ariel: a review of international english literature
Vol. 48 No. 1 Pages 97–122

Rewriting the Female Gothic in the Antipodes: Fiona Kidman's *Mandarin Summer*

Doreen D'Cruz

Abstract: This essay makes a case for Fiona Kidman's inclusion in the international feminist canon and focuses on her contribution to feminist metafiction in her redeployment of the Gothic genre in her second novel, *Mandarin Summer* (1981). In her reinvention of the genre, Kidman departs from the compromises of "victim feminism" that Diane Hoeveler has identified as characterizing the Female Gothic in favour of a tactical feminism that brings about the triumph of female cognitive power. This essay uses the successive contexts invoked by Kidman's particular brand of feminism, the Female Gothic tradition, and *Mandarin Summer*'s textual ancestry in *Jane Eyre* to consider how a female epistemic site emerges through the novel's tactical containment and encircling of patriarchal plots. This is partly enabled by the Janus-eyed vision of its central protagonist, who rejects patriarchy's binary divisions between women, and partly through the protagonist's refusal to be complicit in the symbolic and actual murder of mothers. However, in Kidman's denouement, the rescuing of women comes at a price.

Keywords: Female Gothic, metafiction, tactical feminism, matricide, female madness, (female) sublime

Fiona Kidman's reputation as a major New Zealand novelist of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries is secure, but her place in the international canon, as a woman novelist who has changed "the tradition," in Gayle Greene's understanding of this important shift (1), is less certain. In her 1991 book, *Changing the Story: Feminist Fiction and the Tradition*, Greene studies four transatlantic women writers—

Doris Lessing, Margaret Drabble, Margaret Laurence, and Margaret Atwood—whose ventures into metafiction "challenge the cultural and literary tradition they [have] inherit[ed]" (2). In parentheses, Greene defines metafiction as "fiction that includes within itself commentary on its own narrative conventions" (1). Unsurprisingly, Kidman does not make the cut, nor for that matter does any Antipodean writer. The reasons may be entirely innocent. At the time, Kidman was still establishing herself as a writer; there was, and still is, a poverty of scholarly and critical evaluation of her work; moreover, the global reputation of the transatlantic writers Greene names could not be gainsaid in the 1980s. However, a quarter of a century later, with a prolific output in fiction, poetry, non-fiction, and drama behind her, her national reputation and popularity assured, and numerous honours to her credit, including the title Dame Companion of the New Zealand Order of Merit in 1997 for her services to literature, the time has come for sustained critical attention to Kidman's work, particularly her feminist challenges to traditions of fiction.

Most of Kidman's early oeuvre, from her first novel *A Breed of Women* (1978) to *True Stars* (1990), has performed the typical act of feminist intervention by remaking inherited genres, literary forms, and texts in order to reverse their entrenched sexual politics. In *A Breed of Women* and *Paddy's Puzzle* (1983), she interrogates and subverts the female bildungsroman's traditional investment in the marriage plot; in *Mandarin Summer* (1981), the Female Gothic is her target for revision. In *True Stars*, she develops a curious mutation of the female detective genre to provide a vehicle for political fiction that is critical of the New Right reforms of the 1980s. In *The Book of Secrets* (1987), arguably her most accomplished work, she uses fictional female testimonies to recuperate female genealogies and histories and thus moderates the patriarchal bias of official colonial history. The gendering of colonial historiography through literary strategies also dominates her much later novel, *The Captive Wife* (2005). The unrelenting objective of her literary labours appears to be the refiguration of an androcentric national imaginary to include female ancestries and subjectivities. Notwithstanding genre shifts, Kidman's work often features a vulnerable female protagonist

who evades capture by patriarchal agents through her assertiveness, intelligence, and resilience. This act of self-rescue typically provides the implicit occasion for the self-conscious genesis of her novels, whether through modes of metafictional framing or self-reflexive begetting. In *Mandarin Summer*, the primary subject of this essay, Kidman's reinvention of the Gothic form relies upon Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre* as its proto-text. The narrative is transferred to an Antipodean setting, yet still endowed with the usual machinery that mobilizes the Gothic—persistent victimization, lurking terror, demonic plots, and calculated criminality. In re-harnessing the form, Kidman uses metafictional innovations that take feminism's historic links to the Gothic away from the compromises of "victim feminism" that Diane Hoeveler identifies (2). Instead, Kidman deploys the Gothic to expose a tactical battle in which female cognitive power triumphs over patriarchal plots and subsumes them.

Although feminism infuses Kidman's fiction to a remarkable degree, its intersection with racism is a subordinate consideration. This is demonstrated in her work's critique of the disparity in the remedies to sexism and racism that compensatory politics have yielded to women and Māori respectively. From her first novel onward, Kidman's fiction has gradually enlarged its scrutiny of the problematic territory that links women and racial others in the context of white patriarchal dominance. In her initial attempts at representing feminism's encounter with racism, she depends on female characters who, having been conditioned by white feminist sympathies, take a competitive rather than an allied approach in the face of the joint victimhood suffered by women and people of colour. In *A Breed of Women*, Harriet at the dawn of the 1960s contemplates the dissolution of her marriage with her first husband Denny, a Māori, noting that "nobody, nobody at all ever saw them as anything but a Maori and a pakeha" (Kidman, *Breed* 171).[1] The popular judgement of their break-up faults Harriet for having "rejected a Maori" (171), while Denny's infidelities go unexamined. The moral compensations for racial oppression outweigh those accorded to women for gender oppression, leading Harriet to the bitter conviction "that in the scale of oppression, it would be women whose claims were the largest, and who were the last to be

considered" (172). In Kidman's third novel, *Paddy's Puzzle*, compromise overrules competition: the love between a white woman, Clara Bentley, and a black man, Ambrose, dislodges the possible racist and sexist strife that could exist between them. However, it is in the intervening novel, *Mandarin Summer*, that Kidman first achieves a compromise between racial and gender politics. Nevertheless, she does not seem to abandon the position enlisted through Harriet's view that the oppression of women occurs on a scale greater than that of racial oppression. In effect, feminization of the Other comes to typify the treatment of the Jew in the novel's depiction of the particular brand of nascent anti-Semitism spawned by new settler colonialism in New Zealand in the aftermath of World War II. Kidman's suggestion that the oppression of women is more fundamental than other oppressions, which are but facsimiles of the treatment meted out to women, thus also selects the feminine as the most fundamental version of the Other. To this extent, Kidman's position invites comparison with Emmanuel Levinas' conception of the "absolutely other" as "the *feminine*" (48; emphasis in original).

