating that it's worse than a case of snakes

---

77 Ironically, in Aarne-Thompson-Uther Index, a tale type - ATU 673 is dedicated to stories involving characters that attain the ability to communicate with animals with the aid of a snake.

believing that they are human, "They're walking around thinking they're snakes" (WA 232). Which perhaps helps explain why unlike Greebo[78], even with human bodies, the snake-sisters retain their unique quickness and concentration. They defy physical laws because they still believe fully and unshakably that they are snakes. They are diametrically opposed to the wolf, who, despite being psychologically turned into a human, retains the shape of a wolf. It appears that a mental transformation without an accompanying physical one is far more damaging than the other way around; then again, said mental transformation involves the development of semi-human consciousness, wherein the sisters retain an animals' reliance on natural instincts, making the process less psychologically damaging.

Despite the animal mind's previously described "inflexibility," the sisters seem to be unaffected by the metamorphosis, perhaps, because to them it is merely physical; and their animal identity is well-established and "stable", thus remaining intact. Their human forms certainly benefit from their animal identities, as the story sees them achieving physical feats that are beyond human capabilities. Belief is a powerful force on the Discworld, and their belief that the remain snakes allows them to remain so in terms of psyche and agility, despite the fact that Lilith has transformed their bodies. This serves to make these two silent sisters, two of the scariest characters in *Witches Abroad*. But, perhaps a contributing factor to their intimidating image is the type of creature that they are.

Although in Eastern mythology, white snakes are a good omen, and snakes in general have been known to symbolize fertility[79], many people feel uncomfortable with snakes, more so than other beings, even far more dangerous ones. *The Book of Yokai* presents an interesting argument for humanity's fear and loathing of snakes, in particular. Quoting an essay by Abe Kōbō, one of Japan's most important modern writers, they link said fear to humans' inability to relate to snakes, as they are able to relate to other animals:

---

78 Whose belief in his "humanity" brings about his transformation, although he retains a cat-self as well.

79 Or perhaps because of it, as fertility is associated with "grotesque" female bodies

> [S]nakes are beyond just “scary.” There is something deeply unnerving about them; they provoke a loathing that is qualitatively different from the fear we have of other wild beasts […]. [O]ur fear stems from the fact that snakes have no legs, and when we look at one slithering out of a small hole in the ground, we have an experience very different from the experience of watching an animal like a dog or cat. Somehow we can imagine ourselves in the place of a dog or cat (we know what it is like to walk on our hands and knees). But a snake is too alien for us to “personify” in this way; it is simply ’close to impossible to imagine its everyday life from the inside.’ The same problem occurs when a creature has too many legs—as in the case of a *mukade* (centipede)—because it, too, moves so differently from us. We cannot identify with it; we can’t empathize. (Foster and Shinonome 2015: 87)

In essence, our inability to identify with snakes might suggest an inability to become snakes, unlike more familiar (domestic) animals, like Greebo, or even ones that “make sense” to us, snakes’ grotesque and “wrong” bodies lead to feelings of abjection, and thus, rejection. The snake sisters in *Witches abroad* do nothing to evoke different feelings; on the contrary, they relish their role as predators, even intimidating a fully-fledged, albeit timid witch – Magrat Garick. They do not question their new bodies, nor are they affected by them, as they are unable (and more likely) unwilling to “become” human.

The sisters’ transformation is “incomplete", as is the case with the wolf. In their case, this stems from a lack of mental transformation to accompany the physical one, perhaps due to the chasm that exists between humans and snakes. Still, one might argue that the sisters’ lack of desire to truly integrate in the human world plays a factor. Let us, then, examine another one of Lilith’s creations, one that most certainly desires to become human, at any expense – the Duc.

A frog that is transformed into a prince-like shape, the Duc aspires to marry Emberella in order to retain his human shape[80] without the assistance of mirror magic. Seemingly, a character that appears human, is able to communicate using human language, and actively desires to be human, would be impossible to recognize as non-human, yet that is not the case. The Duc’s would-be love interest, Emberella[81] is unable to stomach marrying him, and fights the possibility throughout the story, even though, ostensibly it will put an end to her miserable form of existence, and afford her a “happy ending". She senses his inhuman state, even if it is merely on a subconscious level. All

---

80

As, in fairy-tale tradition, a kiss from her will fully seal his transformation into a man

81

that she is able to express is that he "looks slimy. He makes [her] flesh crawl […]. They say he's got funny eyes. And everyone knows what he does at night!" (WA 178). This suggests that in Pratchett's universe, a reflection of our own, no magic can change the true inner core and that the eyes, truly, *are* the window to the soul; which indicates that a façade, no matter how elaborate, will ultimately chip away and dissolve as one's true character (and even identity) is revealed. The issue of the Duc's eyes is poignant, as even Lilith contemplates them as an imperfection, a way of seeing beyond the illusion that she created (through her smoke and mirrors) to the true person/creature beyond. And when one considers that said creature is in-fact a frog, the connotation is immediately negative.

> Lilith was proud of the Duc. Of course, there was his embarrassing little nocturnal problem, because his morphic field weakened when he slept, but that wasn't yet a major difficulty. And there was the trouble with mirrors, which showed him as he really was, but that was easily overcome by banning all mirrors save hers. And then there were his eyes. She couldn't do anything about the eyes. There was practically no magic that could do anything about someone's eyes. All she had been able to come up with there were the smoked glasses. (WA 64)

So, as suggested previously, the difference between Greebo and the Duc's transformation could stem from the circumstances of the transformation, or the fact that cats are closer to the human world by virtue of their domesticity. Still, this also means that should an animal interact and coexist with humans for prolonged periods of time, it should technically be more receptive to becoming human as well. This does indeed happen with the Duc, as Lilith contemplates: "[H]e was too vain and stupid to know what was going on. [Lilith had] seen to that. At least, she'd thought she had. Lately, he seemed to be picking things up…" (WA 63). Essentially, the longer an animal stays human taking on a human shape, having a human consciousness, and perhaps most importantly, experiencing a human existence with human interactions, the more it

---

A Cinderella character whose father (the true ruler of the city) is killed by Liliy/Lilith, and who is forced to live with the evil step-sisters (who are in-fact snakes), in order to create the ideal conditions for the traditional fairy-tale. Replacing "cinder" with "ember", as part of the character's name, Emberlla's calling-name shifts several times throughout the story, with the narration referring to her as Emberella, Embers and Ella at various points. Be it a humorous play with the language or a reference to the variety of pop-culture references to the story (and the "subtle" main character names in Cinderella like movies and books that ultimately boil down to an iteration of Cinderella's name in one form or another); the character's constantly shifting name can act as a reference to her role as the archetypal princess who will have the same role throughout the various versions of the story – 'a rose by any other name…'

becomes so. Despite his precarious existence as Lilith's puppet, the Duc actively desires to remain a man, and is fearful of the possibility of permanently reverting back to his natural shape (as he does on a nightly basis, when the magic wears out):

> 'But you haven't brought me the girl,' said the Duc. 'You promised me the girl. And then it'll be all over and I can sleep in a real bed and I won't need any more reflecting magic -'
>
> But even a good job can go too far.
>
> 'You've had your fill of magic?' said Lilith sweetly. 'You'd like me to stop? It would be the easiest thing in the world. I found you in the gutter. Would you like me to send you back?'
>
> His face became a mask of panic.
>
> 'I didn't mean that! I just meant ... well, then everything will be real. Just one kiss, you said. I can't see why that's so hard to arrange.' (WA 64)

Interestingly, the Duc is fully aware that his existence, as it stands, is not "real". It is fleeting and unstable, only achieved with the aid of Lilith's mirror magic. In essence, his power and existence as a human is a reflection of her power as the story-teller. One might say that the Duc's belief that he will gain true humanity through his marriage to Emberella could represent the "power" that he will gain, when he becomes the legitimate ruler of the land, as she is the daughter of the late Baron.

Pratchett employs the Duc's character, as he does other characters, in order to parody classic fairy tales. In the Duc's case, the satirized fairy-tale trope is that of the previously mentioned animal-groom cycle, wherein the animal shape and subsequent transformation into a handsome prince are utilized to make arranged marriages more palatable to young women; no matter how "monstrous" a husband is, no matter if he is a stranger who was forced upon a woman, one can turn him into a prince through piety, dedication and unwavering love. Genua's Duc is the polar opposite. No matter how handsome he is (or how dashingly he dresses), he remains a frog underneath. This works as a simple justification for Emberella's resistance of the marriage, but the deeper implication is also present. Despite the façade, this Duc is not a free agent. He remains a

tool in the hands of someone more powerful; someone who, after killing the true ruler[82], and creating the conditions of the story, plans to use him and Emberella with him to continue her control over people's lives. Ironically, no matter how much power Lilith gains, she still needs to gain and retain it through "stories" (or through narratives, as is the case in our world); she also needs the Duc to marry Emberella, in order to make his (and subsequently her) claim to the throne "legitimate". As Kevin Paul Smith writes in *The postmodern fairytale*: "Marriage, *Witches abroad* shows us, is more than just a happy ending, and in fact works as part of a socio-political power network. This fact is often lost upon modern Western readers for whom arranged marriage is a relic…" (Smith 2007: 148).

The Duc's transformation into a frog towards the end of the story, and his immediate death at the hands of the (reanimated) Baron, paves the way for Emberella, not to have a different form of a happy ending, but to begin her rule of the city, for better or for worse, free from interferences. This is something that Granny Weatherwax fights for. She prevents Baron Saturday, and more importantly Mrs. Gogol[83] from interfering any more, beyond making her the ruler. A bleak picture is painted, wherein should Mrs. Gogol continue to play a role, she would become a worse tyrant than Lilith, even though she was a part of the "good guys" up until that moment. Pratchett's characters are always complex and "human" to boot. Being horribly wronged, and then playing a positive role by actively working towards setting said wrong to rights (or the kind of "right" that exist at that moment in time), does not prevent one from being consumed by power, nor does it serve as a justification for any future action. Emberella will become the ruler, that is true, but whether she will be a good or bad ruler remains to be seen. The fact that she is a fairy-tale heroine does not make her immune to bad decisions, nor does it make an automatic good queen. The story ends with her choosing to cancel the fairy-tale ball, and go to the carnival.

Emberlla's choice to eschew the world of "orderly" fairy-tale balls, where every character knows its role in favor of a carnival is quite significant. It speaks to the story's

---

82

Baron Saturday, who was not a "nice" person by ay means, and who continued to exist in a zombie-like state with the aid of his lover, Mrs. Gogol the voodoo-woman, due to his strong desire for revenge.

83

Emberella's voodoo witch mother

rejection of what might be deemed as narrative determinism in favor of the "chaos of life". It also speaks to the message that is present throughout *Witches Abroad* of the power of cultural narrative and cultural roles, which ultimately results in the victimization of individuals by society, on both a larger and a smaller scale. The wolf was unable to fit in its old society, and there was no place for it in a different one. Thus, it was relegated to a miserable existence on the margins of both societies, until its longed-for death is achieved. But this is not limited to cases such as the wolf, or even the grandmother, who ultimately lives in isolation in the first place because as an old woman with a hook nose who lives alone in the forest, she is seen as a possible witch, and neglected by her community. At the beginning of the story we are introduced to a "marginal" character such as a toymaker, who lives in constant fear, as he is unable to fit his role, and is only able to make toys, without singing or telling stories to children; which is seen as completely unacceptable by the story's-agent, Lilith. This makes Emberella's choice to abandon the ball at the end, and join the carnival (with all her courtiers joining as well, as no one would be "dumb" enough to go against a monarch's choice, even though they were giving the right to do so), a poignant one. Bakhtin's carnivalesque is, as Stuart Hall describes it a "metaphor of cultural and symbolic transformation" (White 8) that doesn't simply set the "low" in place of the "high", thus retaining their binary structure:

> In Bakhtin's "carnival", it is precisely the purity of this binary distinction which is transgressed. The low invades the high, blurring the hierarchical imposition of order; creating, not simply the triumph of one aesthetic over another, but those impure and hybrid forms of the 'grotesque'; revealing the interdependency of the low and high and vice versa, the inextricably mixed and ambivalent nature of all cultural life, the reversibility of cultural forms, symbols, language , and meaning; and exposing the arbitrary exercise of cultural power, simplification, and exclusion which are the mechanisms upon which the construction of every limit, tradition, and canonical formation, and the operation of every hierarchical principle of cultural closure, is founded. (White 1993: 8)

Emberella's choice to join the carnival gives a hint as to the city's future. While it is unknown whether she will be a good or bad ruler, as her attainment of power is as arbitrary as in the case of many rulers before her, her decision to blur the hierarchical boundaries, mix with people from all walks of life, and shatter the fairy-tale narrative by which every being must abide, gives rise to the hope of a better future, not in the form of a happy ending, but in the form of "free choice" in one's identity. While rulers may

come and go, and while the citizens of Genua have had dictatorial rulers in the past, until Lilith, they did not have to don a role, convince everyone and yet no one (least of all themselves) of their happy existence in their assigned role; whether she will be a good or bad ruler, this is the hope that Emberella affords the citizens. Still, her choice of favoring a carnival over a ball, also gives hope to her belief in a more inclusive society.

Witches abroad ends with this glimmer of hope for the citizens of Genua, and the witches, and Greebo – now a cat, returning to their home. Interestingly, even though he was was able to adjust to his full transformation, and even enjoy his human existence, Greebo ends the novel thinking that "[h]umanity's a nice place to visit, but you wouldn't want to live there" (WA 341). The Librarian who chose to eschew his human self in favor of maintaining his animal would certainly agree.

