

# The Trickster in Postmodern Literature with Special Reference to Peter Carey's Novel *Illywhacker*

**P W Conradie**  
**21185476**

Dissertation submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree  
*Magister in English* at the Potchefstroom Campus of the North-West  
University

Supervisor: Prof NTC Meihuizen

Co-supervisor: Prof MJ Wenzel

November 2015

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost I want to thank my mother and father who have been an inspirational source to me from the start of my studies. Thank you for the financial and emotional support, as well as the regular conversations regarding Jung's ideas. You have guided me in my understanding of Jungian concepts during my years as a teenager and an adolescent.

Thank you to my Jungian analyst Elizabeth Martini for broadening my understanding of Jung's works on a more practical level, and for continual discussions about the trickster.

Thank you to my friends Joané Gous, Oliver Rautenbach and Eddie Kok who have inspired me to read further in the fields of psychology, philosophy and literature.

Thank you to my wife Wilma Conradie for her continual support and guidance through difficult times, and specifically during the finalisation of this dissertation.

Thank you to Professor A. de Lange for inspiring me to help develop my understanding of modern and postmodern fiction.

Special thanks to Professor M. Wenzel for introducing me to the wonders of Carey. Thank you to her for her guidance as my co-supervisor, her invaluable feedback, patience and extended devotion.

Special thanks to Professor N. Meihuizen who has been the primary source of my success in the endeavours associated with this dissertation. Thank you to him for remaining patient as I developed my ideas, and for assisting me with weekly interviews. These weekly meetings have been a primary source of motivation to complete the task of writing the work.

And lastly, I want to thank the Research Unit: Language and Literature in the South African Context at the Potchefstroom Campus of the North-West University for the opportunity to complete this dissertation.

## ABSTRACT

Peter Carey's novel *Illywhacker* (1985) contains an example of an Australian trickster figure, who serves as a model of the trickster's continual appearance in contemporary literature as a vehicle for the shadow archetype of the collective unconscious. This figure can be approached academically through multiple perspectives, such as picaresque criticism, postmodernism, magic realism, postcolonialism, deconstructionism, and new historicism. While taking into account the wide-ranging scope of these various approaches to *Illywhacker*, this dissertation sees the novel as particularly suited to a Jungian reading, and thus offers an alternative approach to previous ones. It tries to show the relevance of Jung's interpretation of the trickster, as part of an ongoing investigation of literary figures who might be seen as tricksters. The trickster is an important character type in literature, and in *Illywhacker* he may be considered to have a therapeutically archetypal function, which is to inspire individuation. Through the trickster's therapeutic function the reader as ego-bound individual may become conscious of feeling-toned complexes that have been repressed and subsumed into the shadow of the personal unconscious.

### Key Concepts

Archetype, collective unconscious, complex, ego, deconstructionism, historicism, *Illywhacker*, illywhacker, individuation, Jungian analysis, magic realism, personal unconscious, picaresque, Post-Jungian criticism, postcolonialism, postmodernism, self, shadow, therapeutic effect, trickster

## OPSOMMING

In Peter Carey se roman *Illywhacker* (1985) word 'n trieksterfiguur uitgebeeld wat dien as voorbeeld van die Australiese weergawe van hierdie tipe karakter, en in wyer verband as model vir die wyse waarop die triekster in kontemporêre literatuur gebruik word as draer van die skadu-argetipe in die kollektiewe onderbewussyn. Akademies gesproke kan hierdie tipe figuur benader word vanuit 'n verskeidenheid perspektiewe soos die pikareske kritiek, postmodernisme, postkolonialisme, die dekonstruksie en die nuwe historisme. Hoewel hierdie wye spektrum van moontlike benaderingswyses tot *Illywhacker* in ag geneem word, word daar in hierdie verhandeling geoordeel dat die roman hom uitstekend leen tot 'n Jungiaanse lesing, en daarom word 'n alternatiewe benadering gevolg ten opsigte van bestaande studies. Daar word gepoog om die relevansie van Jung se interpretasie van die triekster duidelik te maak as onderdeel van 'n wyer verkenning van literêre figure wat gesien kan word as trieksters. Die triekster is 'n belangrike karaktertipe binne die letterkunde, en dit is moontlik om te argumenteer dat die trieksterfiguur in *Illywhacker* 'n terapeutiese argetipiese funksie vervul in die voltrekking van die individuasiëproses. Hierdie terapeutiese funksie van die triekster skep die moontlikheid vir die leser as ego-gebonde individu om bewus te word van gevoelsgekleurde komplekse wat voorheen onderdruk en gesubsumeer is in die skadu van die persoonlike onderbewuste.

### Sleutel terme

Argetipe, bedrieër, dekonstruksie, ego, historisme, *Illywhacker*, *illywhacker*, individuasie, Jungiaanse analise, kollektiewe onderbewussyn, kompleks, magiese realisme, persoonlike onderbewussyn, pikaresk, Post-Jungiaanse kritiek, postkolonialisme, postmodernisme, self, skadu, skelm, terapeutiese effek, triekster