In "Time and the Other," Levinas argues that the Other is understood as such "not because of the Other's character, or physiognomy, or psychology, but because of the Other's very alterity" (48). He exemplifies thus his perception of the Other: "The Other is, for example, the weak, the poor, 'the widow and the orphan', whereas I am the rich or the powerful" (48). Levinas asks: "Does a situation exist where the alterity of the other appears in its purity?" and answers his own question by stating that "the absolutely contrary contrary, . . . the contrariety that permits its terms to remain absolutely other, is the *feminine*" (48; emphasis in original). He substantiates this observation with the contention that "[s]ex is not some specific difference. It is situated beside the logical division into genera and species" (48). The alterity of the feminine defies reconstitution into a whole, because sexual division represents neither the potential convertibility of a contradiction, nor the "duality of two complementary terms," which "presuppose[s] a preexisting whole" (49). Hence, for Levinas the feminine is a "mystery," "a mode of being that consists in slipping away from the light" (49) and can be encountered only through "Eros" and not through the exercise of power (50–51).

Indisputably, he can ascribe this absolute alterity to the feminine only through a tacit acceptance that the knowing, theorizing subject is masculine. This demonstrates Simone de Beauvoir's charge that Levinas has slipped from an intention "to be objective" to "an assertion of masculine privilege" (de Beauvoir 16, n. 1). Cast thus by masculine privilege as the unspeaking, mysterious Other of erotic contemplation, the feminine for Levinas serves as the pure figure of the inaccessibly veiled, fundamental alterity that the Other represents (49). Yet it may also be argued in response that, as the prototype of the Other, the feminine becomes the exceptional recipient of the marks of oppression when power overcomes eros or is indifferent to it.

Kidman approaches the issue of feminine Otherness from a standpoint that is diametrically opposed to that of Levinas. By seeking to recover a feminine subject position, she necessarily rejects the veiled mystification that supposedly shrouds women; secondly, the Othering of the feminine in her depictions is the inevitable product of prevailing masculine projects for achieving female subjection. Thus for her the feminine gender's alterity is totally discrepant with the Levinasian version of it as arising from an encounter with an "unknowable," hidden, and ungraspable "alienation" borne by it (Levinas 49–50). On the contrary, in Kidman's works, women's radical Otherness is attributable to their visible place as victims on a scale of oppression that arguably exceeds most forms of social tyranny. Hence, women in her novels fluctuate between being victims of male hostility, their subjectivity and autonomy threatened, and being the perceiving subjects who, having survived the projects intended to Other them, penetrate layers of social inequality to discover and challenge the foundational misogyny that serves as the archetype for all forms of oppression.

Levinas' perspective on the feminine has its roots in a philosophical postulate about the utter and total unknowability of the Other, which calls for a responsiveness to the Other that is divested of all ambitions for power—a difficult project, as demonstrated by his own slippages. Kidman's interpretation of women's place is formed by a historical understanding of how power operates through the naming and isolation of the Other, who at her base is female. Despite a similarity in their

understandings of the original source of Othering as allied to femininity, Levinas' masculinist philosophical idealism and Kidman's feminist response to history differentiate their responses to the feminine.

Just as the feminine is viewed as the archetypal source of the Other, misogynist signifiers, as Kidman seems to suggest in *Mandarin Summer*, complete the task of racist degradation. Consequently, inherited practices of gendered and racial Othering cannot be fully and logically interrogated and jettisoned without the recovery of female agency. This justifies Kidman's reinvention of the Gothic, the detective genre, and other literary modes in order to recuperate female subjectivity. The cognitive power and naming agency that issue from such recuperation also disestablish patriarchal monopoly over the position from which the erstwhile Others have been viewed.

Any interpretation of Kidman's contribution to reframing the Gothic genre has to be situated within an understanding of how the Gothic has traditionally been harnessed for feminist ends. Most studies linking women and the Gothic trace their critical genealogy to Ellen Moers' chapter on the "Female Gothic" in her *Literary Women* (Smith 8; Hoeveler xiv; Heiland 57–58; Milbank 121). Moers identifies the defining characteristic of the Gothic as entailing the "auctorial intent . . . to scare" (90). Far from seeking "to reach down into the depths of the soul and purge it with pity and terror" in the way of tragedy, the Gothic reaches into the body; it incites and solicits the "physiological reactions" prompted by fear (Moers 90). She observes that "the first Gothic novelists" were dubbed "Terrorist[s]" (99) and that "perversities" and "monstrosities" comprised the special effects through which Gothic terror was realised (100–01). Moers contends that one of the directions of the Female Gothic was set early on by Ann Radcliffe's novels, in which "the central figure is a young woman who is simultaneously persecuted victim and courageous heroine" (91). A similar understanding of the Female Gothic tradition features in Alison Milbank's commentary, which identifies the heroine as the victim of the "authoritative reach [of a] patriarch, abbot or despot" who "usurps the great house, and threatens death or rape" (121). By all accounts, the gendered vulnerability of the female protagonist is fundamental to the unfolding of

the Female Gothic narrative. Andrew Smith and Diana Wallace reflect this in their claim that "a body of critical work" has emerged that stems from "Moers' analysis of Female Gothic texts as a coded expression of women's fears of entrapment within the domestic and within the female body" (1). However, they question whether the Female Gothic is "a separate literary genre" rather than "an umbrella term" that encompasses a number of variations such as "'women's Gothic', 'feminine Gothic', 'lesbian Gothic', even 'Gothic feminism'" (1). I use the term "Female Gothic" in Smith and Wallace's inclusive sense.

In *Gothic Feminism* (1998), Hoeveler re-envisions the Gothic heroine's manipulation of her femininity in her struggles as a kind of feminist performativity. The typical scenario has the Gothic heroine triumph over her persecutors and adversaries, the members of an evil patriarchy, regaining her disputed fortune in the process (Hoeveler 6–7). The Female Gothic thus becomes a stage for enacting modes of female resistance against the villainy of patriarchal power, which in turn leads to alternative models of family that diminish the extremes of gender inequality (6–7). Hoeveler argues that a "'wise passiveness,'" which she interprets as "a form of passive-aggression," was the strategy recommended by "Radcliffe and her followers" for the Gothic heroine's encounter with her adversaries, thus allowing her a victory that was moral as well as material (7).