Most of the above-mentioned transformations involve a process of physical or mental shape-shifting, wherein the individual (or animal) embraces (or fail to become) a new self. One of these transformations (Greebo's) is brought about with the aid of Granny Weatherwax. Although Greebo's nature, breed and circumstances, might be the reason for the relative stability he maintains throughout his transformation, the fact that it was done with the aid of Granny Weatherwax can also be seen as a contributing factor. Although she does not herself undergo bodily transformations, Granny is able to "shape-shift" into animal form through a process of "borrowing". This ability, coupled with her moral inner core, plays a role in her ability to humanly interact with the animal around her, as seen in her treatment of the wolf. The next section with explore Granny's "shape-shifting", and her mutable, yet stable self.

3.4. Becoming multiplicity: Granny Weatherwax

> "That's the ... other phoenix, isn't it?" he said.
> "Yes," said Granny, watching the door. "A phoenix. You can't have just one of anything."
> "But it looks like a little hawk."
> "It was born among hawks, so it looks like a hawk. If it was hatched in a hen roost it'd be a chicken. Stands to reason. And a hawk it'll remain, until it

> needs to be a phoenix. They're shy birds. You could say a phoenix is what it may *become*..." (*CJ* 332)

Esmeralda (Granny) Weatherwax is a witch who first makes her appearance in *Equal rites* (1987), a novel focused on a young woman becoming a wizard rather than a witch. The witches (or at least those who tend to take central stage in Pratchett's novels), differ from the Discworld's wizards, among other things, in their approach to magic. Granny Weatherwax and her closest companions' "relationship to the world is mapped out in and through their pragmatism and much of their magic is home-made. Granny's traditional even shamanistic approach to witching, for instance, is encapsulated in her preference for ordinary household objects rather than crystal balls, runic knives, tarot cards and fancy candles" (Butler, James, and Mendlesohn 2001: 132). This is not to say that other witches do not dabble in what might be considered "witchy performativity". Magrat Garlick, one of Granny's companions, tends to take a more Wiccan approach to her magic, feeling that treating it as a mundane part of life is not giving it the respect it deserved; and Mrs. Letice Earwig tends to wear "occult" jeweler as part of her persona (to the disgust of Granny Weatherwax). But all in all, the "home-made" and practical approach to magic is dominant when it comes to the Disc's witches, as opposed to the wizards who take the scholarly route.

The theme of witchcraft and magic in Pratchett, according to Croft (2009), is related to learning and to coming of age: the acquisition of magical skills is related to personal growth, to the emergence of mature personality. This is the theme that was central in J.K. Rowling's novels about Harry Potter. As Croft observes, the acquisition of magical skills is gendered: the path from boy to wizard is different, perhaps easier, than a girl's path to becoming a witch. Thus, the theme of "education of a witch" is used to express various ways of "thinking about gender in education, work, and power" (2009: 129).

> The system in Harry Potter's world is one of co-education, where all humans who have magical potential theoretically have equal access to the same education and to positions of power in any field after graduation; in contrast, on Discworld, witches and wizards occupy totally different niches, are trained separately according to traditional concepts of gender-related strengths and weaknesses, and tend to value and excel in different types of work. (129-30)

Thus, Granny, who is considered the most powerful witch of her age, a "first among equals" (for witches do not have official leaders), tends to avoid using magic when it is not needed, opting to focus on what she terms – Headology, whereby, for instance, she convinces a person that she has cursed them, which (she maintains) works just as well in uprooting their lives as having actually done so. This speaks towards the practical nature she and other witches have towards magic, and the everyday. "Ture" magic is not used when it is not needed, and it is often not needed. One of her most widely used truly "magical" powers is that of "borrowing". Granny Weatherwax does not physically shapeshift into animal form. However, similar to Martin's Direwolf masters, she connects with the minds of animals overtaking and directing them. In a manner reminiscent of modern virtual reality, she is able to "experience" life through said creatures, in an out-of-body experience that leaves her own in a catatonic state imitating death.

In order to understand Granny's approach to borrowing other creatures, one should first examine her attitude toward her own identity. One way of doing so is by exploring her relationship with her sister Lily Weatherwax, who is a mirror image of her, and who might be seen as her double, or doppelgänger.

3.4.1. On reflections and other grannies[84]

As stated previously, *Witches abroad* sees Granny facing off against her Fairy Godmother sister Lily[85] (or Lilith as she prefers), an almost mirror image of herself, in a battle utilizing and fighting reflections. As previously mentioned, Lily Weatherwax (also knows as Lady Lilith de Tempscire) is at the same time the "fairy godmother" and villain of *Witches abroad*, as she attempts, through manipulations, to shape people and different beings into stories to force "happy endings" on characters, and particularly on Emberella and the setting in the city of Genua. In terms of visual description, the two sisters are near perfect mirror images of each other, yet each follows a different

[84] The contents of this section has been previously published in *Humaniora* 1(25)/2019: 13-19. The present section has been expanded and includes major revisions.
[85] In the previous section, I used the character's preferred name – Lilith when relating to her. However, as this section deals with the true person behind the façade and the relationship between the two sisters, I will refer to her as Lily for the most part.

approach to their lives. The Weatherwax sisters who are of similar looks and disposition take widely different paths in life, which both reflects and informs their identities. As such, one may be able, through an examination of Esme (Granny) and Lily (Lilith) to postulate on the idea of uncanny repetition, as discussed by both Derrida and Deleuze. In her introduction to the book *Repetition, difference, and knowledge in the work of Samuel Beckett, Jacques Derrida, and Gilles Deleuze,* Sarah Gendron writes that what is dubbed "repetition and difference", is a kind of repetition that implies that "there can be no identity without difference. As such, it presents a direct challenge to the classical form of repetition, or the return of the self Same" (Gendron 2008: xiv). This can be said to be reflected in the difference between Esme's established identity and Lily's fractured one, as manifested through her use of different names, charms and mirrors, as well as her inability to recognize her true self amidst the reflections.

According to Cliff Stagoll's "Difference" in *The Deleuze dictionary*, Gilles Deleuze is often described as a "philosopher of difference", which implies that "difference" occupies a crucial position in his critical output. "He is concerned to overturn the primacy accorded identity and representation in western rationality by theorising difference as it is experienced" (Parr 2010: 74). In *Repetition and difference*, Deleuze presents a link between the two concepts. He does not understand repetition as the exact same thing occurring again; for him, "repetition is connected to the power of difference in terms of a productive process that produces variation in and through every repetition" (Parr 2010: 225). The implementation of difference by means of repetition produces a mixed population of specimens, characterized by variety and mutation; thus, life itself emerges from the combination of the difference and repeptition.

Further inquiry into "repetition" results in a critical discussion of "originality". With reference to originality in this context, Gendron writes:

> Derrida calls his reimagining of this hierarchy "the enigmatic quality of the first time," or the "retard originaire." The argument is that in order for there to be a "first time" there must also be a "second time," for if this "first time" is the "only time," it is the "first" of nothing at all. Likewise, if there were not, from the "first time," a différance (a differing and deferring) between that "first time" and what follows it—designating it as a "second"—there would, again, be no "first time" of which to speak. (Gendron 2008: 19)

As such, the relationship between the "first" and "second", or between the "original" and "copy" is that of reciprocity.

Esme and Lily Weatherwax characters can be interpreted by means of the opposition between the first and the second links in a chain of repetition. Although Lily seems to be "older" and counts as the "first" character introduces to the plot, also being the more frequently appearaing character, and playing a more important role in the plot, Esme is logically "first" or "original" one. Since, as it has been argued by Deleuze, repetition and difference are interconnected, Lily presents an image of Esme's potential self, because she is a copy that both contradicts and informs Esme, questioning and amplifying the character's self. The reader understands Lily by reading her relationship to Esme, and thus gains more insign into Esme's multilayered personality.

Esme and Lilly, because of their perfect similarity and generic connecteedness, are related to the Gothic device of the double, and *doppelganger*. This stock image of horror fiction has attracted a lot of critical attention, but probably the best known theory of the double was presented by Sigmund Freud in his 1919 essay "The uncanny"; this classic essay has already been mentioned with reference to Bakhtin's concept of the grotesque, and its ramifications on the shapeshifting theme are quite obvious, as it has already been observed in at least one discussion of metamorphic imagery in literature (Salisbury 2014: 2014). In the opening of the essay, Freud presents various meanings of the word uncanny; the word, in its German usage, has a set of seemingly unrelated and contradictory meanings but generally can be used to describe anything that excites fear. Referring to the uncanniness of the "double", Freud begins with a comparison of the words *Heimlich* and *Unheimlich*[86] and suggests that the merger of the "unfamiliar" and the "familiar" can cause a sense of fear and cognitive dissonance, the sense of the uncanny. "The quality of uncanniness can only come from the circumstance of the "double" being a creation dating back to a very early mental stage, long since left behind, and one, no doubt, in which it wore a more friendly aspect. The "double" has become a vision of terror, just as after the fall of their religion the gods took on daemonic shapes" (Freud 1955: 87).

Of course, the concept of the "uncanny double" can be combined with that of "repetition and difference", suggesting that Lily is a copy, a double, a repetition of

---

[86]. "The German word *Unheimlich* is obviously the opposite of *heimlich*, *heimisch*, meaning "familiar," "native," "be-longing to the home"; and we are tempted to conclude that what is "uncanny" is frightening precisely because it is not known and familiar", p. 76. "*heimlich* is a word the meaning of which develops towards an ambivalence, until it finally coincides with its opposite, *unheimlich*. *Unheimlichis* in some way or other a sub-species of *Heimlich*"(80).

Esme, one that is uncannily similar, but also frighteningly different from her. This doubling produces an uncomfortable emotional response, by combining the familiarity of repetition with its paradoxical unfamiliarity. This is because repetition of the self, producing a copy of the self, is beyond the possibility of our subjective agency, and seeing one's exact repetition is an image of an alien, external agency that shapes ourselves, our very idea of ourselves. In the case of Pratchett's two characters, this leads to the question of the "potential self", suggesting that there are uncanny, half-realized depths in Granny Weatherwax, a world of inner darkness, lust for power, and destructive agency, which is, and yet is not, her own self.

The interpretation of Lili and Esme Weatherwax should begin with their names, because the names are clear markes of difference. In folklore and fantasy, there is an entire culture of treating names as magical signs of identity and character (Granger 1961). For example, in Ursula K. Le Guin's Earthsea novels, the knowledge of a person's (or object's) "real name" gives full knowledge and control over the bearer; this is a fictional reflection of numerous customs and beliefs mentioned by Granger in his article on the folklore of naming. Similarly in Pratchett's fiction, names have the potential to define a person[87]. Changing a name, for all possible similarities or the status of a double, means changing one's identity. The importance of names and name changes is so significant that the narrative of *Pyramids* (1989) grounds to a halt at one point in order to reflect on the idea: "All things are defined by names. Change the name, and you change the thing. Of course there is a lot more to it than that, but paracosmically that is what it boils down to..." (Pratchett 2012: 100).

Although not changing physically, Lily Weatherwax is able to utilize names in order to transform and redefine herself, through the creation of new identities, the most recent of which being that of Lady Lilith[88]:

> Her name was Lady Lilith de Tempscire, although she had answered to many others in the course of a long and eventful life. And that was something you learned to do early on, she'd found. If you wanted to get anywhere in this world - and she'd decided, right at the

[87] Thas is not just about names. In a typical twist of ironic self-parody, Pratchett extends the importance of naming to the role of hats and other types of headwear: "[H]ats were important. They weren't just clothing. Hats defined the head. They defined who you were [...] it wasn't the wearing of the hats that counted so much as having one to wear. Every trade, every craft had its hat. That's why kings had hats. Take the crown off a king and all you had was someone good at having a weak chin and waving to people. Hats had power. Hats were important" (*Witches Abroad* 186).

[88]

> start, that she wanted to get as far as it was possible to go - you wore names lightly, and you took power anywhere you found it […] And you moved around a lot. Because most people didn't move around much. Change countries and your name and, if you had the right manner, the world was your mollusc. For example, she'd had to go a mere hundred miles to become a Lady. (WA 17)

However, Lily does not become an entirely different person, simply by changing her name. The person she once was, and partially still *is* lurks under the façade that she constructed for herself. While, the people of Genua see Lilith, and her sister sees Lily; *she* herself is conflicted about her own identity, albeit while being ignorant of this. This is represented by the narrative's continuous name changes for her, with "Lilith" appearing in one sentence, only for her name to become "Lily" in the next. The fluctuation of Lily's name reflects the instability of her identity for herself, the reader and the story as a whole.

Pratchett utilizes more than just Lily's name(s) to highlight the lack of stability of the plot of *Witches Abroad*. The would-be "protagonist" of the supposed fairy-tale that Lily manipulates into existence, also experiences numerous name changes throughout the novel; with her name fluctuating between "Embers", "Ella", and "Emberella", respectively. Although, all three are basically variants of the same name, the continual switching between them, not only accentuates the sense of ridicule, but also destabilizes the plot of the fairy-tale as a whole. This confusion of names is accompanied by a more apparent (and significant) one: Ella's "role" as the heroine of two concurrent fairy-tales ("The Frog Prince" and "Cinderella"), in addition to her secret identity as the "true heir to the throne", coupled with her continuous defiance of her expected "character type", and her fervent refusal to conform; all contribute to the plot's ambiguity. If a fairy-tales is "supposed" to unfold in a specific manner, then Ella's defiance, in addition to the witches' drive, force the narrative to continuously reinvent itself.