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	<b>I</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	<b>II</b>
<b>OPSOMMING</b> .....	<b>III</b>
<b>CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXTUALISATION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Section 1: Literary Observations of <i>Illywhacker</i></b> .....	<b>4</b>
Picaresque Narrative .....	4
Postmodernism .....	7
Magic Realism .....	9
Postcolonialism .....	10
Deconstructionism .....	11
Historicism .....	12
Post-Jungian Criticism .....	13
<b>CHAPTER II: THEORETICAL CONCEPTS</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>Section 1: Jungian Criticism</b> .....	<b>19</b>
Therapeutic Effect and Individuation .....	19
Ego and Self .....	25
Personal Unconscious and Collective Unconscious .....	26
Complexes and Archetypes .....	28
Shadow and Trickster, Archetype and Complex .....	30
<b>Section 2: Defining the Trickster</b> .....	<b>36</b>
Trickster Figures .....	37
Purpose of the Trickster .....	40

<b>CHAPTER III: THE TRICKSTER IN <i>ILLYWHACKER</i></b> .....	<b>44</b>
<b>Section 1: Fondness for Sly Jokes and Malicious Pranks</b> .....	<b>49</b>
The Theme of Lying .....	49
Jokes and Pranks.....	51
<b>Section 2: Powers as a Shape Shifter</b> .....	<b>56</b>
Disappearing Trick .....	57
Shifting Between Personas .....	60
Change from the Male Sex to the Female Sex.....	67
<b>Section 3: Dual Nature – Half Animal and Half Divine</b> .....	<b>69</b>
Half Animal .....	70
Half Divine .....	74
<b>Section 4: Exposure to all Kinds of Torture</b> .....	<b>77</b>
Torture at a Young Age .....	77
The Torture of Being Illiterate.....	78
Physical Drawbacks.....	78
Inability to Change Bad Habits in order to Become Successful.....	79
Failure to Establish Fixed Relationships and a Family.....	81
Imprisonment .....	82
<b>Section 5: Approximation to the Figure of a Saviour</b> .....	<b>84</b>
Remorse despite Amoral Nature.....	84
Inspiration for Individuation.....	85
Transformative Qualities .....	92
<b>Section 6: Secondary Characters Who Reflect Trickster Qualities</b> .....	<b>95</b>

Swagman .....	95
Phoebe Badgery (McGrath) .....	96
Jack McGrath .....	97
Leah Goldstein .....	97
Charles Badgery .....	102
<b>CHAPTER IV: CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>107</b>

## CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXTUALISATION

Carey is a poet of fear, and the tales that he tells explore the blacker recesses of the psyche, both personal and national. (Hassall, 1994:2)

Peter Philip Carey is an Australian writer whose fiction has the ability to psychologically draw a reader's attention by its explicit imagery, which is vigilantly interwoven with the contemporary literary approach of postmodernism.<sup>1</sup> The novel *Illywhacker* (1985) is specifically noteworthy in regard to a study of Carey's "imaginative daring," "blazing visual clarity," "raw-edged emotional intensity," and "anguished re-enactment of primal nightmares" (Hassall, 1994:1), because the primary character and narrator embodies a trickster whose amoral characteristics paradoxically serve as a means for "individuation" (Jung, 1969:275). This hypothesis is based on the analysis of Herbert Badgery's character, and it examines how his unconventional behaviour and actions evoke an emotional response from the reader, which may, through his self-reflection, contribute to psychological transformation. The trickster's provocation of an emotional response may be interpreted from multiple viewpoints; for example, as the writer's technique to entice the reader, or as a means to highlight motifs such as "historiography running alongside Herbert Badgery's performance" (Todd, 1995:310); however, an emotional response may also be the source of a reader's positive/negative "feeling-toned complexes" (complexes in short), which are embodied and paralleled by "archetypes" (Jung, 1969:4) in the novel. The aim of this study is to assert that Herbert embodies the shadow archetype who through his trickster components unveils the complexes of a reader, which unconsciously influences the individual psyche through emotional memory that acts as a source of a polarised complex.

*Illywhacker* is a multidimensional novel which might be classified under the term "postmodernist pastiche" (Edwards, 1998:247). The novel's fluctuating aspects have been reviewed and studied by a variety of literary critics; however, little has been said about the psychoanalytical effect of the trickster Herbert Badgery, and whether he portrays individuating qualities relevant to a Jungian reading. For example, with a brevity similar to that found in

---

1. Carey started writing in his early 20's during the 1960's. At the start of his career Carey primarily succeeded in publishing novellas. His first novel, *Bliss*, was published in 1981; this was followed by the novel *Illywhacker* (1985), which was shortlisted for the Booker Prize; *Oscar and Lucinda* (1988), which was awarded the Booker Prize; *True History of the Kelly Gang* (2000), which received a second Booker Prize; and *Parrot and Oliver in America* (2010), also shortlisted for the Booker Prize. From the awards and achievements that Carey obtained in his career as a writer, we see that the timeline of his publications is located in the postmodern era. For a detailed discussion on Carey's achievements and publications refer to Snodgrass's (2010:5-32) account in *Peter Carey: A Literary Companion*.

certain other secondary sources, the discussion of *Illywhacker* in Snodgrass's (2010) *Peter Carey: A Literary Companion* describes the psychological effects of the novel:

Carey developed *Illywhacker* from a single image, the pet emporium. Incarceration, the novel's controlling metaphor, reflects a psychological construct of the persona as it is mirrored by the outside world. The individual tends to accept the opinions and standards of family, friends, and associates. Therefore, the ring of people around a single person serves as one big mirror of behaviours expected of the person at centre. (2010:122)