Hoeveler names this particular mode of operation "victim feminism" (7), which she subsequently rebrands "gothic feminism." She claims that its psychological source lies in women's realization that the outer threats they face are paralleled by vulnerabilities and uncertainties they have absorbed because of their gender: "What I am calling 'gothic feminism' was born when women realised that they had a formidable external enemy—the raving, lustful, greedy patriarch—in addition to their own worst internal enemy, their consciousness of their own sexual difference perceived as a weakness rather than a strength" (10). This consciousness of feminine weakness meets patriarchal brutality, Hoeveler argues, through "a highly codified form of conduct" in which the protagonist uses her femininity as a "masquerade" for taming her adversaries (11), whose wrath she may have tempted through her active curiosity

(13). Thus an ostensibly passive demeanour "as an innocent and suffering victim" supplements and shelters her aggressive ventures (14). For Hoeveler, the Female Gothic performs the function of a "group fantasy" for the culture it appeals to: "[I]t convinces [women] that their safely proscribed rebellion will result in an improved home for both their mothers and themselves[,] . . . all the while justifying their acts . . . by positioning themselves as innocent victims" (10).

Hoeveler's reading extends the domestication of the gender battles that Maggie Kilgour had identified in the Female Gothic in her earlier 1995 study. Kilgour had seen the purpose of the Female Gothic as "an exposé of domesticity and the family" aided by the Gothic's capacity for defamiliarization: "[B]y cloaking familiar images of domesticity in gothic forms, it enables us to see that the home *is* a prison" (9; emphasis in original). Kilgour's observation points implicitly to the conditions that necessitate group fantasies of successful female rebellion. She suggests, not unlike Hoeveler, that the Female Gothic's ultimate objective is the restoration of the social order after having eliminated the demonic forces ranged against the victim (37–38).

Melina Moore's recent criticism, however, steps back from the notion that the conflictual domestic drama of the Female Gothic shapes its feminism and uses Mary Shelley's *Matilda* to consider the genre as a vehicle for a feminism expressed through the authorship assumed by the female protagonist.[2] Moore acknowledges Hoeveler's location of *Matilda* within the "female gothic tradition" (Moore 208). Indeed, Hoeveler reads the incestuous narrative of *Matilda* in terms of the Gothic victimization of women. She writes: "[T]he father produces his progeny only to consume it, feeding on his daughter as a vampire feeds on victims in order to sustain a perverse form of death-in-life" (Hoeveler 182). However, the violence that Hoeveler attributes to the father—also described as "a ravening, lustful, perverse presence" (181)—overstates the involuntary nature of the incestuous fantasy that consumes the father as well as the daughter, who regards him as "the only being I was doomed to love" (Shelley 67). Moore observes that the female narrator is able to "wield her pen" and find her voice "only in isolation" (209), following her father's suicide and the withdrawal of her male poet

friend. Moore cites various "recent feminist re-readings" (208) to suggest that the heroine achieves empowerment and agency through her "ability to tell her own story" (209) and "finally perform her own subjectivity" (209). This claim modifies victim feminism's manipulation of weakness as a defensive ploy by reframing it within a project for "female narrative autonomy" (Moore 214). The manifest reclamation of female subjectivity through writing thus functions as a self-reflexive rebuttal to the victimhood depicted in the narration. Through her authorial agency, Shelley's female writer-protagonist, in a pre-Freudian move that anticipates some of Luce Irigaray's post-Freudian criticism,[3] stakes out important epistemic ground about the Oedipal fantasy that structures female desire. She identifies the father as the seducer who is responsible for the perpetration of this fantasy, which is foundational to the victimhood and self-imposed exile that she portrays. The authorial agency wrested out of her predicament lights the way for similar reworkings of the genre in which female authorship retroactively neutralizes victimhood, as it does in Kidman's novel.

Nevertheless, Kidman's reinvention of the Female Gothic in *Mandarin Summer* owes less to Radcliffe or Shelley and more to *Jane Eyre* as a textual antecedent, which is reflected in the novel's reiteration of symbols such as the incarcerated "madwoman" and the final conflagration that consumes the manor house. By transferring the setting to a blazing yet verdant summer in New Zealand's Northland in the later 1940s, Kidman reworks the aesthetics of the Gothic. The "ruins, castles [and] monasteries" (Smith 4) of the traditional Gothic give way to the colonial abode whose hidden recesses serve as the synecdoche for insidious plots spun out of troubling secrets. Replete with the villainous patriarch, disguised by a commanding urbaneness that sometimes betrays his lurking corruption, the novel summons *Jane Eyre* as a literary ghost in order to refigure the meaning of female madness, confirm the villainy of the master of the house without the obfuscations cast by romance, and uncover the true target of the patriarchal plot as the denial of female access to an independent, questing subjectivity.

Kidman's novel thus belongs within a literary tradition of "self-conscious critical rewriting," to use Smith's apt phrase (8). He observes this

to be a feature of the Female Gothic in the twentieth century and selects for mention the writings of Shirley Jackson, Angela Carter, and Toni Morrison. He argues that the rewritings of the Gothic form, far from embodying mere replications of previous "cultural debates," engage in "rework[ing], develop[ing], and challeng[ing] them" (Smith 8). *Mandarin Summer* participates in the twentieth-century mutation of the Gothic by taking its place within the textual genealogy engendered by *Jane Eyre* through a return to the examination of the intersections between sexual and racial politics upon which Brontë's novel is founded. Margaret Rubik and Elke Mettinger Schartmann write that "few literary works have proved their capacity to act as sources of literary inspiration, to be constantly re-assembled, re-contextualised, re-imagined, re-written, so exuberantly as *Jane Eyre*" (11). They do not include *Mandarin Summer* among *Jane Eyre*'s vast progeny, but neither have studies of the New Zealand Gothic given it much extended attention, with the exception of Jenny Lawn's essay "Domesticating the Settler Gothic in New Zealand Literature." Lawn also gives the novel a passing glance in "Warping the Familiar," the introductory essay to her co-edited collection *Gothic NZ*. It rates a cursory mention in Alison Rudd's study of the New Zealand Gothic (204, n. 2), but this is merely an acknowledgement of an article by Lawn in which *Mandarin Summer* is cited. It is entirely overlooked by Ian Conrich in his critical survey "New Zealand Gothic," which is rather surprising since his approach to the "different forms of the Gothic . . . through variations in space and place" should have permitted its inclusion (394).

Kidman remakes *Jane Eyre* for the Antipodes as Jean Rhys had done for the Caribbean in *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1966), yet also harnesses the postmodern tendency toward metafictional narration. Both of these narrative migrations of *Jane Eyre* to postcolonial locations interrogate political and cultural capitulations to imperialism and/or patriarchy in the original text. An important facet of their geographical migration involves the part played by the postcolonial location in the cultural interrogation that is taking place. However, given the differences in their temporal contexts and their constructions of "colonialism," the term "postcolonial" may carry different nuances for these texts. *Wide*

Sargasso Sea's portrayal of the strategies and ethics of colonial acquisition through the commodification of black and female bodies as well as of the land, along with its exposure of the anxieties that motivate colonial lust, help to position the text securely within the dominant postcolonial paradigm of "writing back" to the imperial centre. On the other hand, Kidman's novel dispenses with the historical weight of colonialism and relies instead on a fictional neo-colonialism whose perpetrators and victims alike are European settlers differentiated by wealth, class, influence, and tenure of settlement. Paradoxically, the victims are the older settlers. The excision of historical colonialism does not necessarily amount to the disavowal of the original colonial violence against Māori, as Lawn argues ("Domesticating" 52; "Warping the Familiar" 17), as much as it allows for a recognition of colonialism's mutating recurrence in substitute guises. However, the novel's chronological and contextual shifts mean it does not interrogate historical imperialism.