While both Lily and Ella experience ambiguity and constant name changes, the distinction between them lies in that Ella's ambiguity primarily serves to reflect the

---

Not wanting to read too much into the choice of name, fascinating as it is, let us just say that, Lily's (Pratchett's) reasons for choosing said name could span from either a "sophisticated" manipulation of her own name, giving it an aristocratic touch (or changing its "shape" as it were) in order to reinvent herself through it as a Lady; or alternately, the name could be a reference to the Biblical "Lilith" who was Adam's first wife. That Lilith was created like him from dust; she defied God by refusing to submit to Adam, and subsequently became the first monster-woman, the first witch.

ambiguity of the narrative itself, and her “role” in it, while Lily’s ambiguity is mainly the product of her own internal confusion and fragmented identity. In her essay “Faith and Ethics", Farah Mendlesohn states: “When Lily Weatherwax changes people’s shape she does so in the erroneous assumption that this will enable her to change who they are. Because she confuses outward appearance with reality, when asked to find herself she can only look in mirrors” (Butler, James, and Mendlesohn 2001: 241). Mirrors are not only important to the plot of *Witches abroad*, and Lily’s character journey, but to the Discworld as a whole, after all, the world itself is constantly referred to as a mirror of worlds. One might claim that Lily’s merciless appropriation and use of well-known tales, “mirrors” Pratchett’s intertextual parodying of earlier literature. They both employ the familiar pattern (or pre-existing texts) in service of their agendas; Lily uses it acquire dominance over the people of Genua, whereas Pratchett uses it in order to undermine old belief systems, forcing readers to reconsider the moral, ethical and social codes that they accept as the norm.

In terms of visual description, it has already been observed that Lily and Esmeralda Weatherwax are near perfect mirror images of each other. One distinction is the perceived age: although Lily is older, she looks physically younger than Granny (perhaps with the aid of magical modifications); Lily’s victims certainly believe that Granny is her at first[89]. Naturally, they both contradict and complement one another, as do all reflections. Lily is a fairy god-mother, while Esme is a witch. Interestingly, the lines between good and evil are blurred, with Esme resenting her sister for abandoning her to the role of “the good one", after running away when they were young. In spite of that, she has a great deal of love and respect for her sister, as evidenced by her refusal to allow Mrs. Gogol to exact revenge on Lily upon her impending defeat, and her attempts to save her from herself[90]. Esme’s sisterly love for Lily (and presumably her Weatherwax pride), is only part of the reason she feels sympathy for her; Lily also functions as an image, a manifestation and representation of Esme’s worst potential self. Power-seeking, malicious manipulation, and pride to the point of vanity, all of these

89 As is the case with the people of the sleeping castle whom Granny saves, p.116.

90 A hint of her caring is found in the description of Granny’s “trip” into Lily’s mind. She encounters hints of old regrets, and regretfully surmises that there is not enough time to explore them, p.239.

attributes could easily have been Esme's share, had she allowed herself to become mired in her own "self", and failed to sympathize with others. As someone who must constantly guard against the same trap, she feels unable to condemn her sister entirely for falling into it.

Nonetheless, as two proud and powerful characters, that are "mirrors" of each other, a powerful confrontation seems to be an inevitable part of the plot. The plot requires a final showdown, and it also necessitates the differentiation between the "real" and the "fake". This is probably related to Freud's psychological dynamic of the uncanny: the differentiation of identity between Lily and Ella is necessary, because as long as they seem the same, there is a repulsive terror of uncanny repetition of identity, a doubling of characters. Thus, the confrontation destroys the doubling: Following a verbal clash between the two, Granny endeavors to break Lily's mirror, which leads to the two of them being drawn into the mirror world. In horror-like fashion, Lily is physically pulled inside by her own smiling reflection, while Granny's physical body is left behind as she is transported there mentally. Each is then confronted by Death, who informs them that their only path to release is by them "choosing" which of their numerous images is the "real" one.

Granny, being the confident, independent and "whole" person that she is, and being proficient in the art of "Headology", promptly point her finger at her physical self, stating that *she* is the real one. Lily on the other hand, engrossed in the illusory "power" that reflections provide, and experiencing life through mirrors, is confounded by the question, and runs around through her reflections, searching for herself. She loses the ability to differentiate between reality and fantasy, between what is genuine and what is fake, becoming merely one of her own many reflections. In *The* m*adwoman in the attic* Gilbert and Gubar observed that "[t]o be caught and trapped in a mirror rather than a window […] is to be driven inward, obsessively studying self-images as if seeking a viable self" (37). Lily Weatherwax, who in her own words wore names lightly, did not use one mirror, but two, so creating an infinite circle of reflections, and reflection of reflections. She embedded her own soul into these illusions, and in so doing, lost it within an ocean of reflections. "Lily had become so good at thinking of the world in terms of reflections that she had lost sight of the real one" (*TR* 403).

It can also be said that Lily's interest in and reliance on mirrors also serves to emphasize her fragmented identity. One may be tempted to see her reliance on reflections as a form of embracing multiplicity, but as Jonathan Roffe writes, in his chapter "Multiplicities" in *The Deleuze dictionary*: "Multiplicities are not parts of a greater whole that have been fragmented, and they cannot be considered manifold expressions of a single concept or transcendent unity. On these grounds, Deleuze opposes the dyad One/Many, in all of its forms, with multiplicity" (Parr 181). This exemplifies the difference in approach to identity between Esme and Lily, in a manner that clarifies the different end that each of them meets. Granny constantly demonstrates her comprehension of the concept of multiplicity, first by borrowing the beehive's mind, not by overtaking it, but by "becoming animal", then by becoming aware of the different Grannies that exist, and through her fluidity, her ability not to be "fragmented" or brought down by that. When she encounters the mirrors and reflections in *Witches abroad*, she is able to see through them and find herself. Lily on the other hand, falls victim to the illusion of power, of grandeur from the start. Her hubris leads her to assume that one can disconnect from the world around. When asked on why she prefers mirror magic, she states that it is safer and more self-contained: "When you use mirror magic, you don't have to rely on anyone except yourself. That's why no one's ever conquered the world with magic…yet. They try to take it from…other places. And there's always a price. But with mirrors, you're beholden to no one but your own soul" (71). Lily sees her endless reflections as an expansion of herself, never seeing it for what it truly is, a fragmentation that results in an unstable identity: "She could feel *herself* pouring into *herself*, multiplying itself via the endless reflections" (14). Thus, at the end of the novel, she finds herself destroyed by said reflections, as they constitute a part of her identity. When she encounters them, it truly is as if she encounters thousands of fragments of herself, and is consequently lost in their midst.

Lily and Esme are able to illustrate the power of "choice" in a variety of ways, through their narrative function as doubles. Their possession of similar magical abilities, personal capabilities and physical appearance serves to highlight the different paths they choose to take. Esme makes the ethical decision to pursue a path that requires her to always be aware of other people, so she does not lose sight of what truly matters and the world around her. At the same time, Lily, amidst the plethora of personas she

has created for herself, and "drunk" on her own power, loses sight of both the world and herself in the process. Despite the sisters' many similarities, both outward and inward, it is the internal changes that lead to their divergent paths of development, which truly distinguish them from one another in a moral and narrative sense.

The theme of the multiple Grannies, reappears in the subsequent witches' novel. *Lords and ladies* demonstrates another example of Granny's stable, yet fluid identity. Said novel also sees Granny mind being exposed to multiple versions of herself, as the thread between worlds becomes thin due to the presence of the elves. Throughout the novel, Granny is able to tap into the various Granny Weatherwaxes that exist in various dimension, and get a glimpse of what her life "could have been like". To most humans, the question of "what might have been?" could almost be crippling, under normal circumstances; all the more so if one was able to actually see said "could have been". But, Granny Weatherwax, a witch who knows who she is, who is able to maintain a sense of self even amidst thousands of bees, is not felled by this despite being momentarily affected.

> [S]he knew now why her mind had felt so unravelled, and that was a help. She couldn't hear the ghostly thoughts of all the other Esme Weatherwaxes anymore.
>
> Perhaps some lived in a world ruled by elves. Or had died long ago. Or were living what they thought were happy lives. Granny Weatherwax seldom wished for anything, because wishing was soppy, but she felt a tiny regret that she'd never be able to meet them. Perhaps some were going to die, now, here on this path. Everything you did meant that a million copies of you did something else. Some were going to die. She'd sensed their future deaths ... the deaths of Esme Weatherwax. And couldn't save them, because chance did not work like that.
>
> *On a million hillsides the girl ran, on a million bridges the girl chose, on a million paths the woman stood. ..*
>
> All different, all one.
>
> All she could do for all of them was be herself, here and now, as hard as she could. (386)

This developed conscious awareness of her other selves, and the ability to let the effects of their presence pass through her is another indicator of her embracing of multiplicity, in an almost literal sense. She is a million Grannies, she is one Granny[91].

3.4.2. Borrowing others, being oneself

"To Granny a cat was a damn' cat whatever shape it was" (M 253)

Lords and ladies does not only see Granny "tapping" into her other selves, and managing to retain a core and stable self in the process, it also sees her achieving the most noteworthy act of borrowing known to witches – borrowing a hive's mind. "borrowing", in itself (as it is called) is not a talent limited to Granny. Many a witch has dabbled in it, though some prefer to avoid it altogether, in part due to the danger inherent in the possibility of losing oneself in another's mind. "Nanny Ogg had never liked the idea of Borrowing, and Magrat had always refused even to give it a try."[92] Other witches of the area are no more welcoming of the idea. "The old witches on the other side of the mountain had too much trouble with inconvenient in-body experiences to cope with the out-of-body kind" *(LL* 82). Which speaks to the complexity, and identity blurring experience entailed in the process. Perhaps it also suggests that in order for one to be able to master borrowing, one needs to be able to "know" oneself, even when they are not present within themselves; a talent that Granny certainly possess in abundance, as demonstrated previously, in her altercation with her Fairy Godmother sister Lily/Lilith. Beyond that, some witches' hesitance to engage in borrowing, might be linked to its addictive quality, as well as to the moral obligation entailed in the process.

[91] The majority of the section was previously published as an article, titled: "'The Mirror Crack'd': Representation of Characters in Terry Pratchett's Witches Abroad" in the *Humaniora* journal (Mussa 2019). The previously published material has been revised and modified.

[92] During the events of *Lords and Ladies*, Nanny Ogg and Magrat Garlick are the two other witches in Granny Weatherwax's coven, representing two of the Goddess' aspects – the Mother and the Maiden; leaving Granny to (begrudgingly) assume the role of the Crone.

> You had to be careful. It was like a drug. You could ride the minds of animals and birds, but never bees, steering them gently, seeing through their eyes. Granny Weatherwax had many times flicked through the channels of consciousness around her. It was, to her, part of the heart of witchcraft. To see through other eyes …
>
> ... through the eyes of gnats, seeing the slow patterns of time in the fast pattern of one day, their minds traveling rapidly as lightning...
>
> ... to listen with the body of a beetle, so that the world is a three-dimensional pattern of vibrations ...
>
> ... to see with the nose of a dog, all smells now colors ...
>
> But there was a price. No one asked you to pay it, but the very absence of demand was a moral obligation. You tended not to swat. You dug lightly. You fed the dog. You paid. You cared; not because it was kind or good, but because it was right. You left nothing but memories, you took nothing but experience. *(LL* 82-83)

A moral obligation, not shared by the Discworld Elves, creatures who cruelty and violently overtake minds, uncaring of the damage done to the creatures they use, leaving them broken in the process[93]. When Granny first realizes that the Elves have broken into her world during the events of *Lords and ladies*, and can be found in the mental dimension that she is used to occupying on her own, she describes them as such:

> [T]his other roving intelligence ... it'd go in and out of another mind like a chainsaw, taking, taking, taking. She could sense the shape of it, the predatory shape, all cruelty and cool unkindness; a mind full of intelligence, that'd use other living things and hurt them because it was fun.
>
> She could put a name to a mind like that.
>
> *Elf*. (83)

The extreme dichotomy between the elven approach and the witches' approach, highlights the moral aspect. These abilities to control minds and shape the fates of the creatures involved, and the elves' haphazard, uncaring treatment of said creatures (and even humans) work to emphasize the witches' moral superiority, and their ethical

---

93

A cruelty and disregard to animal "minds" shared by Lily (Lilith) Weatherwax in *Witches Abroad*, when she transforms animals into humans, uncaring of the mental tole this process takes on said animals.

approach to said power. As Granny states, this stems, not from one's own goodness, but simply from a sense of balance, and "rightness". The Discworld's witches, as opposed to the Discworld's wizards, are inherently connected with the world of nature. They are "practical" and unafraid of menial and "real" work[94] . They are midwives, and healers, they attend the dead, and cure the sheep; in fact, most of their work is conducted by the application of common sense, knowledge that has been handed down from woman to woman, and of course Headology. In fact, in most interactions, their approach to everyday life is more reminiscent of the ancient tradition concerning "women work, than it is actual witchcraft; In *Witches, midwives, and nurses: A history of women healers* Barbara Ehrenreich and Deirdre English write: "For centuries women were doctors without degrees, barred from books and lectures, learning from each other, and passing on experience from neighbor to neighbor and mother to daughter. They were called 'wise women' by the people, witches or charlatans by the authorities." (3) Of course, unlike these women, Pratchett's witches actually have power, but though they possess magic, they often avoid it, and prefer, if possible, to solve their problems without relying on it.