However, in relation to the literary survey of this dissertation, nothing has yet been found on the appearance of Jung's archetypes in Carey's corpus, or the archetypal qualities of the trickster as an illywhacker. Critics regularly refer to the "picaresque" qualities of *Illywhacker*,<sup>2</sup> but despite the relation between the picaro and the trickster it has not been noted that Jung's (1969) commentary in *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* on the trickster are relevant in a study of *Illywhacker*. For example, in Jung's discussion of the various trickster figures, he even refers to picaresque tales as an example of the shadow archetype that is apparent through trickster-like characteristics:

In picaresque tales, in carnivals and revels, in magic rites of healing, in man's religious fears and exaltations, this phantom of the trickster haunts the mythology of all ages, sometimes in quite unmistakable form, sometimes in strangely modulated guise... In his clearest manifestations he is a faithful reflection of an absolutely undifferentiated human consciousness, corresponding to a psyche that has hardly left the animal level. (Jung, 1969:260)

Though Jung does not specifically focus on picaresque tradition, he provides a relational model between different tricksters which can be used to study the trickster elements of a picaro, as well as an illywhacker. Therefore, Jung's (1969:255-272) commentary "On the Psychology of the Trickster Figure" is relevant in a comparative study of the trickster qualities of an illywhacker in the novel *Illywhacker* (the picaro would best be considered from this point of view in a study of its own). From the findings of such a study, one may gain a clearer understanding of the psychoanalytical values that the novel *Illywhacker* conveys to the reader through its archetypal shadow/trickster elements.

---

2. The picaresque is a general aspect noted by critics such as Blaber and Gilman (1990:55-59); Hassall (1994:89, 95); Todd (1995:313-314); Woodcock (1996:53); and Snodgrass (2010:53).

Regarding the trickster in the title of this dissertation, a Jungian approach is used to determine how the trickster in the postmodern novel *Illywhacker* represents similar characteristics to a trickster figure that specifically embodies the aspects of the shadow archetype of the collective unconscious. In effect, a postmodern reading is not the primary motivation behind this dissertation, nor is it the methodological approach used to analyse the primary material, although it remains an important notion for the reader who wishes to distinguish the different aspects of *Illywhacker* and the factors that influenced it during the time period in which it was written. “Postmodern literature” in the title rather refers to the postmodern era in which *Illywhacker* was written and highlights the continuing relevance of a trickster in contemporary literature.

To categorise this discussion, Chapter I of this dissertation contextualises the different approaches applied by literary critics to the novel *Illywhacker*. The focus is on postmodernism, which serves as a backdrop to an estimation and understanding of the literary period in which *Illywhacker* was written. Chapter II of this dissertation discusses the primary theoretical approach, namely Jungian analysis. This involves a discussion of Jungian terminology, as well as a discussion of the substantial data used by Jung in his claim that the trickster represents an example of the shadow archetype. The dissertation will then use this approach as a basis to study the novel *Illywhacker* and the trickster’s appearance as an illywhacker. Note that the theoretical data will primarily be obtained, qualitatively, from Jung’s collected works. Chapter III applies a Jungian approach, as considered in Chapter II, in combination with a general literary approach to the novel *Illywhacker* by means of separately analysing character traits from *Illywhacker* in relation to Mercurius as discussed by Jung. This yields additional or new information in an already familiar text, providing an alternative critical angle to previous studies. And finally, in Chapter IV the findings of this study will be presented, as well as a brief contextualisation of potential Jungian studies that are also applicable to Carey’s corpus.

## Section 1: Literary Observations of *Illywhacker*

### Picaresque Narrative

Carey's use of the picaresque narrative technique has been noted by a selection of critics as an apparent method applied to *Illywhacker*. It is therefore relevant to note the picaresque aspects; however, one must remain aware of the fact that picaresque narrative is a more traditional form of writing in relation to postmodernism, which implies that a certain narrative structure applies to a complete picaresque novel. The theme of the picaresque in *Illywhacker* is specifically studied by Blaber and Gilman (1990) in *Roguary: The Picaresque Tradition in Australian, Canadian and Indian Fiction*, who examine the continuance of picaresque narrative with reference to *Illywhacker* as one of several Australian literary texts.<sup>3</sup> In the theoretical part of their discussion, Blaber and Gilman claim that picaresque narrative may be viewed in a similar way to postmodern fiction, which "generally foregrounds a self-reflexive and parodic narrative mode, featuring a protagonist lost in an illogical disconnected world" (1990:32). From the different critical readings, it is already of note that a postmodern approach is considered a possible one (though applied from different points of view). Effectively, one can assume that picaresque narrative contains the potential for being combined with a postmodern reading; however, the point made by Blaber and Gilman (1990) in connection with *Illywhacker* is not primarily focussed on a postmodern reading, but rather picaresque tradition.

There are three ways in which Blaber and Gilman classify *Illywhacker* as a picaresque narrative. Firstly, Blaber and Gilman claim that *Illywhacker* portrays picaresque tradition through Herbert Badgery who shows "concern for a particular dogmatic set of convictions such as Australian nationalism, commitment to egalitarianism, [and] a belief in democracy" (1990:55). From a political or social standpoint Herbert represents "the microcosm through which the macrocosm of the collective Australian people can be seen as a comic backdrop. This is why he can assume, so deftly, as picaro a representation of the national identity, for he is only