Mandarin Summer and the Reinvention of Gothic Feminism

Mandarin Summer's prologue contains the defining metaphor for its composition: the piecing together of a puzzle. The pieces are from events that occurred when narrator Emily Freeman was a twelve-year-old resident of Brigadier Frederick Barnsley's property along with her parents, who were his gardener and cook. The mature Emily Freeman's authorial task of assembling the collective narrative of her family's experiences from their time at Carlyle House during the summer of 1946 is simultaneously a statement about the triumphant survival of female subjectivity over the repressive onslaughts of patriarchy. The pieces of the puzzle that Emily puts together are primarily derived from her own memories, given in the first-person, and (to a lesser extent) those of her mother, provided in the third-person. The point of view of Emily's father, Luke, buried on the morning of the day she embarks on her venture, thirty-five years after leaving Carlyle House, is expected to be subsumed under that of her mother, Constance: "[F]rom this morning it is she who must speak for Luke" (Prologue n. pag.). On the day that Emily commences her writing, Constance provides the final "touches" and "intimate thoughts such as women share," which complete Emily's

knowledge and contribute the galvanising impetus for her authorial debut (Prologue n. pag.). The novel thus epitomises far more than the success of a singular act of female resistance against entrapment within a patriarchal episteme; its distribution of points of view between mother and daughter means that it embodies the evolution of the puzzle-solving process toward a multi-generational female epistemic site. In its simultaneous decoding of the meaning of the neo-Gothic threats identified within Carlyle House and its patriarch, it destabilizes the patriarchal monopoly on knowledge and gains access to the secret plots through which patriarchal power is maintained.

Consequently, *Mandarin Summer*'s metafictional quality rests on the exposure of those features of the novel contributing to its self-begetting from a female cognitive source. The authorial understanding that Emily brings to her narrative is a product of her earlier life: as a young girl, she successfully outwits Frederick Barnsley's attempts to restrict and control the female gaze and, in the process, defeats his plot to murder his wife. The story she tells of her youthful transgressions at Carlyle House, which lead to her penetration of its secrets, provides the origins of her later authorship of the narrative. This self-begetting circularity points self-reflexively to the novel's female and feminist credentials and signals an encompassing vision that extends from her transgressions and eventually subsumes and contains the patriarchal plot. Hence, the novel's metafictional gestures register the fictional recuperation of the feminist subjectivity through which the patriarchal plot is interrogated and disarmed. Encirclement seems to be the inevitable fictional ploy against a monological patriarchal system that sustains itself through a circular logic. In "Cosi Fan Tutti," Irigaray alludes to the circular logic through which patriarchal theory, specifically Lacanian theory, maintains its claim to exclusive authority over language by denying women's existence previous to such a language (88–89). Aware or not of Irigaray's critique, Kidman responds to a similarly seemingly impregnable logical manoeuvre, exercised in the containment of the female subject within a patriarchal plot, by liberating the hidden, transgressive gaze of the female and allowing her to spin her encircling plot around it. Kidman's narrative strategies in this regard resemble the "liberating circles" that Greene

identifies in some contemporary women writers' work (Greene 14). Particularly apposite in this context is Greene's reference to Monique Wittig, who shifts the circle "away from a symbol of women's sexuality to an emblem of women's revolution against men" (Greene 16).

The counter-tactical measures of Kidman's Gothic feminism thus depart from the Gothic's historical investment in "victim feminism" through an activism that uses fiction to encircle, trap, expose, and frustrate patriarchal criminality. Her metafiction is implicated in a battle between competing plots and victory depends on superior tactical knowledge. Despite the novel's post-war setting, it contains reminders of the war through the presence of two survivors of the Jewish Holocaust in the Barnsley household, pianist Elva von Hart and Schwass, her deaf-mute uncle, as well as through the "game of strategies" played by Frederick Barnsley (Kidman, *Mandarin* 49), and the mock inspection of imaginary troops by Colonel Roache, a neighbour (39). Carlyle House becomes a place for certain entrenched cultural victories as well as the continuation of various personal wars to shore up the advantages of those in power. The programmed servitude of both Constance and Schwass, as cook and general factotum, respectively, make legible the lines of privilege and cultural disempowerment. Othered by a culturally enforced or acquired silence, their situations indicate that white patriarchy's victory over women and Jews is assured. In contrast to the woman reduced to drudgery is her antithesis, the idealized female, embodied in Elva, who is precariously elevated as a male trophy but is consequently vulnerable to a withdrawal of preference and relocation to obscurity. Both Barnsley's wife Lilian, who plays up to the role of the incarcerated "mad" wife, and Elva, Barnsley's mistress, understand that a war is still on, yet have succumbed to the "divide and conquer" strategy by which it is conducted and which ensures their enmity (115, 125–26). Elva thinks that, since it is no longer "possible" for Jews to be targets for extermination in the post-Holocaust world, only a little "torture" is reserved for them (125); contrarily, women are the new universal "enemy" (125). Kidman's interpretation of "post" in the post-war period, then, has to be read as involving a misnomer since the novel suggests that war continues on other fronts.

The war against women is compounded by a refiguration of the topos of colonization, which renders the original settlers, represented by the Freemans, as servants of a new settler culture, established by "the China Set" (61), who attempt to replicate an anachronistic feudal aristocracy. The agonistic encounter between the older, recently oppressed settlers and the wealthy and powerful newcomers, who are recast in a formidably reactionary mould, may characterize, as Lawn argues, "a phobic effort to maintain self-innocence" within the older settler psychology through the transference of guilt (Lawn, "Domesticating" 48). In shifting the guilt for tyrannical cultural dominance to a new facsimile of the colonial family, whose anachronism is underlined through the revival of Gothic literary conventions, Kidman exonerates her female protagonist from the legacies of settler guilt. Emily, as narrator, declares her family's complete ideological and historical estrangement from the Barnsleys:

> We might have been the remnants of some bygone age. Yet what age did [the Barnsleys] belong to? They seemed so colourful, so sophisticated, but now, looking back, I can see that they belonged in some even more remote and certainly ill-conceived period of colonial history than anything I might have inherited. (Kidman, *Mandarin* 71)

By unsettling a homogenous paradigm of settler history and identity, a model of unified white privilege is also destabilized and dismantled through the exposure of internal cleavages that culminate in the "war" on women, with the Female Gothic as the vehicle for its representation.