The above-mentioned description, as is Granny's thought regarding "seeing through others' eyes" being a part of a witch's heart, both highlight the Discworld witches' liminal status. As Granny says: "Witches always lived on the edges of things." (*CJ* 35), which affords them a unique perspective of being in-tune with the world around them. Traditional witches have always been creatures in-between, and Pratchett's witches are no exception. On the one hand, they are the stereotypical witches, revelling in their traditions; and yet, on the other, they are the midwives, healers, and pillars of community (an image also historically linked to witchcraft, brought about by fear of the Other). It is, perhaps this liminality, that allows witches to borrow without hurt, gaining experience, and leaving no pain; understanding that a price must be paid for what is taken, even if, (and perhaps especially because), no one asks them to pay it. Delving into the minds of these creatures without violence, also

94 Though as stated previously, they are not a monolith, as some witches would occasionally be lured by the glamour of the performativity of the occult, only to be seen as "posers" by other witches. They also become more diverse in later books, deviating from the "traditional" image of a witch, with a beautiful Duke's daughter and a count's son joining the ranks in *I Shall Wear Midnight* (2010) and *The Shepherd's Crown* (2015) respectively.

demonstrates the acceptance of said creatures' selves. They are not tools to be used at will, nor are they to be pushed aside without consideration; it is a sharing, rather than an overtaking. Thus, the process of borrowing, as performed by the witches, might be said to be that of hybridity, allowing them to temporarily merge with these creatures, share their headspace, "understand" them, and then leave without hurting them. It is, for all intents and purposes, a form of shapeshifting, albeit not involving the shape-shifters' "real" body, but their consciousness. Of course, the addictive quality of borrowing, of becoming something that they are not, gaining experiences that their own bodies are incapable of, *that* is something that witches are wary of. There is something to be said for seeing the world through animal eyes, for the clarity that it provides, as the Librarian's case demonstrates. But balance is key. Pratchett is not the first fantasy author to provide such a warning. Myth and folklore are ripe with examples of humans forgetting themselves, basking in the joy and freedom to be found inside an animal head. Ursula Le Guin's Earthsea series also includes a similar warning for wizards not to be carried away, losing the ability to retain their original shape (as discussed in Chapter 2)[95].

There is, however, one type of borrowing, that cannot be achieved by any witch – borrowing a beehive's mind. Through *Lords and ladies*, it is emphasized time and time again that said feat cannot be accomplished. However, by the end of said novel, Granny Weatherwax becomes the only witch in existence capable of doing so; forever, thereafter being linked to bees[96], both inworld and on a meta level, with official illustrations using bee imagery to represent her. This feat, however, is not easily achieved by her. As, proud as she is, she admits early in the novel that she is incapable

---

95

Of course, Pratchett's Librarian does not seem to lose himself in his acquired animal body. Rather he chooses freely and "logically" to retain it, opting out of regaining his human shape, and resisting any attempts to turn him back.

96

The bees could e a reference to the three dream-making bees found in an early fantasy classic, the Book III of James Branch Cabell's *The silver stallion* (1926); Cabell's bees are linked to the release of irony and the restoration of imagination (they fly out of a character's head). There is also a connection with Granny in that releasing them from the stone, a feat that escaped magicians for centuries is achieved by a woman performing a mundane task. Although, unlike Pratchett, Cabell does not treat the act as a practical approach that beats the wizards' bombastic performative parlor tricks. The story states: " Koshchei, who made all things as they are, had decreed, they report, that these bright perils could be freed only in the most obvious way, because he knew this would be the last method attempted by any learned person" (59).

of said borrowing. The reason behind her inability, and the inability of numerous witches before her to do so, is the simple fact that a bee's mind is not wholly its own. In fact, in order to be able to borrow a bee's mind, one would have to borrow the whole hive's mind, which is difficult to say the least:

> Bees were her one failure. There wasn't a mind in Lancre she couldn't Borrow. She could even see the world through the eyes of earthworms*[97]. But a swarm, a mind made up of thousands of mobile parts, was beyond her. It was the toughest test of all. She'd tried over and over again to ride on one, to see the world through ten thousand pairs of multifaceted eyes all at once, and all she'd ever got was a migraine and an inclination to make love to flowers. (*LL* 68)

This achievement, like others, does not remain impossible for her, however. Towards the end of *Lords and Ladies*, she is able, to the amazement of all, to borrow the mind of a swarm of bees.

Granny's borrowing in its different forms correlates with "becoming" animal, wherein she embraces multiplicity through her understanding of said animals. Yet, none of it is as demonstrative of said "becoming", as when she is able to borrow the hive's mind. One might suggest, that talented as she is, it is not only Granny's magical ability that plays a role in achieving what no witch has done before. It is, in fact, the possibility that she had been embracing becoming-bee long before actually borrowing the hive's mind. She had always shown respect and thorough understanding of bees, thinking for instance:

> People underestimate bees.
>
> Granny Weatherwax didn't. She had half a dozen hives of them and knew, for example, there is no such creature as an individual bee. But there is such a creature as a swarm, whose component cells are just a bit more mobile than those of, say, the common whelk. Swarms see everything and sense a lot more, and they can remember things for years, although their memory tends to be external and built out of wax. A honeycomb is a hive's memory—[…]
>
> Granny didn't really keep bees. She took some old wax every year, for candles, and the occasional pound of honey that the hives felt they could spare, but mainly she had them for someone to talk to. (*LL* 67-68)

97

* Footnote in the original text: "It was largely dark".

Her in-depth understanding of bees, the intricacies of their hives, the fact that their wax told their stories, and her acceptance that she does not in-fact "keep" bees, but cohabitates with them, speak to her roles as a witch who is one with nature, and who has "become" these bees by understanding them. In this, Granny is reminiscent of Tolkien's Beorn, who lives in harmony wThis harmonious existence with nature, coupled with Granny's natural power and unshakable confidence, allow her to achieve the unachievable, as she manages to effectively borrow the hive's mind towards the end of the novel, aiding in the process of driving away the elves from her realm. In overtaking the swarm's mind, one may claim that Granny Weatherwax epitomizes the notion of becoming multiplicity. In *Difference and repetition*, Deleuze defines "multiplicity" not as "a combination of the many or one, but rather an organization belonging to the many as such, which has no need whatsoever of unity in order to form a system." (230). Time and time again, Granny demonstrates an identity of multiplicity. She is not only a proficient borrower, allowing her to retain "herself" while in other creatures' mind[98], but she is able to return to herself after borrowing the hive's mind, albeit with some minor and temporary residual (speech related) effects. Immediately after waking up from the process, she says:ith nature, keeping a beehive, taking only what is needed, and not disturbing the natural order.

This harmonious existence with nature, coupled with Granny's natural power and unshakable confidence, allow her to achieve the unachievable, as she manages to effectively borrow the hive's mind towards the end of the novel, aiding in the process of driving away the elves from her realm. In overtaking the swarm's mind, one may claim that Granny Weatherwax epitomizes the notion of becoming multiplicity. In *Difference and repetition*, Deleuze defines "multiplicity" not as "a combination of the many or one, but rather an organization belonging to the many as such, which has no need whatsoever of unity in order to form a system." (230). Time and time again, Granny demonstrates an identity of multiplicity. She is not only a proficient borrower, allowing her to retain "herself" while in other creatures' mind[99], but she is able to return to herself after

---

98

And even the mind of the Unseen University for Magic in *Equal Rites*, and the mind of the city of Lancre in *Wyrd Sisters*, exemplifying perhaps the concept of becoming-city and her heterogeneity.

99

borrowing the hive's mind, albeit with some minor and temporary residual (speech related) effects. Immediately after waking up from the process, she says:

> "I wantzzz a bunzzch of flowerszz, a pot of honey, and someone to szzzting."
>
> "I brung the sugar bowl, Esme," said Nanny Ogg.
>
> Granny eyed it hungrily, and then looked at the bees that were taking off from her
>
> head like planes from a stricken carrier.
>
> "Pour a dzzrop of water on it, then, and tip it out on the table for them." (*LL* 373)

The mental effects of the borrowing can be seen in her speech pattern, as well as her desire for a pot of honey and "someone to sting"; but her moral approach to borrowing is also emphasized by her immediate request that the sugary water be given to the bees that she borrowed, even though she herself wished to consume it (due to another residual effect). That said, Granny does not humbly overlook the feat that she had achieved, stating triumphantly, immediately after taking care of the bees: "I done it with beezzz! No one can do it with beezzz, and I done it! You endzzz up with your mind all flying in different directionzzz! You got to be good to do it with beezzz!" (373). And she is indeed right, and in-fact that "good".

3.4.3. Consuming self: from vampirization to weatherwaxation

In *A thousand plateaus*, Deleuze and Guattari write: "We believe in the existence of very special becomings-animal traversing human beings and sweeping them away, affecting the animal no less than the human" (237). Though Granny does not physically transform, the effects of the borrowing (which become more severe the longer said borrowing takes) can be seen on her afterwards. But this is a two-sided coin; while traces of the creatures she borrowed can be found in her, traces of her can also be found

---

And even the mind of the Unseen University for Magic in *Equal Rites*, and the mind of the city of Lancre in *Wyrd Sisters*, exemplifying perhaps the concept of becoming-city and her heterogeneity.

in said creatures. Similar to Deleuze and Guattari's example of Ahab and the Whale, whereby both Ahab and Moby-Dick "become" each other, Granny and the animals whose minds she borrows also become each other. Granny Weatherwax's effect on the animals that she borrows is evident, as is said effects on her bees, whose relationship with her becomes closer; thus, when Granny dies in the last Discworld novel, *The shepherd's crown*, as much attention is giving to the animals and creatures paying respect to her, as it is to the humans.

This process of reciprocity can, interestingly, be examined in and contrasted by Granny's interactions with the vampires in *Carpe jugulum*. While not officially borrowing their minds, and thus becoming them, Granny is bitten and thought to be turning into a vampire. Instead, not only does she not transform (or become) a vampire, but the vampires who, unknowingly, drank her blood begin to, in-fact, be "Grannified", craving tea and biscuits.

> He rubbed his forehead. The Count prided himself on his mind, and tended it carefully. But right now it felt exposed, as though someone was looking over his shoulder. He wasn't certain he was thinking right. She couldn't have got into his head, could she? He'd had hundreds of years of experience. There was no way some village witch could get past his defences. It stood to reason ... (*CJ* 327)

But, get past their defenses she did. Similar to the process Granny undergoes when she is borrowing, she does not completely overtakes the minds of the vamipres, but rather shares them. By sharing the mind the mind of a sentient beings, ones who are play an aderserial role in her life, not on a personal level, but due to the harm they inflict upon others, Granny's apporach to this form of borrowing is less subtle, with the borrowed feeling her within their minds, and with her projecting her personality on to them. While explaining what happened to the head vampire (or vampyre as he prefers to be known as), Cout Magpyr, she states:

> "Oh, they're strong, your walls of thought," said Granny dreamily. "I couldn't get through them."[…] "So I didn't," she added. […] "You wanted to know where I'd put my self," said Granny. "I didn't go anywhere. I just put it in something alive, and you took it. You invited me in. I'm in every muscle in your body and I'm in your head, oh yes. I was in the blood, Count. In the blood. I ain't been vampired. You've been Weatherwaxed. All of you. And you've always listened to your blood, haven't you?" (354)

Granny's effect on the vampires is so strong that she rightly assumes that they will not be able to harm the hostages that they have taken. By consuming her blood, she becomes a part of them. Thus, not only do the vampires take on Granny's everyday habits, they, unwillingly, take on her sense of morality (for the time being). They take on what she herself perceives as her (albeit theoretical) fault, in the form of not backing out, even "on a weak hand" (359). By becoming a part of these vampires, in a way "overwriting" their programming in favor of her own, Granny demonstrates some the characteristics of a Rhizome. She is not bound by a single idea, a matter that has been demonstrated time and again, and was reaffirmed by her "refusal" to bow down to the rules of vampirism; She shapes the environment to her own will; she is multiplicitous; she is unpredictable, making her trajectory only mappable, but monstly not traceable, (unless one takes into account the fact that she always acts with a moral compass); and her properties are transferrable, as the Magpyr family discover to their detriment.

Granny's approach to the vampires differs from that to animals. When the Count tries to justify his unscruplouous ways, claiming: "We are vampires. We cannot help what we are", Granny retorts with: "Only animals cannot help what they are," (356), drawing a clear line between what vampires view as their "nature" and what truly *is* nature.

3.4.4. Life in death: Granny's corporeal demise

> The anomalous is neither an individual nor a species […] Lovecraft applies the term "Outsider" to this thing or entity, the Thing, which arrives and passes at the edge, which is linear yet multiple […] It is a phenomenon, but a phenomenon of bordering. (*A thousand plateaus* 43)

Granny's broom defies her. She sees it as the only "being that does". Interestingly, similar to the dwarfs' axes, said broom "has been entirely replaced over the years by spare parts" *(TR* 402), epitomizing the essence of Theseus' Paradox . Yet, since Granny sees her identity as being tied to a broom that for all intents and purposes does not remain the same broom for long, it can be said that she also wisely sees her identity as

fluid and changing. She is the same, yet not the same. This process, can be said to be “justified” by her embracing of multiplicity. She is a part of the “pack", yet not incomplete, not fragmented. She is mutable, yet with a core that allows her to retain stability even amidst an ever-changing world.

Granny’s proficient use of Headology, a process that demonstrates her knowledge of human nature, works many times to highlight her moral axis. One may claim that Granny does not face any confusion as to her identity, precisely because, at the bottom of it lies the unshakable desire to do the right (though more often than not the difficult) thing. For instance, in *Carpe jugulum*, Granny is faced with the decision of saving either a mother or a baby’s life. Rather than put the burden onto the husband, she makes the decision herself, stating to the bewildered midwife that she does not hate the husband, and thus would not force him to make such a soul crushing decision. She also demonstrates her humanity and moral nature when she refuses to allow Baron Saturday to retrieve her beloved hat from an alligator infested swamp, even despite the importance of hats to witches, and Granny’s critical stance on his existence (as a Zombie remaining in the realm of the living for revenge). The way Granny sees it: “Hats were important. But so were people” (*WA* 225), no matter if said people were living or dead.