---

3. Apart from being an evident element in *Illywhacker*, the picaresque is a well-established topic of discussion in literature: "Another important predecessor of the novel was the picaresque narrative, which emerged in sixteenth-century Spain; see Michael Alpert, trans., *Lazarillo de Tormes* and *The Swindler* (2003), and Giancarlo Maiorino, *At the Margins of the Renaissance: Lazarillo de Tormes and the Picaresque Art of Survival* (2003). The most popular instance, however, *Gil Blas* (1715), was written by the Frenchman Le Sage... The first, and very lively, English example was Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller* (1594). We recognize the survival of the picaresque type in many later novels such as Mark Twain's *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* (1876), Thomas Mann's *The Confessions of Felix Krull* (1954), and Saul Bellow's *The Adventures of Augie March* (1953)" (Abrams, 2012:253). Another example of a picaresque tale can also be observed in *The Canterbury Tales* of Chaucer (Cooper, 1989). In relation to Chaucer, the direct connection with Herbert's escapades implies the critique of a hypocritical society and the double irony of the picaro, or trickster, as the product of such a society.

one of many picaresque Australians” (Blaber & Gilman, 1990:57).<sup>4</sup> Secondly, Blaber and Gilman offer a classificatory chain of “picaresque conventions” that are obtained from Herbert’s character: he “loses his mother when he is very young”; “he runs away from his father and falls under the tutelage of Goon Tse Ying... [who] was also an orphan”; “[he schemes] his way through life”, which comes naturally to him from his “talent for conversation” (1990:55); his impulsive behaviour is the result of “moral ambiguity”; and his “final scenario comes straight from the survivor motif common to the picaresque tradition” (1990:59). And thirdly, several technical observations about the novel’s structure are of relevance to a discussion of the picaresque qualities of *Illywhacker*. The plot is an “episodic structure [that] is strung together by Herbert’s two enthusiasms, selling Fords and flying his Morris Farman... Mobility is also the trademark of the picaro’s way of life” (Blaber & Gilman, 1990:56). Narrative technique relates to Herbert’s keenness to lying, and this produces a “delight in mendacity [which] creates a telling ambiguity in the text” (Blaber & Gilman, 1990:56). Although the novel contains autobiographical details of the protagonist as a character and Carey as the author, the “pertinence of non-meaning to the picaro’s pseudoautobiography is particularly apt”, since Herbert “is always himself and what his memoirs affirm is the primacy of the personal experience”; and he “exposes the bare grounds of an individual way without recourse to religion, philosophy, [and] politics as a sustaining force” (Blaber & Gilman, 1990:59). And, the ending of the novel is important regarding “the framework of the picaresque experience [which] is open-ended and filled with repetitive patterns and recurrent situations” (Blaber & Gilman, 1990:59).

Effectively, one can use Blaber’s and Gilman’s analysis as a basis to determine some of the picaresque qualities of *Illywhacker*; however, the dominating features of picaresque tradition in *Illywhacker* do not overshadow the postmodern elements of the novel (discussed below). Blaber and Gilman also refer to secondary readings which equate the picaro with the trickster; they claim that on “occasion the trick motif and the role-playing are subsumed in readings that equate the picaro with mythic or traditional trickster figures”; however, “the equation is tenuous because the trickster functions as a scapegoat or a redemptive figure for society, whereas the picaro, while possibly an avatar of the trickster, is much more ambivalent” (1990:26). From the perspective of a more detailed examination of the trickster, it can be argued that Blaber and Gilman may not have exhausted all the possible readings. For example, by comparing the

---

4. Blaber and Gilman classify the picaro according to several dominants. The first point we mentioned in regard to Herbert’s picaresque qualities, refers to the “*Implied parody of other fictional types (romance) and the picaresque itself*” (Blaber & Gilman, 1990:25). For a detailed account of these dominant picaresque features, refer to Blaber and Gilman (1990:9-32).

reading of *Illywhacker* as a picaresque narrative to the Jungian reading of a trickster, one can certainly observe a trend of trickster motifs (discussed in Chapter II and Chapter III of this dissertation) that cohere with the motifs of the picaro as discussed by Blaber and Gilman. For an alternative study, this may be an interesting point of comparison, since Blaber and Gilman do not refer to Jung regarding their claim that the trickster and picaro cannot be seen as two figures possessing similar qualities. A study of Jung's observations may offer a reasonable link and provide grounds for underlining the similarities.

Picaresque narrative remains a topic of interest that regularly appears in literary studies of *Illywhacker*; although, again, it only receives brief mention due to the overriding postmodern elements that are more apparent in Carey's corpus: "Carey adopts some of the conventions of the picaresque in Book Two, but his vision is only partly accommodated by that form, and he is not constrained by it" (Hassall, 1994:95). Carey, in fact, uses several writing techniques in *Illywhacker*, which makes it difficult to reduce the primary structure of the novel to one single interpretation, such as picaresque narrative. Therefore, a picaresque traditional reading is only one approach to an example of the various techniques to be found in Carey's writing.

Another key feature of Blaber and Gilman is the use of Bakhtin's concept of the carnivalesque, which is a theory that fits the interpretation of a trickster in the literary context of *Illywhacker*. Blaber's and Gilman's use of the concepts of carnival and the grotesque can be placed alongside our understanding of the trickster's malicious behaviour in *Illywhacker*, for example: "Carnival, the grotesque and laughter serve to overturn and question the official and the hierarchical, and celebrate renewal, change, the body, and community above individuality" (1990:12). In *Illywhacker* Herbert Badgery reminds us that life remains a changing environment and that authority may not be as infallible as presumed. It is specifically by means of grotesqueness that the trickster gets people's attention and demonstrates an earlier stage of development that still remains a primary concern even to the single individuals who regard themselves as more civilised than "lower class" individuals.