In addition to reducing Emily's parents to servitude, Brigadier Barnsley under his ostensible seigneurial demeanour is also a colonial looter who has amassed a collection of figurines, ornaments, bowls, and vases made of precious and semi-precious stones such as jasper, amethyst, alabaster, and nephrite. Emily declares him to be "a thief[,] . . . not a common thief, a most uncommon one" (42). The appropriative ethic that rules the colonizing mentality manifests itself in his newly settled habitat through his aggressive acquisition of the most fertile land and access to an extraordinary share of the water supply to the detriment of other, more long-settled farmers. Barnsley actually offloads his

unproductive land on the unsuspecting and gullible Luke Freeman in return for all the capital Luke possesses. The novel thus demonstrates that colonialism exploits the politics of class when it serves its purposes more effectively than the politics of race. While the politics of class and race determine the male pecking order that establishes the patriarchal seigneur in his place, his victory is not assured until he achieves mastery over women. The intersection of colonialism and patriarchy is critical to the strategic picture of masculine dominance.

The feminist Gothic offers a narrative space in which the plot against women is unveiled and then subverted, neutralized, or defeated. Emily arrives at Carlyle House, poised on the brink of adolescence. She becomes a target of masculine repression and, because of her transgressions of explicit and implicit boundaries, is the person through whom the politics of patriarchal domination is transmitted. Her first night establishes her Gothic dread of the place, which yields to Emily's giving rein to her exploratory instincts. Her room, with the door closed and "a heavy blind" drawn down over the window, becomes "a black and frightening hole" (15). Looming danger is suggested by her prescience that she "would have to be careful in Carlyle House" (16) and that there are "minetraps waiting to be sprung" (38). Nevertheless, on her first morning she steadfastly strays into prohibited territory despite frightening setbacks. Her transgression is signalled through her consumption of the forbidden fruit, the mandarin, which she does with great urgency and desire during her self-driven reconnaissance of the garden. Her act of wilful curiosity finds its fortuitous object in the strange and furtive behaviour of Dan Cape, Brigadier Barnsley's male servant, who Emily spies in an apparent assignation with someone lurking in the bushes who is wearing mauve and whose identity becomes significant to the plot.

The control of Emily's gaze and curiosity becomes a new objective for Barnsley, who not only imposes restrictions on the extent of her movements on his property but also makes ominous threats against her capacity to see. Noting her discerning appreciation of his Chinese treasures during an escorted tour of his property on the same fateful morning, he observes with cruel disdain that "the Chinese used to poke out the eyes

of people who saw too much" (42). Barnsley's scarcely disguised hostility anticipates the later attempts by an unknown assailant on Emily's life in a chilling replay of Gothic terror. This occurs during a walk in a wooded picnic spot, when she is briefly separated from her mother. In each case, it is the female gaze that is anathema to the enemy.

Equally threatening to Barnsley is the mother-daughter symbiosis. He tries to intercept the bond between Emily and her mother through a pretended preference for Emily, whom he elevates to a place at the breakfast table so that her mother is forced to endure the indignity of waiting on her own daughter. He employs similar divisive tactics that sow hostility between his daughter Becky and his wife. He secretly colludes with Becky, the wearer of the mauve garment, in her taking Dan Cape, the man who had been the recipient of her mother's sexual favours in return for opium, as her lover. By revealing Dan's sexual transactions with her mother to Becky, Barnsley incites, as was to be expected, a jealous, murderous rage in the girl towards her mother. This is the climax of an antipathy that Barnsley had nurtured in Becky by making her party to his callous and scornful treatment of Lilian; it evolves into Becky's becoming a co-conspirator with her father in the planned murder of her mother. If Barnsley's manoeuvres to destroy the mother-daughter bond succeed with his daughter, they most definitely fail with Emily. The novel's ostensible mode of composition through information-sharing is proof of the persistence of the symbiotic and discursive bond between mother and daughter that Barnsley had tried to annihilate.

The other face of the "divide and conquer" tactic practised by Barnsley is provided by the rivalry he instigates between wife and mistress, who live in adjoining quarters in Carlyle House. Lilian's maniacal laughter, incarcerated narcotic state, and wordless communication through wall-tapping are placed in binary opposition to Elva's beauty, sublime music, and evident desirability. Not surprisingly, Lawn argues that Lilian "plays Bertha to Elva von Hart's Jane Eyre" ("Domesticating" 53), except, one may observe, that Jane is not the exotic beauty that Elva is. More seriously, the mere citing of character replicas overlooks their metafictional function in Kidman's rewriting of Brontë's plot, which depends on an exposure of how the plot's pivotal reliance on female rivalry is stage-

managed by a patriarch to serve masculine interests. Hence, the character resemblances argue for the palimpsestic function that Brontë's text performs as it is glimpsed through Kidman's erasures and rewritings.

An important aspect of Kidman's rewriting is its unsettling of the binary opposition between wife and mistress as well as the corresponding shifts in narrative identifications, which are achieved through the text's doubling of the direction of Emily's gaze. Through the Janus-faced perspective that she develops, "look[ing] both ways at once" (Kidman, *Mandarin* 141)—and in a move that is contrary to that of Brontë's narrator Jane Eyre—narrative equity is extended to the competing female protagonists in the Barnsley menagerie. Curious and resourceful, Emily manages to gain entrance into Lilian's room, through having learned the voice code to which she would respond. The conversation that follows between the now frightened Emily, who regrets her temerity and is ready to shy away, and the perceptive, ironically tempered Lilian, who does not allow Emily to withdraw, destabilizes the fiction of the "madwoman" and her silence. The older Emily, in her role as narrator, prefaces her account of her meeting with Lilian with the uncompromising assertion that "Lilian belongs to me" (106). This sense of ownership corresponds to the unlocking of a fictional door in order to provide alternative meanings to "female madness."

Chapters Eight and Thirteen contain the revealing meetings between Emily and Lilian in which the former's entry into the penetralium of "female madness" contributes to its demystification and the decoding of its tactical function. The verbal code that Emily had learned from Schwass for getting Lilian to open her door—"Hoy Morn," which means "open the door" (111)—is the code for admission to opium dens in China and signals Lilian's specific brand of "madness": her opium addiction. Despite Lilian's supposed "madness," Emily's conversation with Lilian establishes the latter as an intelligent interlocutor who has reclaimed and redefined the place of the "mad wife." Unlike Bertha Mason, Lilian is not physically imprisoned by her husband. She has withdrawn to her room in protest against Barnsley for having installed Elva, his mistress, in their house; she intends to use her self-imprisonment as leverage. Insofar as Lilian is involved in a tactical game against

Barnsley, prompted by her desire for him, she intimates her claim to equality with him as a desiring subject.