As stated previously, Granny’s awareness of herself through the multiple reflections, as well as, her awareness of other versions of herself demonstrates an identity fluidity and embracing multiplicity, yet retaining a core self that allows her to anchor her “identity". She does not resist the currents of change and mutability, but rather surrenders to them, which allows her not to be overtaken and overwhelmed by them. In essence, Granny Weatherwax is carnivalesque.

Granny Weatherwax dies during the events of *The sheperd’s crown* (2015), fittingly, the last novel completed by Pratchett, prior to his death. Like other witches, Granny is aware of her impending demise, and uses her last day, not to cry or say goodbye to loved ones (witches are much more practical than that), but to make preparations, clean the house, ready it for the next witch who must occupy it, complete unfinished tasks (even menial labor), and prepare her “body” for rest, taking care not to leave any “unnecessary” work for those who will bury her. A witch’s approach to the matter at hand is that of acceptance of the cycle of life and the inevitability of death.

Although Granny does not “warn” her fellow witches of her death, prior to its occurrence (for they will feel it on their own as soon as it happens), nor uses any of that time to see any of them, she does manage to visit her beehive and say goodbye to it, thanking the bees for all that they have given her.

> Granny Weatherwax went to her beehives.
>
> ’You are my bees,’ she said to them. ’Thank you. You’ve given me all
>
> my honey for years, and please don’t be upset when someone new comes. I hope that you will give her as much honey as you have given me. And now, for the last time, I will dance with you.’ But the bees hummed softly and danced *for* her instead, gently pushing her mind out of their hive. And Granny Weatherwax said, ’I was younger when I last danced with you. But I am old now. There will be no more danced for me.’ (*TSC* 31-32)

Toward the end, the bees say goodbye to Granny, and push her out of their hive, out of their consciousness, as if to say that this final journey is one that she must take alone, being solely and completely “herself".

In *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, Deleuze writes:

> there is no being beyond becoming, nothing beyond multiplicity; neither multiplicity nor becoming are appearances or illusions. But neither are there multiple or eternal realities which would be in turn, like essences beyond appearance. Multiplicity is the inseparable manifestation, essential transformation and constant symptom of unity. Multiplicity is the affirmation of unity; becoming is the affirmation of being. The affirmation of becoming is itself being, the affirmation of multiplicity is itself one. Multiple affirmation is the way in which the one affirms itself. (23)

Granny Weatherwax, who embraces and yet is not distracted by her other selves, who is able to borrow a swarm of bees – the physical manifestation of becoming multiplicity, is able to affirm her unity and her becoming, thus affirming her being. Thus, when she dies, she is able to remain alive in a sense, not in a magical manner, but by becoming one with nature. Thus, when the Discworld’s Death[100], comes to escort her to the afterlife, he makes a point of emphasizing the echo she has left in the world:

> YOU ARE TAKING THIS VERY WELL, ESME WEATHERWAX.

100

an extremely sympathetic character, who speaks in all-caps

> “It’s an inconvenience, true enough, and I don’t like it at all, but I know that you do it for everyone, Mister Death. Is there any other way?"
>
> NO, THERE ISN’T, I’M AFRAID. WE ARE ALL FLOATING IN THE WINDS OF TIME. BUT YOUR CANDLE, MISTRESS WEATHERWAX, WILL FLICKER FOR SOME TIME BEFORE IT GOES OUT – A LITTLE REWARD FOR A LIFE WELL LIVED. FOR I CAN SEE THE BALANCE AND YOU HAVE LEFT THE WORLD MUCH BETTER THAN YOU FOUND IT, AND IF YOU ASK ME, said Death, NOBODY COULD DO ANY BETTER THAN THAT ... (*TSC* 36-37)

And said effect, truly, is felt by all those around her; not only do people from all walks of life come to pay tribute to her after her death, but the world of nature does too. Granny’s connection with the world of nature, in part through her interactions with her borrowed animals, and her harmonious living with nature, indicate a state of hybridity and post humanity. By embracing multiplicity, Granny becomes the epitome of a posthuman figure, she becomes one with the world. After being laid to rest, her connection with the world of nature is emphasized yet again, by animals paying respect to her:

> The whole forest now sang for Granny Weatherwax. […] Tiffany was astounded when creature after creature settled down near the grave and sat there as if they were domestic pets.
>
> Where is Granny now? Tiffany wondered. Could a part of her still be ... here? She jumped as something touched her on the shoulder; but it was just a leaf. Then, deep inside, she knew the answer to her question:
>
> *Where is Granny Weatherwax?*
>
> It was: *She is here – and everywhere.* (*TSC* 65)

Granny is immortal, not in the traditional sense, but in her ability to become one with the world; although her mortal body is gone, traces of her remain in living creatures, some of which have been “borrowed” by her. In fact, when it was time to choose an unofficial successor to Granny Weatherwax (for witches did not technically have a leader), Granny’s choice was reaffirmed by her animal companions, with her cat “You” mewing and standing next to her protégé Tiffany, and with the bees circling Tiffany’s head like a halo, “crowning her, and swarm and girl stood on the threshold of

the cottage and Tiffany reached out her arms and the bees settled along them, and welcomed her home" (*TSC* 77). Thus, Granny's borrowing of the beehive's mind a few books prior, not only allowed her to become the bees, they in-fact also became Granny. Honoring her wishes, and retaining remnants of her consciousness, even after death. Thus, Death's affirmation that Granny's candle would remain alight for a while yet can even be seen as an underestimation. Granny's embracing of nature, of hybridity, of multiplicity, actually makes her one with the universe, and thus everlasting. "Granny Weatherwax was indeed here. And there. She was, in fact, and always would be, everywhere" (*TSC* 318-319).

Conclusion

Our reality, is richer, bigger, and far more complex and diverse than we think, and it is changing faster than we think. Our bodies, as is the world around us, are in constant flux, which continually raises questions regarding our identity, stability and mutability. Terry Pratchett's writing is always ripe with concepts of identity, hybridity and "human" consciousness. Touching upon philosophical interpretations of the fluidity of time, in *Good omens*, the son of Satan actively chooses to rewrite his identity, and *become* the son of the people who raised him. In one of his series, The Long Earth, with Stephen Baxter, Pratchett has a character – Lobsang, a sentient computer who is the reincarnation of a Tibetan motorcycle repairman – (at one-point Lobsang later becoming a monk, touching upon posthuman concepts of technological hybridity, while also raising questions of said character's identity. And finally, the Discworld series itself is filled with characters with fluid identities and at times fluid shapes. A consciousness is not the sole prerogative of humans, with animals and at times what should be inanimate objects consciously interacting with the world around them; affording the readers a glimpse into a new perspective, through the true and tried concept of defamiliarization.

Pratchett's Discworld is a vibrant world filled with an eclectic assortment of characters, species and objects alike. From a semi-homicidal chest (the Luggage) that follows the wizard Rincewind around on his misadventures; to an aging hero - Cohen the Barbarian, who, having survived the world of heroism and adventures, finds himself an exceptionally strong old man who is an outsider in the "new world"; to Death himself who is, ironically enough, many readers' favorite character, with his empathetic, yet practical treatment of human beings and human mortality (and mortality in general); the

Discworld contain colorful and lively characters that still serve to embody elements of social commentary. The Discworld's different races serve, among other things, to raise the issues of othering and marginalization. The various shape-shifting characters also serve to emphasize questions of personal and collective identity, as well as othering and abjection.

The methodological background presented in chapter 1 combines French theory with Bakhtin's notion of the carnivalesque, preparing the central statements of the present dissertation: shape-shifting is an image of discontent and subversion, and its use is central in fantasy, when it is understood as a satirical genre of social criticism. In other words, imagery of shapeshifting is probably more critical and radical than other modes of identity formation in fiction, such as the *Bildungsroman* or revisionary mode of historical fiction, because it undermines the very fabric of culturally constructed bodily experience and reality itself. As a framework for this claim, chapter 1 referred to Deleuze's *Difference and repetition*, to Deleuze and Guattari's *A thousand plateaus* and to Julia Kristeva's *Powers of horror* and Helene Cixous's *Laugh of the medusa*: all of those works demonstrate that bodily monstrosity is not just a prop in Gothic aesthetic, but an image of a pervading, natural propensity for powerful change and subversion, a terrifying, unsettling drive that seems to be inherent in human psychology, and in literary production. This framework is relatable to Bakhtin's concept of carnivalesque, because the French theorists often refer to bodily transformations, grotesque and disfigured bodies, emerging and "becoming-" forms of life. Such concepts bear clear resemblance to Bakhtin's aesthetic category of the carnivalesque, the masquerade, the unsettling and contestation of the world as it is through creative, satirical, and playful production of a popular festival, and its literary equivalents in fiction.

In the second chapter, the theoretical concepts derived from work by Deleuze, Guattari, Kristeva, Cixous, and Bakhtin, were applied to shapeshifting images in fantasy literature, especially to the "British boom" fantasy as it emerged after 1945 (Butler 2013). The survey of works by J.R. Tolkien, Angela Carter, J.K. Rowling, among other authors, provides a context for Pratchett's work, which is consequently described in terms of the English satirical fantasy that reaches back, perhaps, as far as the 17th and 18th centuries, as exemplified by *Gulliver's travels* (1726) by Jonathan Swift or Bernard Mandeville's *Fable of the bees* (1714). What defines this tradition is not simply satire,

but an angry satire expressed in terms of monstrosity, bodily transformation, grotesque deformity, as of the private and public body tried to free itself, by changing shape, from some deadly pressure that cannot be reasoned with or fought back. This kind of plight is particularly visible in fiction by Angela Carter, which was discussed in detail in this chapter. Another context for Pratchett, which is arguably an important context for all fantasy, is the folk-tale tradition, which was discussed in a separate subsection. Here, too, bodily transformation, and various forms of liminal, half-human existence (animal spouses, werewolves) can be interpreted as images of anger and satirical criticism.

In chapter 3, the theoretical apparatus, and the literary contexts, were applied for an analysis of shape-shifting characters in Pratchett's text. In this dissertation I have chosen to focus on a number of shape-shifting characters and races that appear throughout the Discworld novels. The dissertation includes a brief introduction to the cyborg-like Igor clan that, although its members do not shape-shift in the "traditional" manner, can be said to transform through body-part transplantation, and at the same time, they absorb and maintain their culture through their inherited body-parts and body modifications. While the Igor clan does not fulfil the role of "traditional" shape-shifters, others on the Discworld do – at least on the face of it. "Traditional" human-animal shape-shifters (becoming animals) include the Librarian and the werewolves (and even vampires, if one take into account their bat-shapes). The Librarian, who is transformed into an orangutang via magical incident, actively refuses to turn back into a human, proclaiming for all intents and purposes that his life as an ape is preferrable to his old human existence. He does embody elements of Deleuze and Guattari's becoming-animal, however, as he still maintains his human faculties and memories; deny as he might, he is not only an ape, but a human-ape hybrid with a preference for the physical existence, heightened senses and initially the "black and white" attitude of an ape. The werewolves are a multi-faceted group, as like the Discworld's Igors, and vampires, they are a race that is separate from and yet connected to human-beings. "Real" wolves can recognize (and consequently reject) werewolves, while humans are less able to do so (at least on a conscious level). That said, werewolves are always a race in-between; neither belonging to nor able to completely disentangle from humanity. While they embody the "ultimate" hybridity, Pratchett does not present it as a solution for questions of identity and mutability. Their hybridity can be dangerous to them and to others, as, unlike the

Librarian, it is not a hybridity that they actively chose, and as such, they like others struggle with their sense of self, although in their case it is a sense of “selves", the human self, the wolf self, and the human-wolf self. The werewolves include classical biomorphs, wolf-men and Yennorks, all of whom struggle with their identities in their own way. Two of the characters – Ludmilla and Lupine are able to connect through their shared trauma and sense of marginalization; although as a semi-traditional werewolf and a wolf-man, they approach their transformations from different sides, and although their experiences differ based on the shape they maintain for the majority of the time. Of course, said connection might not be sustainable as hinted at by the later plot. The character that comes closest to a sense of “stability” in her mutability is Angua von. Überwald, who can be said to embody the becoming-animal and becoming-woman, and who achieves a tentative balance between her various selves, but who is constantly aware of the tentativeness of said balance.

The second kind of “becoming” that the dissertation focuses on (although it does not technically exist) is that of becoming (hu)man. While Deleuze and Guattari’s involve becoming-minoritarian; the dissertation discusses a number of animal characters that become human – in a sense becoming-majoritarian. In most cases, this process is met with failure, as the character are unable to fully cope with the human (or semi-human) existence. The Wolf (that does not fully transform) is shunned and feared by all, to the point that it (not he) actively seeks death; the prince maintains his frog-like sliminess, and the step-sisters remain snakes, albeit in human bodies. The only character that is able to navigate his transformation on a psychological level (although not without challenges) is Greebo the cat. Be it due to the fact that cats are individuated animals, the idea that cats are (as cat owners maintain) half-human already, or Greebo’s own sense of self, he is able to attain minimal damage from the process, and to even “escape” into human shape when the need arises thereafter.

The third type of transformation is not of the physical kind, and it belongs to Granny Weatherwax, who (along with some other witches) is able to “borrow” the minds of creatures (and in her case even that of a university and a city), seeing and navigating the world through their eyes. Unlike the elves, the witches are consciousness borrowers, attempting to avoid leaving traces in these creatures’ minds, so as to allow them to maintain their sense of identity, undisturbed. Granny’s unique achievement is

her ability to borrow the mind of a beehive, and still maintain her sense of self. Granny who t one point is met with different versions of herself (and the lives she could have lived), who is able to recognize herself through multiple reflections, and who is able to "Grannify" a group of vampires who bite her, embraces her multiplicity and through it finds stability. Ultimately, when she dies, she, as Death asserts, is able to live-in-death as the traces she leaves on the world of the living will not soon fade.