The carnival according to Bakhtin has a universal spirit: "It is a special condition of the entire world, of the world's revival and renewal, in which all take part" (1984:7). Carnival is part of a broader dialectic:

The people of the Middle Ages participated equally in two lives: the official life and the carnival. Their existence was determined by two aspects of the world: by the aspect of the piety of seriousness and by the aspect of laughter. (Bakhtin, 1985:41)

People become overwhelmed by the serious aspects of life to the extent that they feel a need to counteract the suffering they experience, and carnival is the means of doing this. According to van der Merwe and Bekker, “existence becomes endurable again by placing the official world in [a] relativised perspective” (2015:3). Bakhtin explains:

Seriousness reduced people to servitude, scared them. It lied, it was hypocritical, it was stingy and it fasted. It was possible on the fairgrounds to put the serious tone down on the holiday table and another truth began to sound: laughing, crazy, unseemly, swearing, parodying, travesty. Fear and the lie are dispelled due to the triumph of the material-physical and that of the festive. (1985:39)

Van der Merwe and Bekker continues: “Ultimately, the concept of a carnival should be seen as a metaphor for the world: the cyclical swing from laughter to seriousness and back, repeated, as a universal condition” (2015:3). Carnival is not an alternative to life; it is embedded in the real world, and the real world is embedded in the carnival, a mirroring which is itself carnivalesque:

Birth becomes visible in death, death becomes visible in birth, in victory defeat, in defeat victory, in elevation humiliation, et cetera. The carnival laughter ensures that not one of these moments of change is made absolute, that it does not freeze into one-sided seriousness. (Bakhtin, 1985:66)

In brief, Bakhtin’s theory can also be used to discern the trickster’s role in *Illywhacker* and it has also been applied by Edwards, for example: “This lower bodily view of the city is a much darker carnivalesque than the ebullient parody in *Illywhacker* but, like the earlier work, it questions comfortable assertions of reality” (1998:260). However, the primary focus at present is on a Jungian interpretation, while yet keeping in mind the similarity between these theories.

## Postmodernism<sup>5</sup>

This brings us to the next approach, the postmodern one, which is usually discussed in combination with approaches such as postcolonialism, deconstructionism, magic realism, and

---

5. Take in consideration that we only provide one example of postmodernism, specifically regarding the novel *Illywhacker* and most relevant observed Carey critics. A detailed account of *Illywhacker* as a postmodern text will include literary modes such as metafiction, parody, pastiche, bricolage, and intertextuality. Effectively the novel contains more postmodern elements than the elements of approaches such as postcolonialism, magic realism, and deconstructionism. This discussion does not discourage a postmodern reading, but specifically uses a Jungian analytical one.

historicism. In Hassall's (1994) *Dancing on Hot Macadam: Peter Carey's Fiction* he specifically examines the "extra-textual" qualities of *Illywhacker*, which make up an element of the postmodern approach:

While rendering one level of the narrative unreliable, it simultaneously reinforces the illusion that there is a "real" Herbert Badgery with a life outside the text.

Casting Doubt on the validity of extra-textual reality is a common postmodern strategy, reflecting the view of Jean Baudrillard, among others, that the hyperreality of the text is the only reality we can know. (1994:83)

To explain this theory of hyperreality, consider Carey's use of an archaic and distant critique on something from the past, which creates a simulated experience for the reader and also brings to mind Jean Baudrillard's description of the *simulacrum* (Leitch, 2010:1553-1566). In the epigraph of *Illywhacker* Carey makes use of two direct references of which the first is of interest pertaining to a non-fictional work by Twain (1897) known as *More Tramps Abroad*. Twain specifically critiques the history of Australia; being thus quoted, this critique is endorsed by Herbert as a fictional character and narrator. Twain's critique of the history is based on his own experience, knowledge and contemporary (late nineteenth-century) history. Twain's actual experience pertains to an inaccessible temporal stratum. One can therefore only perceive Twain's experience textually and not at first-hand. But as Herbert's interpretation of history is based on this quote by Twain, the text becomes hyperreal, using historical data to support fictional observations which nevertheless carry their own relation to the truth of lived experience.

The primary postmodern theme that Hassall regards in his examination of *Illywhacker* as a postmodern novel is imprisonment, which is a contemporary analogy for the reality Australians have been exposed to and are currently a part of. In Hassall's critique of *Illywhacker* he claims that "European Australia began as a gaol, and if *Illywhacker* is to be believed, it has never escaped from that narrative of imprisonment" (1994:88). All the characters are imprisoned by Herbert's story, but at the same time they imprison themselves, as well as Herbert, in their own stories that are placed in the primary story by Herbert, who is actually imprisoned in the present tense of the novel. The multiple writers in *Illywhacker* contribute to the supposedly factual information surrounding Herbert as an actual character and unreliable narrator: "Herbert is only one of many writers in *Illywhacker*, and they all shape their fictions to please themselves. If Herbert invents the other characters in his narration, they respond by constructing fictional versions of him and embedding them in his story" (Hassall, 1994:85). Even the magic that seems

to be an aspect of Herbert's tomfoolery is an example of the secondary characters' interpretation of Herbert as a liar and illywhacker: "The real *Book of Dragons*, then, is *Illywhacker*, Herbert's collection of frightening lies and stories. He is the sorcerer who made Sonia disappear, and who keeps returning himself to imprisonment" (Hassall, 1994:99).