However, the gender politics of Carlyle House precludes this position for women. Barnsley had married Lilian, a servant in his family's household to whom he was initially indifferent, when her sudden and unexpected inheritance of a fortune turned her into an attractive prospect in his eyes. He thus marks her as a lucrative commodity. However, in withdrawing to her room at this late point in her marriage, Lilian may be seen as rejecting Barnsley's recent view of her as a dispensable commodity and clinging to the remnants of herself as a desiring subject. Yet her addiction renders the gesture ambiguous, as it shifts her between desiring agent and abject commodity. On the one hand, the drug falsely translates her to the "dreamtime" of reciprocated desire and sexual agency (178); on the other hand, it is a substance that degrades her mind and confirms her exile. The fact that her husband is only too eager to cultivate the drug to satisfy her addiction makes him complicit in her degradation and exile, and to that extent he holds the key to her prison and her "madness." But ultimately the origins of Lilian's "madness" lie in herself—in her addiction and in the passion that has prompted it. Her subjective derangement and exile from the speech community, notwithstanding the clarity of her discursive exchanges with Emily, are symptomatic markers of the isolation of "madness." But the source of this "madness" lies in an obsessive passion that is out of bounds; her passion for Barnsley is of this nature and transforms her tactical gestures of agency into self-defeating acts. From this perspective, "madness" is the price women pay for their abject, disproportionate self-surrender to unreciprocated love. However, there is no inevitability to this abjection, as suggested by the strange, temporary emergence of Lilian's sane alter ego who announces her ability to "stop" her addiction at "any time" (178).

In contrast to Lilian, who attempts to shift the transactional economy of patriarchy based on female commodification, Elva in many respects seems to conform to it. In return for sanctuary for herself and Schwass, Elva becomes Barnsley's mistress. But through her reputation as a concert pianist, brilliant playing of the piano, and fidelity to her genius,

she removes herself from entrapment by Barnsley. Her music creates a sublime, sacrosanct space outside of Barnsley's reach, even while it elevates her in his eyes to a trophy worth having. Emily calls this music "soul music" and says that it makes her want "to lift [her] arms and soar" (20). In this expansion and exaltation of her being in response to Elva's music, Emily experiences a characteristic feature of the encounter with the sublime: the achievement of human transcendence.

Running contrary to this notion of the sublime is the Burkean idea of the sublime as having its "source" in "terror" and "excit[ing] the ideas of pain, and danger" (Burke 36). Smith, explaining Burke's idea of the sublime, observes that behind it lies the idea of "an Old Testament God of punishment and damnation" before whom "the subject is diminished" (11). According to Smith, the Gothic's use of terror as an imaginary effect responds to the Burkean notion of sublimity without necessarily copying it (12). In the context of Kidman's rewriting of the Gothic in *Mandarin Summer*, terror of extreme magnitude lurks in the background in the genocide and dehumanizing atrocities of the Holocaust from which Elva and Schwass are recent refugees. In the more benign setting of post-war Northland, an authoritarian power of lesser magnitude continues to exert its force through the terrorizing tactics used by patriarchy for establishing and policing its boundaries, and in the casual "relish" with which the patriarch Barnsley rehearses the "atrocities committed against Jews" (Kidman, *Mandarin* 70). However, Elva's music, with its genesis in and appeal to a sublimity reached through human transcendence and its communication of "moments of grace" (20), functions as a subversive, aspirational force that unsettles the alternative form of sublimity whose sources are power and terror.[4]

Emily's ascent through Elva's music to transcendent, boundless elation may have some affinities with the Kantian idea of the sublime. Christine Battersby describes the cause and reach of the Kantian sublime:

> [T]he cause of the sublime is the empirical object, but the response is not just to the object but to the thought of a higher order—the supersensible. . . . The Kantian sublime is bound up with 'awe', and with our response to the infinite or to the

> indefinitely great: to that which our senses cannot measure, manage or contain without a kind of shock. (75)

Emily describes Elva's playing in similar terms. The quality of her music exceeds the empirical event: "I could not forget that first rapturous awe she had inspired in me, or the lovely music that poured forth from her fingertips. . . . She had a quality which made my heart stand still" (Kidman, *Mandarin* 98). However, Battersby clarifies that "[i]n Kant we have not yet entered a discourse in which art objects are sublime: what is sublime is the natural world" (75). On the other hand, Kidman's representation of the sublime through Elva's music belongs without any self-conscious strain to a discourse that has already assimilated the aesthetic sublime. Even more notably, the creation and reception of this sublime rapture occurs through female subjects, which is an emphatic departure from the Kantian version of the sublime. Battersby observes that for Kant "women are debarred from any proper enjoyment of the sublime" (77). In the evocation of female sensibilities capable of creating and discerning sublime grandeur, Kidman shows female subjectivity as retaining a capacity for transcendence despite the machinations of Gothic terror. Emily thinks that a "magic aura" surrounds Elva (Kidman, *Mandarin* 98).

Hence, the power that maintains Gothic terror is internally destabilized by the two women cast as opposites—Elva and Lilian. Elva's sublime aesthetic performance functions as an implicit retort to the terrifying sublimity from which patriarchal power is supposedly derived. Lilian's tactical quest for agency silently enacts an interrogation of the patriarchal economy's pragmatic manoeuvres for power through the sexual commodification of women. In different ways, therefore, Elva's music room and Lilian's room serve as ambiguous places of female resistance that may prefigure *Mandarin Summer*'s more accomplished resistance to and containment of patriarchy. To this extent, Emily's Janus-eyed vision that sees into Elva's and Lilian's separate situations schools her in the need for an uncompromising fidelity to the transcendent capacities of one's creative genius as well as in the importance of not undermining one's tactical moves through the surrender of one's integrity. Both of

these lessons are critical to defining the excessive feminist site embodied in Emily's narrative.