The appeal of shape-shifting characters has accompanied the human psyche since early days; from cave drawings to various cultural beliefs. It is a theme that has been revisited time and time again in fantasy literature spanning back to Ovid, through Kafka, and ending with more recent creations such as Stephanie Meyer's *Twilight* series and beyond. I do not by any means claim to be the first to attempt exploring this theme, yet I believe that my dissertation has presented a fresh and unique analysis of it, particularly with regards to the treasure trove that is Pratchett's multi-layered corpus.

In *The modern literary werewolf: A critical study of the mutable motif*, Stypczynski writes:

> The human-to-animal figures […] and the cursed ones tend to draw the shape-shifter away from the trickster into an archetype of its own because, in many cases, they are more interested in removing their curse or recovering their lost human shape than in trickery or changing society. This is not to say that they do not make use of trickery to achieve their goals, but rather that their goals and those of the Jungian trickster are not generally the same. (Stypczynski 2013: 14-15)

What is interesting about Pratchett's shape-shifters is that while not all may fit the "trickster" archetype, they do not work towards gaining or regaining their "humanity"; in some cases (like the Librarian) they actively resist going back, and in others (like the werewolves), shapeshifting is an integral part of their identity. And while they might not aspire to change their society, their mere presence and embrace of their situation affects said community.

It is my belief that Pratchett's works present a thorough insight into the workings of the human consciousness and contemporary culture. It is my hope that my dissertation has presented a thought-provoking and sufficiently comprehensive discussion of human nature and human identity, through the theme of shape-shifting as presented in "Pratchett's work. Shape-shifting can be seen as a fantastical representation of everyday processes, with the physical transformations corresponding with mental and

spiritual ones. These “shifts” are at times brought about by the individual, by society’s influence over said individual, or by the natural progression of one’s life (a process that, in itself, is unpredictable). Pratchett own Alzheimer’s and sense of loss of self is certainly proof of the lack of control one might have over said changes.

These, at times multi-layered, shifts can have complex root causes that are not always easily traceable. As Franz Kafka states in his short story, “The Great Wall of China”:

> Human nature, essentially changeable, unstable as the dust, can endure no restraint; if it binds itself it soon begins to tear madly at its bonds, until it renders everything asunder, the wall, and the bonds and its very self [...] The *limits* that *my capacity* for thought imposes upon me are narrow enough, but the province to be traversed here is infinite. (Kafka 1946: 86)

One thing that is quite evident is that shape-shifting entails mutability. Though we live in an ambiguous world that still manages to have dichotomies based on race, gender and sexual identity; by exploring said mutability, I hope to have afforded further understanding of people as social constructs, and the human psyche.

The body is a construct. Never has it been as relevant than at an age where people have almost complete virtual lives (V-Tubers, game avatars, filters etc.) or are able to (surgically or cosmetically) shape their bodies as they see fit. Resurfacing the questions of “what is a human?” and “who am *I*?” As our identity is molded by several factors, so is our shape mutable. If in times past it was only through aging, disease, disfigurement, or child-birth (processes that are justly or unjustly grouped together, and viewed as “grotesque"), today, it is through avatars, cosmetics and surgeries. Where in the past, these changes were “forced” upon us and upon our bodies, the new (added) forms of transformation involve agency and active perusal of said changes. Fantastical shape-shifting (in addition to science fiction hybridity) has long served as a literary and metaphorical tool, and can now be seen as a literary representation of our post-humanity.

Afterwards

"I have learned how to live, how to be ***in*** the world and ***of*** the world, and not just stand aside and watch" – *Sabrina* 1954

In early 2020, the world would start getting familiar with a virus that would change life's trajectory for the foreseeable future. The world was forced to hold still. People had to social distance, work from home, and learn to adapt to a new form of existence. People became familiar with concepts of hybridity, albeit in a work-related sense. Older people have had to learn to embrace technology, and overall, everyone had to reconceptualize their everyday. At the same time, any people had to re-evaluate their lives. An interesting example comes in the form of a well-known (extremely wealthy) YouTube influencer, who is said to thrive on "drama", and flaunting his wealth, taking a step back, and coming to terms with his loneliness, as a solitary quarantine in his auspicious mansion forced him to face himself.

Now, we have to consider the rise of Machine-Learning, Artificial Intelligence, more recently, physically shapeshifting robots (that can transform by melting their bodies). These and other matters lead to numerous ethical questions, that we are likely to debate for some time to come. A debate that Isaac Asimov would surely have enjoyed partaking in, had he been with us today.

Nature benefited (briefly) from our reduced activity, with dolphins seen swimming in the Venetian Canals, and our Carbone footprint being momentarily reduced. This will not suffice to hinder global warming and climate change, as demonstrated by for example the recent summer floods that occurred in Europe and China, and the extreme heat and fires that happened in the United States and Canada at approximately the same time.

All of the above-mentioned hint at a transformation of the idea of human subjectivity, one that embraces Deleuze and Guattari's notion of becoming minoritarian, and of a post-human approach to said subjectivity. Be it through our relationship with

technology, with the ecology or with evolution itself as the virus and vaccine raise questions about biology and evolution. Even the type of chosen vaccines (in the form of traditional vs. mRNA vaccines and their possible effects on human evolution) was a source of major debate. Thus, the question of (post)human subjectivity has never been more relevant, as we move forward in a world that has been dramatically changed, even if some of these changes may not be permanent. It is worthwhile, however, to continue to delve into said question, as people struggle to gain a new understanding of themselves, and as they learn to adapt to new forms of communication, to re-shape their lives in a new reality, and perhaps form new connections with the world around them.

> Why do you go away? So that you can come back. So that you can see the place you came from with new eyes and extra colors. And the people there see you differently, too. Coming back to where you started is not the same as never leaving. (*A Hat Full of Sky*, 332)

Abstract

The current dissertation explores how the postmodern and post-human Subjects may be reflected through the idea of fantastical shape-shifting. It focuses on the depictions of these shape-shifters in Sir Terry Pratchett's Discworld series, which includes substantial amounts of intertextuality and social commentary. The unique blend of tradition and innovation that Pratchett is able to seamlessly achieve can present a fertile ground for insights regarding human nature, social dynamics and our relationship with nature and the world around us. Pratchett's writing is comedic and angry, and through an exploration of his shape-shifting characters, one may be able to tap into, and understand said social anger.

In the first chapter, the dissertation reviews theory surrounding Terry Pratchett's body of work, as well as theories of identity, monstrosity and post-humanity. The dissertation briefly delves into the works of Cixous, Kristeva, Butler, Bakhtin, as well as Deleuze and Guattari. It draws on the connection between said scholars, body identity, and by extension shape-shifting and Pratchett. The second chapter presents a brief overview of shape-shifting as it appears in Western folklore, as well as in the works of notable contemporary authors, such as J.R.R. Tolkien, George R.R. Martin, Andrzej Sapkowski, Diana Wynne Jones, J.K. Rowling and Angela Carter. A connection will be made between folklore tropes, the work of the aforementioned authors, and the work of Terry Pratchett. The third chapter will start with an exploration of notable Discworld races and beings through which the relationship between body and soul can be explored. Afterwards, the dissertation will focus on a number of shape-shifting characters and/or groups of characters, which will be divided into "types" of shape-shifters named after Deleuze and Guattari's concept of Becoming. The chapter will include human

characters that become animals, animal character that become human, and a witch who is able to embody “multiplicity” through her connection with the world of nature and her own “self". The dissertation concludes by making a connection between said transformations and the characters’ hybridity and post-humanity. In an ever-changing reality, fraught with a lack of stability, marginalization and othering, it is increasingly vital to understand our own mutability, or as Deleuze and Guattari would term it – our constant state of becoming. It is my hope that this dissertation contributes to the discussion in-question.

Streszczenie

Niniejsza rozprawa zawiera opis badań na tym, jak podmioty postmodernistyczne i post-ludzkie mogą zostać przedstawione przy pomocy obrazów fantastycznego zmieniania kształtu. Rozprawa skupia się na obrazach zmiennokształtności w powieściach z serii Świata Dysku napisanych przez Sir Terry Pratchetta, które cechują się dużą liczbą nawiązań intertekstualnych i krytycznych komentarzy społecznych. Wyjątkowe połączenie tradycji i innowacji, którego dokonał Pratchett, stwarza okazję do rozważań nad naturą ludzką, dynamiką społeczną, oraz relacją pomiędzy ludźmi a przyrodą i ogólnie światem zewnętrznym. Proza Pratchetta jest jednocześnie komiczna i pełna gniewu, a poprzez badania nad jego postaciami zmiennokształtnymi można lepiej zrozumieć i wykorzystać akcenty krytyki społecznej wyrażanej przez tego autora.

Rozdział pierwszy rozprawy zawiera przegląd literatury krytycznej związanej z twórczością Pratchetta, oraz teorii tożsamości, potworności i post-ludzkości. Rozprawa krótko omawia wybrane dzieła Cixous, Kristewy, Butler, Bachtina, oraz Deleuze i Guattariego. Wykorzystuję związki pomiędzy wymienionymi teoretyczkami i teoretykami a pojęciem tożsamości opartej na ciele, co z kolei wiąże się ze zmiennokształtnymi postaciami w prozie Pratchetta. Rozdział drugi zawiera krótkie omówienie przykładów zmiennokształtności w kulturze zachodniej, a szczególnie w dziełach znanych współczesnych autorów fantasy, takich jak J.R.R. Tolkien, George R.R. Martin, Andrzej Sapkowski, Diana Wynne Jones, J.K. Rowling, oraz Angela Carter. Praca zwraca uwagę na związki pomiędzy tropami folklorystycznymi, dziełami wymienionych autorek i autorów, oraz twórczością Pratchetta. Rozdział trzeci rozpoczyna się od omówienia najważniejszych typów postaci w powieściach o Świecie Dysku, oraz postaci użytecznych przy omawianiu reprezentacji pojęć ciała i duszy, oraz

związków pomiędzy ciałem i duszą. Następnie rozprawa skupia się na postaciach zmiennokształtnych, które zostały podzielone na „typy” zmiennokształtności wypracowane na podstawie pojęcia Stawania się, zaczerpniętego z prac Deleuze’a i Guattariego. Rozdział ten zawiera omówienia postaci ludzkich, które zamieniły się w zwierzęta, zwierząt które zamieniły się w ludzi, oraz postaci wiedźmy, która potrafi stać się ucieleśnieniem „wielokrotności”, dzięki związkowi pomiędzy własnym „ja” i przyrodą. W zakończeniu rozprawy zostają przedstawione związki pomiędzy zmiennokształtnością postaci, a ich hybrydowością i post-ludzkim charakterem. We wciąż zmieniającej się rzeczywistości, naznaczonej brakiem stabilności, marginalizacją i dyskryminacją Innego, coraz bardziej potrzebne staje się zrozumienie własnej zmienności, którą Deleuze i Guattari określają jako ciągłe “stawanie się”. Mam nadzieję, że moja rozprawa przyczyni się do debaty na ten temat.

References

Alton, Anne Hiebert and William C. Spruiell. 2014. *Discworld and the disciplines : Critical approaches to the Terry Pratchett works*. Jefferson NC: McFarland.

Asker, D. B. D. 2001. *Aspects of metamorphosis: Fictional representations of the becoming human*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Attebery, Brian. 1992. “Fantasy as mode, genre, formula”, in: *Strategies of fantasy*. Bloomington IN: Indiana University Press, 1-17.

Baker, Steve. 2000. *The postmodern animal*. London: Reaktion Books.

Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich. 1984a. *Rabelais and his world*. (Translated by Irene Iswolsky.) Bloomington, INL: Indiana University Press.

Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich. 1984b. *Problems of Dostoevsky’s poetics*. (Edited and translated by Caryl Emerson.) Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Batty, Holly. 2015 “Harry Potter and the (post)human animal body.” *Bookbird: A Journal of International Children’s Literature*, 53, 1: 24–37. doi:10.1353/bkb.2015.0020.

Beauvoir, Simone de, et al. 2010 [1949]. *The second sex*. (Translated by Constance Borde and Sheila Malovany-Chevallier.) London: Vintage Books.

Blécourt, Willem de. 2013. “Monstrous theories: Werewolves and the abuse of history”, *Preternature: Critical and Historical Studies on the Preternatural*, 2(2), The Pennsylvania State University Press, 188–212.

Braidotti, Rosi, and Maria Hlavajova. 2019. *Posthuman glossary*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Braidotti, Rosi. 2013. *The posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bray, Abigail, and Claire Colebrook. 1998. "The haunted flesh: Corporeal feminism and the politics of (dis)embodiment", *Signs*, *24*(1): 35–67. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3175671

Brown, Andrew. 2015. "Without Terry Pratchett, the world is less magical", *The Guardian* 12 March.

Bruns, Gerald L. 2007. "Becoming-animal (Some simple ways)." *New Literary History*, 38, 4: 703–20. doi:10.1353/nlh.2008.0003.

Bryant, Sylvia. 1989. "Re-constructing Oedipus through 'Beauty and the Beast'", in: Lindsey Tucker and G.K. Hall (ed.), *Critical essays on Angela Carter.* Hoboken NJ: Prentice Hall International, 83–95.