### Magic Realism

Magic realism is an alternative approach that follows upon Hassall's discussion of the significance of magic as metaphor of the postmodern elements in *Illywhacker*. Hassall briefly refers to this approach as "the author's magic realism" (1994:110); whereas Todd's (1995) article, "Narrative Trickery and Performative Historiography: Fictional Representation of National Identity in Graham Swift, Peter Carey, and Mordecai Richler", specifically discusses the magic realist qualities of *Illywhacker*. Todd (1995) offers his understanding of what a magic realist text is,<sup>6</sup> and this is followed by an examination of writers who display magic realist elements in their fiction; he refers specifically to *Illywhacker*. Carey's placement of his characters alongside actual place names and historical events of Australia, tricks the reader into believing the events described in the novel, despite its fictional reconstruction of the factual and historical information. Unnatural events are from time to time put into the mix. The following passage is of note:

Having urged that the ontological dubiousness of the entire narrative is made to coexist with its linear execution, I should now single out the three major periods in Badgery's life, conforming to the text's division into three sections (Books), through which *Illywhacker* contrives to convey the larger historiographical narrative of twentieth-century Australia: not simply through diaspora leading to a cultural mosaic, but by genetic and marital displacement leading to subversion of pedigree; not simply through colonization by greater powers, but by cultural pluriformity... The literal and the figurative coexist, in this particular magic realist fiction, through the displacing agency of trickery. (Todd, 1995:312-313)

---

6. Consider the following passage regarding magic realism: "Narrators of magic realism play confidence tricks on their readers, disavowing the more straightforward claim of the mimetic naturalist realist that what she or he is narrating actually happened in a heterocosmic world related to the one we know by analogy. Instead the magic realist narrator distorts the very idea of analogy and operates syncretically, asking the reader to believe, for instance, that the natural order of things can be subverted in the world of her or his fiction... An exemplary expression of the confidence trick leading to the subversion of the natural order of things is to be found in the alternative historiography that in various ways outrageously transgresses the 'given facts' of history" (Todd, 1995:305).

Todd claims that Carey uses Herbert's trickery in the novel as a means to accommodate a magic realist approach. As fictional character, Herbert undermines our understanding of his rebellious actions, which contain embedded satiric messages, through his magic performances and unnatural depictions of different characters. The reader's attention is drawn to question or decipher the fictional events' realistic qualities, while unconsciously he or she is also made aware of social and political events that metaphorically parallel the unnatural events of the novel. For example, actual events such as racial discrimination are hidden behind the extraordinary fictional events of Herbert's act of disappearance, which may also be mistaken for entertainment. In effect, this is a way to display the earnestness of the emotions a character may experience during acts of discrimination or repression: "I lay across the rocks blubbering, as broken as the beetles I had sought to injure... He hit me time and time again. I wept. I begged. I tried to run away, but he caught me effortlessly" (Carey, 1985:202). Emotions such as these result in an out of body experience, which may explain Herbert's assumed disappearance; they may also lay claim to encoding a repressed aspect of history – the Chinese's experience of xenophobia.

### Postcolonialism

The underlying message depicted through magic realism might also be seen as an example of the writer's reference to colonialism and an example of his postcolonial approach.<sup>7</sup> This is more explicitly discussed by Woodcock (1996), who explores the multidimensional elements of *Illywhacker* in *Peter Carey*. Similarly to Hassall, Woodcock acknowledges the postmodern underpinnings of the novel:

*Illywhacker* examines twentieth-century Australian history with the savage humour and fantasy of the earlier fiction now placed within an epic framework. The result is a novel with energy, panache and sardonic vision, which mixes family history with satirical fable and fantasy in an abundance of play and arraignment. Like *Bliss*, *Illywhacker* transgresses and undermines presumptions of formal continuity and genre coherence: it both entertains and indicts as it investigates the construction of fundamental Australian mythologies, the visions, dreams and lies of the national psyche. In the process, it deconstructs the contemporary state of the nation. (1996:53)

---

7. Refer to Barry for a detailed account of the different approaches. For example, regarding postcolonialism: "Characteristically, post-colonial writers evoke or create a precolonial version of their own nation, rejecting the modern and the contemporary, which is tainted with the colonial status of their countries" (Barry, 187:2009).

But unlike Hassall, Woodcock examines national identity as well as the novel's postcolonial appearance in a postmodern context: "Carey's novel creates an exposé of the colonial process through a post-modern extravagance and the way various narrative elements adopt emblematic qualities" (1996:54). Therefore Woodcock describes the imagery of the novel as a direct link to postcolonial matters. He also studies the representation of the three historical periods of Australian history in *Illywhacker*, claiming that the novel's time period parallels colonial events: *Illywhacker* "depicts a particular phase of Australian culture and nationalism, a search for identity which went wrong" (Woodcock, 1996:57).

### Deconstructionism

Woodcock's analysis of the multidimensional qualities of *Illywhacker* also briefly refers to the deconstructive aspects of its postmodern, postcolonial, representation. However, in Edwards's (1998) book, *Theories of Play and Postmodern Fiction*, this critic specifically studies the postmodern aspect of *Illywhacker* from a deconstructionist's point of view: "Carey's representation, in Badgery, of the author as bricoleur, exemplifies the play in postmodernist construction by featuring the positive possibilities in collusion against totalities" (1998:253). This is done by means of placing underlying messages in Herbert's buildings, which are ruined constructions and representations of the novel's underlying messages: "Combining the idea of Australians on display with the idea of building, and text, as products of 'bricolage,' this novel pet-shop (and the novel as pet-shop) presents the double play of parody together with its postmodernist pastiche upon early twentieth-century Australian history" (Edwards, 1998:247).<sup>8</sup> One can therefore observe the multiple meanings of imagery in *Illywhacker* as representative of its deconstructive approach and a critique upon Australia. For example, this is also evident from the marginalised figures of Australian history, represented by, for example, Herbert and Leah as unconventional figures who should not according to normal standards play a significant part in the bigger history of Australia.