Emily's ability to extend the female gaze depends on her capacity to circumscribe within its range patriarchy's contradictions, cleavages, and internecine conflicts. Thus patriarchy's monopoly over naming identities and cognitive sites is unsettled and patriarchy itself becomes an object of critical scrutiny. For instance, Emily's narrative exposes the fragility of the rule of the father privileged by patriarchy, which meets its gravitational pull through the cleavages that open up between the name of the father and biological paternity. This theme surfaces at breakfast on Emily's first day at Carlyle House when the radio announcer reports that the "boy who had been arrested in Czechoslovakia" and thought to be "Hitler's son, was now believed to be Bormann's" (44). This sounds a proleptic note for the revelation of a widely known secret later in the novel—namely, that Barnsley's putative son Thomas, who bears his name, is actually the biological son of Grady Cape, his now-deceased employee and the father of Dan Cape. Hence, patriarchy as an organization for the control of male inheritance has its treacherous underside in the sexual drives that can derail this outcome. Despite Lilian's passionate love for Frederick Barnsley, in his absence she found a substitute lover in Grady Cape. Likewise, Emily's mother, the responsible and dignified Constance, intuits through her sight of the nearly undressed Thomas and his bulging crotch, the mesmerizing pull of Grady Cape over that of Frederick Barnsley, "for whom she had also lusted" (168). She concludes that "while the Barnsleys seemed to have all the outward attributes needed to win the feud, the Capes held subtle and matchless weapons" (168). The Barnsleys may have the power to name and define the outward sexual transactions, but the urgings of lust can always unsettle these transactions, whether overtly or covertly. Frederick Barnsley accuses the Capes of being "casual feckless amoral people" who "have followed the Barnsleys wherever they have gone" (157). His assessment alludes to the inevitable and disconcerting asymmetrical twinning between the sexual economy and the sexual unconscious, reflected through the Barnsleys and Capes, respectively.

A further doubling within patriarchal paternity occurs in which the father confuses his status as the daughter's progenitor with that of being her symbolic lover. Effectively the father's role in diverting the daughter's sexual desires towards himself sows animosity between her and her mother and keeps her in thrall to him. Yet at the same time he manages to abide literally by the incest taboo by allowing a surrogate to take his place in copulation with the daughter. Barnsley's place as Becky's lover is taken by Dan Cape, with Barnesley's complicity and tacit permission. He plays voyeur to their lovemaking; Lilian remarks with blunt accuracy: "[I]t suited you to have Dan Cape astride her. You might as well have dropped him on top of her yourself" (177). Barnsley's role in his daughter's seduction under cover of the incest taboo is symptomatic of the complicity that Irigaray perceives between the father's law against incest and the seduction of the daughter: "The whole thing must be tidied up and whitewashed by the law. But, of course, if, under cover of the law, seduction can now be practiced at leisure, it seems equally urgent to question the *seduction function of law itself*" (Irigaray, *Speculum* 38; emphasis in original). The seduction of the daughter severs the possibility of unbroken female matrilineal inheritances and leads the way to conspiracies aimed at matricide, as demonstrated by Barnsley and Becky's plotting, which Emily overhears.

The "'murder of the mother'" is one of "two key symbolic motifs" that Wallace identifies as "central to the Female Gothic" (22) in her reading of Sophie Lee's *The Recess* (1783) through Irigaray's theoretical lens (33–34). The other is the "'recess'" (22), which she interprets as "a symbolic representation of the maternal" (35) as "womb and tomb" (22) that signals the locus of exile from the history of matrilineal inheritances. The murder of the mother is the active accomplishment of that exile. In *Mandarin Summer*, the plot against the mother reaches beyond Lilian as its target, taking in even the resourceful and enterprising Constance. Plied with alcohol and rendered gracelessly intoxicated by Barnsley after his party, obsessed by the "sexy" currents of Carlyle House, sexually mesmerized by Dan Cape, lusting futilely after both the dead Grady Cape and Barnsley, and often reduced helplessly to tears, Constance is on the way to her own addictive entrapment in Carlyle House. The fire turns

out to be her escape; it compels her to action and paves the way for her later contribution to her daughter's account of events. She thus reverses the symbolic murder that was intended for her through her relegation to victimhood. Constance, like her daughter, is a tactical feminist in a symbolic war that has material ramifications for women. Kidman's fictional redress of the matricidal incitements of Western patriarchy responds to a cultural symptom that has had a powerful historical grip on the Gothic. But it also serves as a contemporary supplement to Irigaray's theory about the foundations of patriarchy in maternal murder, upon which Wallace erects her analysis.

Also included within the sweep of the novel and more particularly Emily's gaze are patriarchy's internal dissensions, formed by racial and class-based hierarchies. If Barnsley's masculinity is enhanced and tripled or quadrupled by wealth, property, prestige, and influence, Luke and Schwass are unmanned to the extent that they lack these. Patriarchy is not the monolithic bastion and fortress of masculinity that it proclaims itself to be. Carlyle House may be an outpost of colonial patriarchy, but Luke's social inferiority, dependence on Barnsley's patronage, and poverty contribute to his partial emasculation, as Becky's scornful jokes show. Schwass' abjection is even more profound. In him are coalesced all those elements of feminine Othering carried to the extreme—silence, servitude, and effective invisibility. His primary relationships are with women: he is Elva's blood-relation, brings Lilian her daily supply of opium, and helps Constance in the kitchen. He embodies more completely than any of them the feminine position, thus giving weight to Kidman's implicit contention that the feminine is the original Other. Schwass, already Othered by his race, bears in Carlyle House the signifiers of degraded femininity, which come to indicate the magnitude of his loss of status.

Schwass stands in for the self-immolated female victim of *Jane Eyre* in this rewritten post-World War II Gothic. In keeping with the binary configurations of the earlier novel, Lilian is the intended victim, but Schwass is the accidental victim. It is Emily's penetration of Barnsley's plot against Lilian and her vigilance that help to save Lilian, with Luke's help. Lifted to a metafictional plane, the novel, through its use of Emily's

Janus-eyed vision, refuses the patriarchal ethic of playing one woman against another. Emily has her eye on saving Lilian. This is yet another sense in which Lilian "belongs" to Emily, but unfortunately the scope of the younger Emily's vision does not extend to Schwass, for whom she does not envision any danger.