Bülgözdi, Imola. 2016. "Can the Discworld be disciplined?" [Review of *Discworld and the disciplines: Critical approaches to the Terry Pratchett works. Critical explorations in science fiction and fantasy 45*, by A. H. Alton & W. C. Spruiell]. *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies (HJEAS)*, *22,* 2: 469–472. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26894840

Bulgakov, Mikhail, and Avril Pyman. 1990 [1925]. *The heart of a dog and other stories*. Moscov: Raduga.

Butler, Andrew M. 2003. "Thirteen ways of looking at the British boom", *Science Fiction Studies* 30, 3: 374–93. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4241200.

Butler, Andrew M., Edward James, and Farah Mendlesohn (eds.). 2001. *Terry Pratchett: Guilty of literature*. Reading: Science Fiction Foundation.

Butler, Andrew M. 2001. "Theories of Humour", in: Butler, Andrew M., Edward James, and Farah Mendlesohn (eds.), *Terry Pratchett: Guilty of literature*, Reading: Science Fiction Foundation, 67–88.

Butler, Andrew M. 1996. "Terry Pratchett and the comedic Bildungsroman." *Foundation: The International Review of Science Fiction*, 6: 56–62.

Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. London: Routledge.

Bynum, Caroline Walker. 2001. *Metamorphosis and identity*. New York: Zone Books.

Bynum, Caroline Walker. 1999. "Shape and story: Metamorphosis in the Western tradition (1999 Jefferson Lecture)", *Jefferson lectures at the National*

Endowment for the Humanities. https://www.neh.gov/news/press-release/1999-03-22 (date of access: 5 May 2022).

Bynum, Caroline Walker. 1998. “Metamorphosis, or Gerald and the Werewolf”, *Speculum*, *73*(4): 987–1013. https://doi.org/10.2307/2887366

Cabell, James Branch. 1969 [1932]. *The silver stallion: A comedy of redemption*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Carter, Angela. 1995. *Burning your boats : The collected short stories*. New York: H. Holt and Co.

Carter, Angela. 1993. *The bloody chamber and other stories*. London: Penguin Books.

Chan, William F. N., Cécile Gurnot, Thomas J. Montine, Joshua A. Sonnen, Katherine A. Guthrie, and J. Lee Nelson. 2012. “Male Microchimerism in the Human Female Brain”, *PLoS ONE*, 7(9): e45592. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0045592

Chiang, Hsiao-chen. 2004. The trope of an upside-down world: Carnival and menippean satire in Richard Brome’s *The Antipodes*”, *Concentric: Literary and Cultural Studies* 30.2: 55-72.

Cixous, Hélène. 1976 [1975]. “The laugh of the Medusa”, (translated by Keith Cohen and Paula Cohen), *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 1(4): July 1976, 875–93.

Clark, Stephen R. L. 2004. “Progress and the argument from evil”, *Religious Studies* 40(2): 181–92. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20008520.

Clarke, Bruce, and Manuela Rossini (eds.). *The Routledge Companion to Literature and Science*. London: Routledge, 2012.

Clemons, Amy Lea. 2017. “Adapting *Revelation*: *Good Omens* as comic corrective”, *Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts* 28 (1 (98)): 86–101. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26390195.

Clute, John. 2001. “Coming of age”, in: Butler, Andrew M., Edward James, and Farah Mendlesohn (eds.), *Terry Pratchett: Guilty of literature*, Reading: Science Fiction Foundation, 15–30.

Cottingham, John, Robert Stoothoff, and Dugald Murdoch (eds). 1984. *The philosophical writings of Descartes, vol 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Creed, Barbara. 1993. *The monstrous-feminine: Film, feminism, psychoanalysis*. London: Routledge.

Croft, Janet Brennan. 2015. "In Memoriam: Terry Pratchett in 'Mythlore'", *Mythlore*, *33*(2 (126)): 155–155. http://www.jstor.org/stable/26815996

Croft, Janet Brennan. 2008. "Nice, good, or right: Faces of the wise woman in Terry Pratchett's "Witches" novels", *Mythlore*, *26*(3/4 (101/102)): 151–164. http://www.jstor.org/stable/26814590

Croft, Janet Brennan. 2009. "The education of a witch: Tiffany Aching, Hermione Granger, and gendered magic in Discworld and Potterworld", *Mythlore*, *27*(3/4 (105/106)): 129–142. http://www.jstor.org/stable/26815565

Darwin, Charles. 1981 [1871]. *The descent of man, and selection in relation to sex*. (Introduction and edition by John Tyler Bonner and Robert M. May.) Princeton NJ, Princeton University Press.

Dawkins, Richard. 2006. *The blind watchmaker*. London: Penguin Books.

Deleuze, Gilles. 2004 [1981]. *Francis Bacon: The logic of sensation*. London: Continuum.

Deleuze, Gilles. 2013 [1962]. *Nietzsche and philosophy*. (Translated by Hugh Tomlison.) New York NY: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. 1987 [1980]. *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia.* (Translated and edited by Brian Massumi.) Menneapolis MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, Gilles. 1994 [1968]. *Difference and repetition*. (Translated by Paul Patton.) New York: Columbia University Press.

Duerr, Hans Peter, and Felicitas D. Goodman. 1985. *Dreamtime: Concerning the boundary between wilderness and civilization*. London: B. Blackwell.

Dunn, Susan E. 1998. "The place that writes: Locating Hélène Cixous in feminist theory", *Stanford Presidential Lectures and Symposia in the Humanities and Arts.* (https://prelectur.stanford.edu/lecturers/cixous/dunn.html) (date of access 13 Jan. 2020).

Eagleton, Terry. 1981. *Walter Benjamin or towards a revolutionary criticism*. London: Verso.

Ehrstine, Glenn. 2000. “Of peasants, women, and bears: Political agency and the demise of carnival transgression in Bernese reformation drama”, *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, *31*(3): 675–697. https://doi.org/10.2307/2671076

Ehrenreich, Barbara, and Deirdre English. 1973. *Witches, midwives, and nurses : A history of woman healers*. New York, NY: The Feminist Press, 1973.

Erdinast-Vulcan, Daphna. 2013. *Between philosophy and literature : Bakhtin and the question of the subject*. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.

Eubanks, A.R. 2003. [Review of *Aspects of metamorphosis: Fictional representations of the becoming human*]. *The Comparatist* 27: 177-179.

Ford, Paul F. 2005. *Pocket companion to Narnia : A guide to the magical world of C.S. Lewis*. New York NY: HarperCollins.

Foster, Michael Dylan, and Kijin Shinonome. 2015. *The book of Yokai : Mysterious creatures of Japanese folklore*. Oakland CA: University of California Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1978 [1976]. *The history of sexuality. Vol. 1. An introduction*. (Translated by Robert Hurley.) New York: Pantheon Books.

Franz, Marie-Luise von. 1996. *The interpretation of fairy tales. Revised edition*. Boston MA: Shambhala Publications.

Freud, Sigmund. 1973 [1916]. *Introductory lectures on psychoanalysis*. (Translated by James Strachey.) London: Penguin Books.

Freud, Sigmund. 1955 [1919]. “The Uncanny”, in: *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud*. Vol. 17: An infantile neurosis and other works. (Translated and edited by James Strachey.) London: Hogarth Press.

Friedman, Ron J., et al. 2003. *Brother Bear*. Walt Disney Home Entertainment: Distributed by Buena Vista Home Entertainment.

Frost, Brian J. 2003. *The essential guide to werewolf literature*. Madison WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Gaiman, Neil. 2015. “Introduction”, in: Terry Pratchett, *A slip of the keyboard*. London: Transworld, i-xxv.

Gaiman, Neil. 2013. *Smoke and mirrors : Short fictions and illusions*. London: Headline Publishing.

Gardner, Colin. 2014. [Review of *History and becoming: Deleuze's philosophy of creativity*, by C. Lundy]. *Deleuze Studies*, *8*(4): 569–578. http://www.jstor.org/stable/45331733

Gendron, Sarah. 2008. *Repetition, difference, and knowledge in the work of Samuel Beckett, Jacques Derrida, and Gilles Deleuze*. (Edited by Hans H. Rudnick.) Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang Publishing.

George, A. R (ed.). 2000. *The Epic of Gilgamesh : The Babylonian epic poem and other texts in Akkadian and Sumerian; Translated and with an introduction by Andrew George.* London: Penguin Books.

Gilbert, Sandra M., and Susan Gubar. 1979. *The madwoman in the attic : The woman writer and the nineteenth-century literary imagination*. New Haven CT: Yale University Press.

Gluck, Ben, et al. 2006. *Brother Bear 2*. Walt Disney Home Entertainment: Distributed by Buena Vista Home Entertainment.

Granger, Byrd Howell. 1961. "Naming: In customs, beliefs, and folk tales." *Western Folklore.,* 20.1: 27–37. https://doi.org/10.2307/1496513.

Grimes, Katherine M. 2002. "Harry Potter: Fairy tale prince, real boy, and archetypal hero", in: Lana A. Whited (ed.), *The ivory tower and Harry Potter: Perspectives on a literary phenomenon*, Columbia MI: University of Missouri Press, 89–122.

Haberkorn, Gideon. 2007. "Cultural palimpsests: Terry Pratchett's New Fantasy heroes", *Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts*, *18*(3 (71)): 319–339. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24351006

Harkness, Deborah E. 2011. *A discovery of witches*. New York: Viking.

Harrison, Jen. 2018. "Posthuman power: The magic of hybridity in the Harry Potter series", *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*, 43(3):, 2018: 325–43. doi:10.1353/chq.2018.0037.

Heaney, Seamus, and John D. Niles (eds.). 2008. *Beowulf : An illustrated edition*. (Translated by Seamus Heaney.) New York: Norton and Company.

Heiner, Heidi Anne. 2010. *The frog prince and other frog tales from around the world : Fairy tales, fables and folklore about frogs*. San Bernardino CA: SurLaLune Press.

Hennelly, Mark M. 1993. "Carnivalesque 'unlawful games' in "The old curiosity shop'", *Dickens Studies Annual*, *22:* 67–120. http://www.jstor.org/stable/44371839

Hillman, David, and Ulrika Maude. 2015. *The Cambridge Companion to the Body in Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hunt, Peter, and Millicent Lenz. 2005. *Alternative worlds in fantasy fiction*. London: Continuum.

Jackson, Rosemary. 1981. *Fantasy: The literature of subversion*. London: Methuen.

James, Edward. 2001. "The city watch", in: Butler, Andrew M., Edward James, and Farah Mendlesohn (eds.), *Terry Pratchett: Guilty of literature*, Reading: Science Fiction Foundation, 194–216.

Johnson, Claudia Durst, and Vernon E. Johnson. 2003 *Understanding the Odyssey: A student casebook to issues, sources, and historic documents*. Westport CT: Greenwood Press.

Jones, Diana Wynne. 2008. *Howl's moving castle*. New York: Harper's Collins Children's Books.

Jung, C. G. 1980. *The Archetypes and the collective unconscious*. (Translated by R.F.C. Hull. Edited by Gerhard Adler.) Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Kafka, Franz. 1946. *The great wall of China and other pieces*. (Translated by Willa Muir.) London: Secker and Warburg.

Kidby, Paul and Terry Pratchett. 2004. *The art of Discworld*. New York: Gollancz (HarperCollins).

Klapcsik, Sándor. 2008. "Neil Gaiman's irony, liminal fantasies, and fairy tale adaptations", *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies (HJEAS)* 14(2): 317–34. http://www.jstor.org/stable/41274433.

Knight, Barry. 2017. "The society we want", in: *Rethinking poverty: What Makes a Good Society?*, 1st ed., 55–88. Bristol University Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv43vv1s.9.

Kristeva, Julia. 1982 [1980]. *Powers of horror: An essay on abjection*. (Translated by Leon S. Roudiez.) New York NY: Columbia University Press.

Kristeva, Julia. 1991 [1988]. *Strangers to ourselves*. (Translated by Leon S. Roudiez.) New York NY: Columbia University Press.

Langford, David. 2001. “Introduction”, in: Butler, Andrew M., Edward James, and Farah Mendlesohn (eds.), *Terry Pratchett: Guilty of literature*, Reading: Science Fiction Foundation, 3–14.

Le Guin, Ursula K. 1993. *The Earthsea quartet: A wizard of Earthsea, The tombs of Atuan, The farthest shore, Tehanu.* London: Penguin Group.

Leavy, Barbara Fass.1995. *In search of the swan maiden : A narrative on folklore and gender*. New York University Press.

Leppälahti, Merja, and Clive Tolley. 2018. “From folklore to fantasy: The living dead, metamorphoses, and other strange things”, *Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts*, *29*(2 (102)): 179–200. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26627620

Lewis, Clive Staples. 2019. *The voyage of the Dawn Treader*. New York: HarperCollins.

Lockett, Christopher. 2021. “Death, cruelty and magical humanism in the fiction of Terry Pratchett”, in: Neil Brooks and Sarah Blanchette (eds), *Narrative art and the politics of health*, London: Anthem Press, 193–210. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv22d4tkt.16.

Lundy, Craig. 2012. *History and becoming: Deleuze’s philosophy of creativity*. Edinburgh University Press.

Luthi, Daniel. 2014. “Toying with fantasy: The postmodern playground of Terry Pratchett’s Discworld novels”, *Mythlore*, *33*(1 (125)), 125–142. http://www.jstor.org/stable/26815944

Martin, George R. R. 2011. *A dance with dragons*. New Yorl: Bantam Books.

Marz, Ron. 1994. “Deadly force!” *Green Lantern*, 3(54), DC Comics.

May, Todd. 2011. *Gilles Deleuze : An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McIntosh, Mary. 1991. [Review of *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*, by Judith Butler]. *Feminist Review*, *38:* 113–114. https://doi.org/10.2307/1395391

Mendlesohn, Farah. 2001. “Faith and ethics”, in: Butler, Andrew M., Edward James, and Farah Mendlesohn (eds.), *Terry Pratchett: Guilty of literature*, Reading: Science Fiction Foundation, 239–60.