---

8. A brief reference can be made to Jacques Derrida's concept of "différance" (Melchert, 2011:705-707), which plays on the *difference* that accommodates signification (a novel is not a pet-shop), but which also acknowledges *deferral* of actual presence in signification (a novel, therefore, can be seen as a pet-shop).

## Historicism

The topic of history<sup>9</sup> is an important aspect of *Illywhacker* observed from different angles by the above-mentioned critics. According to Blaber and Gilman, Herbert reverses the order of history by laying claim on historical aspects that are generally not regarded as critically important: “Carey has reversed the traditional reporting of history. One common approach to writing history is the ‘great man’ theory of history, in which the earth-shattering events are reflected in the leader’s part in the unfolding of them. In *Illywhacker* Carey gives the opposite view from the bottom of the scale, the ‘little man’ version of history” (1990:58). According to Hassall, Herbert’s reference to history makes us aware of its fluctuations and misrepresentations: “As Herbert confesses, his story-telling is built on masks and deception, on fooling and trickery, but it also illuminates our narratives of reality, it catches the feel and the rhythms of its historical context, and if it did not we would not engage imaginatively with it” (1994:86). According to Woodcock, Herbert represents a character who lives the history of his nation: “His narrative blends the local with the national, indicating that in Australia the two are synonymous and overlap with a proximity difficult to envisage in many other national contexts” (1996:58). According to Edwards, Herbert’s building capacities represent his interpretation of history and the reader’s conscious making of its aspects: “Herbert Badgery’s preoccupation with building houses is analogous to building the historical text and old preoccupations with constructing a national consciousness” (1998:248). And finally, according to Snodgrass, Herbert reveals the hidden qualities of history that readers are too afraid to confront: “Herbert debunks the glorification of the New World expansionism by turning it into a freak show with himself as ringmaster. His scams branch into a framework for a nationalistic overview of Australian history” (2010:121). From the different interpretations of the historical significance of *Illywhacker*, one may notice a trend developing in the linking of different readings.

In relation to the above-mentioned opinions of history, Gaile (2010) specifically focuses on the topic of historicism in his text *Rewriting History: Peter Carey’s Fictional Biography of*

---

9. Gaile gives an account of historical perspectives in the contemporary period: “In both the theoretical reconceptualization of historical discourse and the actual revision of, say, the history of nations, persons, or social groups that have been misrepresented in traditional accounts of past human experience, the ‘postist’ discourses of the last three decades stand out as the most consequential influence. Postmodernism with its anti-authorizing agenda and its ‘incredulity towards metanarratives’, poststructuralism with its debunking of history’s linguistic constructedness, and postcolonialism with its emphasis on the centre-margin dichotomy in the relation between the colonies and the imperial centre have, together, prepared the intellectual ground for feminist historians to rewrite *history* into *herstory*, for authors in the former colonies of the British Empire to rewrite their histories and thus write back to the imperial centre, for all other marginalized players in the historical concert to write their historic selves into being, and finally, for Carey to rewrite the history of Australia” (20-21:2010).

*Australia*. Gaile pulls together all the strands of different approaches applicable to Carey's corpus: Carey's "writings respond to the same cultural currents that Jean Baudrillard, Michel Foucault, or Edward Said, for instance, have analysed in their theoretical work. This is why Carey's fiction has proved to be particularly approachable through postmodern and postcolonial critical concepts" (2010:8). But the specific approach Gaile applies to his study of *Illywhacker* and Carey's other texts, is historicism: Carey uses "postmodernist, postcolonialist and poststructuralist writerly strategies and techniques... [to] deflate the master narrative of Australian history and help the author install a new version in its stead" (2010:9). According to Gaile, *Illywhacker* is one of Carey's texts that introduces a new form of history called "mythistory", which is "a type of discourse that eschews the essentials of traditional Western epistemology and necessitates a recalibration of the bearings of those readers who still think in categories such as true and false, right and wrong, fact and fiction" (2010:11).

### Post-Jungian Criticism

Regarding the above mentioned contextualisation of the different readings that are applicable to the novel *Illywhacker*, it is important to remember that this only forms the contextualisation for this dissertation.<sup>10</sup> Chapter I serves as a backdrop and estimation of the time period in which the novel was written. Displaying the different approaches that are applicable in a study of *Illywhacker* provides an account of different theoretical angles, but it does not specifically use any of these approaches as a methodology. One of the aims of this study is to apply a single approach with the aim of obtaining new information.

A prominent parallel between our discussion of the trickster in *Illywhacker* from a Jungian point of view and the above contextualisation of Carey's critics can be observed in the theme of history. This is a prominent feature of *Illywhacker* and the character Herbert Badgery is used to depict a history of the unconventional events of Australian society, which, due to its peripheral, undesirable nature is usually regarded as senseless information. From a Jungian analytical point of view, one of the trickster's purposes is to place an uncensored view of history before the individual, holding the "earlier low intellectual and moral level before the eyes of the more highly developed individual, so that he shall not forget how things looked yesterday" (Jung, 1969:267). The trickster's message is that we should not forget about the odd snippets of

---

10. Another theoretical approach that may be important, but has not been mentioned, is reception theory.

information that have not been included in history, but are just as much a part of history as the great events.