Conclusion

In Kidman's rewriting of the Gothic genre, women are rescued from patriarchal victimization and entrapment through the narrator's penetration and containment of the patriarchal plot, but the sacrificial place occupied by the feminine remains intact. Schwass inadvertently slips into this place as hostage and victim. The sacrificial charge that sustains patriarchy is signalled through the holocaust that claims him. Anti-Semitism displaces misogyny in Frederick Barnsley's contemptuous reception of Schwass' death through the burning of Carlyle House that he had masterminded. Barnsley screams, "The stupid bastard old Jew," and Emily reports that "there was no mistaking his contempt" (183). Not only is Lilian rescued in this scene, but so also is Elva, since Barnsley's exposure of his anti-Semitism and her uncle's death release her from all obligations to him. She walks away "without a backward glance" (183). Unlike *Jane Eyre*, which may be read as the successive entrapment of women via physical imprisonment or the tentacles of romance, *Mandarin Summer* saves its entrapped women. Furthermore, it reverses the moral convenience that *Jane Eyre*'s Rochester enjoys of being released from his marriage by the fortuitous self-immolation of his mad wife. Barnsley had deliberately arranged for the burning of Carlyle House, expected to pin it on his "mad" wife Lilian (164), and hoped to marry Elva as the triumphant culmination of his plot. But the plan misfires. Kidman's reinventions depend on her moving out of the earlier Gothic model of "victim feminism" with its ethic of partial complicity with patriarchy to a model of tactical feminism that circumscribes within its visionary scope the machinations of patriarchy. Neither "victim feminism" nor "tactical feminism," however, can totally eradicate the place of the "feminine" to which new victims may be consigned.

Notes

1 "Pakeha" is "a Maori term for the white inhabitants of New Zealand" ("Pakeha").

2 There are variant spellings for the title of Shelley's work. Moore spells it in her article as "Mathilda," which is the spelling of the title in the "complete and final copy" of the manuscript (Clemit 1). But Clemit, the editor of the second volume of *The Novels and Selected Works of Mary Shelley*, observes that Shelley refers to the work's title as "Matilda" "in her published remarks" and thus uses this spelling (Clemit 2). Nevertheless on the title page of the novella, she retains the spelling "Mathilda."

3 See Irigaray's suggestion that the father's law against incest may perform a "*seduction function*" through the fantasies it "organizes and arranges" (*Speculum* 38; emphasis in original). A fuller quotation of the relevant passage is provided later in this essay.

4 The notion of the sublime "as necessarily bound up with terror" is reiterated in Lyotard's idea of the postmodern sublime as exemplified in Auschwitz. Battersby writes: "For Lyotard, it is 'Auschwitz' that represents the hiatus within the narratives and ideals of Western modernity which give birth to his account of the postmodern sublime" (86).

Works Cited

Battersby, Christine. "Terror, Terrorism and the Sublime: Rethinking the Sublime after 1789 and 2001." *Postcolonial Studies* 6.1 (2003): 67–89. Web. 26 July 2015.

Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex.* Trans. and ed. H. M. Parshley. London: Picador, 1988. Print.

Brontë, Charlotte. *Jane Eyre.* 1847. Introd. Mary Ibbett. Ware: Wordsworth, 1992. Print.

Burke, Edmund. *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Idea of the Sublime and Beautiful.* Ed. and introd. Adam Phillips. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990. E-book.

Clemit, Pamela. "Matilda: Introductory Note." *The Novels and Selected Works of Mary Shelley: Matilda, Dramas, Reviews & Essays, Prefaces & Notes*. Vol. 2. Ed. Clemit. London: Pickering, 1996. 1–3. Print.

Conrich, Ian. "New Zealand Gothic." *A New Companion to the Gothic.* Ed. David Punter. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012. 393–408. Print.

Greene, Gayle. *Changing the Story: Feminist Fiction and the Tradition.* Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1991. Print.

Heiland, Donna. *Gothic and Gender: An Introduction.* Oxford: Blackwell, 2004. Print.

Hoeveler, Diane Long. *Gothic Feminism: The Professionalization of Gender from Charlotte Smith to the Brontës.* University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1998. Print.

Irigaray, Luce. "Cosi Fan Tutti." *This Sex Which Is Not One.* Trans. Catherine Porter and Carolyn Burke. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1985. 86–105. Print.

——. *Speculum of the Other Woman.* Trans. Gillian C. Gill. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1985. Print.

Kidman, Fiona. *The Book of Secrets.* Auckland: Heinemann, 1987. Print.

——. *A Breed of Women.* Sydney: Harper & Row, 1979. Print.

——. *The Captive Wife.* Auckland: Random House, 2005. Print.

——. *Mandarin Summer.* Auckland: Heinemann, 1981. Print.

——. *Paddy's Puzzle.* Auckland: Heinemann, 1983. Print.

——. *True Stars.* Auckland: Random Century, 1990. Print.

Kilgour, Maggie. *The Rise of the Gothic Novel.* London: Routledge, 1995. Print.

Lawn, Jenny. "Domesticating the Settler Gothic in New Zealand Literature." *New Literature Review* 38 (2002): 46–62. Print.

——. "Warping the Familiar." *Gothic NZ: The Darker Side of Kiwi Culture.* Ed. Misha Kavka, Lawn, and Mary Paul. Dunedin: Otago UP, 2006. 11–21. Print.

Levinas, Emmanuel. "Time and the Other." *The Levinas Reader.* Ed. Sean Hand. Oxford: Blackwell, 1989. 37–58. Print.

Milbank, Alison. "Female Gothic." *The Handbook of the Gothic.* 2nd ed. Ed. Marie Mulvey-Roberts. New York: Palgrave, 2009. 120–24. Print.

Moers, Ellen. *Literary Women.* London: Allen, 1976. Print.

Moore, Melina. "Mary Shelley's *Mathilda* and the Struggle for Female Narrative Subjectivity." *Rocky Mountain Review of Language and Literature* 65.2 (2011): 208–15. Web. 30 May 2013.

Rhys, Jean. *Wide Sargasso Sea.* 1966. Ed. Angela Smith. London: Penguin, 1997. Print.

Rubik, Margaret, and Elke Mettinger-Schartmann. Introduction. *A Breath of Fresh Eyre: Intertextual and Intermedia Reworkings of Jane Eyre.* Ed. Rubik and Mettinger-Schartmann. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007. 9–21. E-book.

Rudd, Alison. *Postcolonial Gothic Fictions from the Caribbean, Canada, Australia and New Zealand.* Cardiff: U of Wales P, 2010. Print.

Shelley, Mary. *The Novels and Selected Works of Mary Shelley:* Matilda*, Dramas, Reviews & Essays, Prefaces & Notes.* Vol. 2. Ed. Pamela Clemit. London: Pickering, 1996. Print.

Smith, Andrew. *Gothic Literature.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2007. E-book.

Smith, Andrew, and Diana Wallace. "The Female Gothic: Then and Now." *Gothic Studies* 6.1 (2004): 1–7. Web. 31 July 2015.

Wallace, Diana. *Female Gothic Histories: Gender, History and the Gothic*. Cardiff: U of Wales P, 2013. E-book.

"The Word Pakeha." *An Encyclopaedia of New Zealand.* 1966. Ed. A. H. McLintock. *Te Ara—the Encyclopedia of New Zealand.* 22 Apr. 2009. Web. 12 Aug. 2015.