Miller, Jenna. 2011. "Terry Pratchett's literary tryst with Shakespeare's Macbeth: A postmodernist reading with a humanist guide." *Outstanding Honors Theses.* Tampa FL: University of South Florida..

Miller, Sarah Alison. 2014. *Medieval monstrosity and the female body*. London: Routledge.

Miyazaki, Hayao, et al. 2004. *Howl's moving castle*. Walt Disney Home Entertainment : Distributed by Buena Vista Home Entertainment.

Moss, Betty. 1998. "Desire and the female grotesque in Angela Carter's 'Peter and the Wolf'", *Marvels & Tales: Journal of Fairy-Tale Studies*, 12,1: 175–91.

Mussa, Jumana. "'The mirror crack'd': Representation of characters in Terry Pratchett's *Witches abroad*", *Humaniora: An Online Journal*, 25,1: 13–19.

Natov, Roni. 2002. "Harry Potter and the extraordinariness of the ordinary", in: Lana A. Whited (ed.), *The ivory tower and Harry Potter: Perspectives on a literary phenomenon*, Columbia MI: University of Missouri Press, 125–39.

Newland, Jane. 2020. *Deleuze in children's literature*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Niemoczynski, Leon. 2013. "Nature's transcendental creativity: Deleuze, Corrington, and an aesthetic phenomenology", *American Journal of Theology & Philosophy*, *34*(1): 17–34. https://doi.org/10.5406/amerjtheophil.34.1.0017

Nietzsche, Friedrich, and Walter Kaufmann. 1968. *The will to power*. (Translated by Walter Kaufman and R.J. Hollingdale. Edited by Walter Kaufman.) New York: Random House.

Noone, Kristin 2010. "Shakespeare in Discworld: Witches, fantasy, and desire", *Journal of the fantastic in the arts*, *21*(1 (78)), 26–40. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24352335

Orgelfinger, Gail. 2009. "J. K. Rowling's Medieval bestiary", in: Karl Fugelso and D.S. Brewer (eds), *Defining Medievalism(s)*, (Studies in Medievalism XVII), London: Boydel and Brewer, 141–60.

Ortner, Sherry B. 1972. "Is female to male as Nature is to culture?", *Feminist Studies* 1(2): 5–31, doi:10.2307/3177638.

Ottoni, Claudio, et al. 2017. "The palaeogenetics of cat dispersal in the ancient world", *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 1,7: 139, doi:10.1038/s41559-017-0139.

Ovid. 1955. *Metamorphoses*. (Edited by Rolfe Humphries.) Bloomington IN: Indiana University Press.

Oziewicz, Marek, and Daniel Hade. 2010. “The marriage of heaven and hell? Philip Pullman, C.S. Lewis, and the fantasy tradition”, *Mythlore*, *28*(3/4 (109/110)): 39–54. http://www.jstor.org/stable/26814910

Parr, Adrian. 2010. *The Deleuze dictionary: 2nd revised edition*. Edinburgh University Press.

Patin, Thomas., and Jennifer. McLerran. 1997. *Artwords : A glossary of contemporary art theory*. Westport CT: Greenwood Press, 1997.

Plato. 1989. *Symposium of Plato*. (Edited and translated by Tom Griffith.) Berkeley CA: University of California Press.

Pratchett, Terry. 1991. *Witches abroad*. New York: Gollancz.

Pratchett, Terry. 1992. *Lords and ladies*. New York: Gollancz.

Pratchett, Terry. 1998 [1997]. *Jingo*. London: Corgi Books.

Pratchett, Terry. 1997 [1989]. *Guards! Guards!* London: Corgi Books.

Pratchett, Terry. 2000. “Imaginary worlds, real stories”, *Folklore,* 111,2: 159–68.

Pratchett, Terry. 2002 . *Night watch*. New York: HarperCollins.

Pratchett, Terry. 2005 [2004]. *A hat full of sky*. New York: HarperTrophy.

Pratchett, Terry. 2008 [1995]. *Maskerade*. New York: Harper.

Pratchett, Terry. 2008 [1998]. *Carpe jugulum*. New York: Harper.

Pratchett, Terry. 2009 [1996]. *Hogfather*. New York: HarperCollins.

Pratchett, Terry. 2010 [2009]. *Unseen academicals*. London: Corgi Books.

Pratchett, Terry. 2011. *Snuff*. New York: Doubleday.

Pratchett, Terry. 2012 [1989]. *Pyramids*. London: Corgi Books.

Pratchett, Terry. 2012 [1990]. *Moving pictures*. New York: Random House.

Pratchett, Terry. 2013a [1993]. *Men at arms*. New York: HarperTorch: An Imprint of HarperCollinsPublishers.

Pratchett, Terry. 2013b [1991]. *Reaper man*. New York: Harper: An Imprint of HarperCollinsPublishers.

Pratchett, Terry. 2013c [1988]. *Sourcery*. New York: HarperCollins.

Pratchett, Terry. 2013d [1999]. *The fifth elephant*. London: Corgi Books.

Pratchett, Terry. 2013e [1987]. *Equal rites*. New York: Harper.

Pratchett, Terry. 2013f [1996]. *Feet of clay*. London: Corgi Books.

Pratchett, Terry. 2015a [2014]. *A slip of the keyboard*. London: Transworld.

Pratchett, Terry. 2015b. *The shepherd's crown*. London: Random House Children's Publishers UK.

Pratchett, Terry, Ian Stewart, and Jack Cohen. 2013. *The science of Discworld*. New York: Random House.

Pratchett, Terry, Ian Stewart, and Jack S. Cohen. 2013. *The science of Discworld II: The Globe*. London: Ebury.

Pratchett, Terry, and Jacqueline Simpson. 2008. *The folklore of Discworld: Legends, myths and customs from the Discworld with helpful hints from planet Earth*. New York: Doubleday.

Pratchett, Terry, and Stephen Briggs. 2015. *Turtle Recall : The Discworld Companion ... so Far*. London: Orion Publishing.

Pratchett, Terry, and Gray Jolliffe. 2002. *The unadulterated cat: A campaign for real cats*. London: Orion Publishing.

Priest, Christopher. 2015. "Sir Terry Pratchett obituary", *The Guardian* 12 March. https://www.theguardian.com/books/2015/mar/12/terry-pratchett (date of access: 23 March 2020).

Priest, Christopher. 2022. "Terry Pratchett: A middlebrow cult" (A review of Rob Wilkins's biography of Terry Pratchett), *The Times Literary Supplement*, 28 October. https://www.the-tls.co.uk/articles/terry-pratchett-rob-wilkins-book-review-christopher-priest/ (date of access: 1 Sept. 2019).

Remus Lupin | Wizarding World. 2002. https://www.wizardingworld.com/writing-by-jk-rowling/remus-lupin. Date of access 5 Apr. 2022.

Robinson, Sally. 1998. "The anti-hero as Oedipus: Gender and the postmodern narrative", Lindsey Tucker and G.K. Hall (eds), *Critical essays on Angela Carter*, New York: Prentice Hall International, 159–75.

Röhrich, Lutz, and Peter Tokofsky. 1991. *Folktales and reality*. Bloomington IN: Indiana University Press.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. 1999 [1762]. *Discourse on political economy and the social contract*. (Translated, annotated and edited by Christopher Betts.) Oxford University Press.

Rowling, J. K. 1997. *Harry Potter and the philosopher's stone*. London: Bloomsbury.

Rowling, J. K. 2000. *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire*. London: Bloomsbury.

Rowling, J. K. 2001. *Harry Potter and the prisoner of Azkaban*. New York: Scholastic Publishers.

Rowling, J. K. 2001. *Fantastic beasts and where to find them*. New York: Scholastic/Obscurus.

Rowling, J. K. 2004. *Harry Potter and the order of the Phoenix*. New York: Scholastic Publishers.

Rowling, J. K. 2007. *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*. London: Arthur A. Levine Books.

Rushdie, Salman. 1995. "Introduction", in: Angela Carter, *Burning your boats: The collected short stories,* New York: H. Holt and Co., ii-vi.

Russo, Mary. 1995. *The female grotesque: Risk, excess and modernity*. London: Routledge.

Said, Edward W. 1979 [1978]. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Salisbury, Eve. 2014. "'Lybeaus Desconus': Transformation, Adaptation, and the Monstrous-Feminine", *Arthuriana*, *24*,1: 66–85. http://www.jstor.org/stable/44698307

Salisbury, Joyce E. 1994. *The beast within: Animals in the Middle Ages*. London: Routledge.

Sandner, David. 2006. *Fantastic literature: A critical reader*. Westport CT: Praeger Publishers.

Sapkowski, Andrzej. 2008 [1993]. *The last wish*. (Translated by Danusia Stok.) New York: Gollancz.

Sawyer, Anady. 2000. Narrativium and lies-to-children: 'Palatable instruction' in 'The science of Discworld'", *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies (HJEAS)*, *6*(1), 155–178. http://www.jstor.org/stable/41274079

Sax, Boria. 1993. *The serpent and the swan : The animal bride in folklore and literature*. Newark OH: McDonald & Woodward.

Sayer, Karen. 2001. "The witches", in: Andrew M. Butler, Edward James, and Farah Mendlesohn (eds.), *Terry Pratchett: Guilty of literature*, Reading: Science Fiction Foundation, 131–52.

Scribner, Bob. 1978. “Reformation, carnival and the world turned upside-down”, *Social History*, *3*(3): 303–329. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4284821

Scribner, Bob. 1994. “Practical utopias: Pre-modern communism and the Reformation”, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, *36*(4): 743–774. http://www.jstor.org/stable/179171

Shepherd, David (ed.). 1993. *Bakhtin: Carnival and other subjects: Selected papers from the fifth International Bakhtin Conference*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Shohat, Ella, and Robert Stam. 2014. *Unthinking eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the media*. London: Routlege.

Simpson, Jacqueline. 2015. “Sir Terry Pratchett OBE (1948–2015)”, *Folklore*, *126,*2: 232–234. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24774313

Sinclair, Lian. 2015. “Magical genders: The gender(s) of witches in the historical imagination of Terry Pratchett’s Discworld”, *Mythlore, 33*(2 (126)): 5–18. http://www.jstor.org/stable/26815986

Smith, Kevin Paul. 2007. *The postmodern fairytale: Folkloric intertexts in contemporary fiction*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

South, Malcolm (ed.). 1987. *Mythical and fabulous creatures : A source book and research guide*. London: P. Bedrick Books.

Stam, Robert. 1992. *Subversive pleasures - Bakhtin, cultural criticism, and film.* Baltimore MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Stephens, John, and Robyn McCallum. 2013. *Retelling stories, framing culture: Traditional story and metanarratives in children’s literature*. London: Routledge.

Stypczynski, Brent A. 2013. *The modern literary werewolf: A critical study of the mutable motif*. Jefferson NC: McFarland.

Sullivan, J.P (ed.). 1986. *The satyricon; The apocolocyntosis*. (Texts by Petronius and Seneca. Translated and edited by J.P. Sullivan.) London: Penguin Books.

Taggart, James M. 1990. *Enchanted maidens: Gender relations in Spanish folktales of courtship and marriage*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.

Tatar, Maria (ed.). 1999. *The classic fairy tales: Texts, criticism*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Thomas, Melissa. 2003. "Teaching fantasy: Overcoming the stigma of fluff", *The English Journal*, *92*(5), 60–64. https://doi.org/10.2307/3650426

Tolkien, J. R. R. 1995 [1937]. *The hobbit; or There and back again*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Tucker, Lindsey and G.K. Hall (eds). 1998. *Critical essays on Angela Carter*. New York: Prentice Hall International.

Vice, Sue. 1997. *Introducing Bakhtin*. Manchester University Press, Distributed exclusively in the USA by St. Martin's Press, http://catalog.hathitrust.org/api/volumes/oclc/36727829.html.

Ward, Renee Michelle. 2010. *Cultural contexts and cultural change: The werewolf in classical, Medieval, and modern texts*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press. Library and Archives Canada/Bibliothèque et Archives Canada.

Warner, Marina. 1999. *From the beast to the blonde: On fairy tales and their tellers*. New York: Noonday Press.

Werner, Wiktor. 2018. "From Andrzej Kmicic to Witcher. Alternative history and historical fantasy in Poland at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries", in: Violetta Julkowska and Wiktor Werner (eds), *Contemporary lives of the past*, Faculty of History, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, 139–63.

White, Allon. 1993. *Carnival, hysteria and writing : Collected essays and autobiography*. London: Clarendon Press.

Wyatt, Jean. 1998. "The violence of gendering: Castration images in Angela Carter's The Magic Toyshop, The Passion of New Eve, and 'Peter and the Wolf'", in: Lindsey Tucker and G.K. Hall (eds), *Critical essays on Angela Carter*, Hoboken NJ: Prentice Hall International, 60–80.

Yates, David, et al. 2019. *Fantastic beasts and where to find them*. Warner Bros Pictures.

Young, Joseph. 2016. "The American Pratchett?: Muck and modality in George R. R. Martin's Song of Ice and Fire", *Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts* 27(2): 290–308. http://www.jstor.org/stable/26321205.

Zipes, Jack. 2009. *Breaking the magic spell: Radical theories of folk and fairy tales*. Lexington KT: University Press of Kentucky.

Zipes, Jack. 1983. *The trials and tribulations of Little Red Riding Hood: Versions of the tale in sociocultural context*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Zipes, Jack. 1999. *When dreams came true : Classical fairy tales and their tradition*. London: Routledge.