The trickster serves as a vehicle of the unconscious, perceivable as what Jung calls “the shadow” archetype, upon which individuals may project all their undesired feelings. Regarding our study of the shadow archetype in *Illywhacker*, Herbert as trickster contains the shadow of Australian society by holding all its repressed undesirable feelings and memories in a single image. Herbert does not represent a perfect character that evades critique, since he acts more upon impulse than reason and behaves instinctually on certain occasions, maintaining a connection with his shadow and the actions it is capable of performing. However, what does the trickster’s message mean on a psychological level? This will be discussed as a subtopic in relation to the bigger question of the purpose of a novel such as *Illywhacker*.

A final word needs to be said about the concept of post-Jungian criticism, which is an notable feature among Jungian critics applying Jung from a contemporary point of view. The term post-Jungian originates in the thought of Samuels who coined it in *Jung and the Post-Jungians*. According to Samuels he uses the “term *post-Jungian* in preference to *Jungian* to indicate both connectedness to Jung and distance from him” (2003:15). This is an important development, since it both links with Jung in contemporary terms and revises certain of his ideas. It explains, for instance, how Jung can be used in combination with modern scientific matters that were not available in his time. Samuels’ ideas are also revisited in texts such as *The Cambridge Companion to Jung* (2008), *Post-Jungian Criticism: Theory and Practice* (2004), and *Jung, Psychology, Postmodernity* (2007). Though this dissertation consciously makes use of Jung in a contemporary context, a post-Jungian approach is not specifically applied in its methodology. It must be borne in mind, however, that Carey’s interaction with possible Jungian elements is unique; from this point of view, the novel assures its own “post-Jungian” nature, as will be seen.

## CHAPTER II: THEORETICAL CONCEPTS

Chapter III of this dissertation classifies the trickster in *Illywhacker* (Carey, 1985) according to a selection of qualities obtained from the mythological figure “Mercurius” as described in Jung’s commentary, “On the Psychology of the Trickster-figure” (Jung, 1969:255-272). The purpose of this classification is to establish proof and an explanation of the trickster’s archetypal nature, his “therapeutic effect,” and his relation to individuation, in *Illywhacker*. This will be done by examining the character Herbert Badgery through relevant examples from the novel, and comparing him to “Mercurius.”<sup>11</sup> Effectively, this parallel will display the archetypal qualities in the novel by illustrating repeated patterns between two figures from different contexts. From the data uncovered we will determine if a therapeutic effect takes place and what its psychoanalytical influences on the reader might be. A study of the trickster within contemporary fiction is of value because of the noticeable continuation of trickster related stories<sup>12</sup> and their contribution to individual psychological development, such as “individuation”.

The primary theoretical motivation for this dissertation derives from a Jungian analytical approach, which forms the basis of the above-mentioned classification. Chapter II examines a selection of concepts concerning Jungian analysis and uses them to obtain a clearer understanding of Jung’s theory, his description of the trickster and the application of his theory to this dissertation. Concepts such as “therapeutic effect,” “personal unconscious,” “collective unconscious,” “individuation,” “complex,” “archetype,” “ego,” “self,” and “shadow,” are noteworthy, since they are used in Chapter III to examine the trickster figure’s archetypal qualities in *Illywhacker* and to signify how these elements, within the novel, promote a possible psychoanalytic influence on the reader. Therefore, a theoretical contextualisation is necessary prior to an application of the theory to the novel. Note that a hermeneutical reading will examine the contents of the primary text, after which the data gathered will be used to exemplify the theoretical approach and contribute to a broader understanding of the novel.

---

11. Although Mercurius is used as a measure, this study is also placed alongside the other examples provided by Jung (1969:255-272).

12. It is evident from trickster related studies and the continual manifestation of tricksters that the trickster remains an important psychological asset to humanity, regardless of the negative response his unorthodox behaviour evokes. For example, an evident trend of trickster-related stories and figures stems from ancient Greek mythology to present day literature and films. See Doty’s and Hynes’s (1993) *Mythical Tricksters: Contours, Contexts, and Criticisms*, as well as Bassil-Morozow’s (2012) *The Trickster in Contemporary Film*.

Jungian analysis was founded by Carl Gustav Jung, a Swiss psychiatrist of the twentieth century who had an interest in academic disciplines, such as, philosophy, mythology,<sup>13</sup> art and psychology. His ideas follow upon psychology theorists, such as, Wilhelm Wundt, Sigmund Freud, and Alfred Adler, who established the basis of the discipline of psychology; philosophers, such as Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling,<sup>14</sup> and Friedrich Nietzsche; and occasionally literary writers, such as William Blake and Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. Jung was also influenced in practice by psychologists, such as Sabina Naftulovna Spielrein, and Otto Hans Adolf Gross, and by his spouse Emma Jung. Of all these influences, Freud had a major impact on Jung's conceptual development, since Jung was a student, colleague, and friend of Freud. Both Jung and Freud shared similar views for several years, specifically during the period of the development of psychology and psychoanalysis as a new discipline; however, when Jung developed his own theory about the psyche in contradiction to Freud, communication between them came to an end.

Apart from a brief contextualisation, it is important to clarify how the influence of Jung's work contributes to a better understanding of the discussion at hand. Psychology is a diverse discipline that nevertheless often applies the same subject-terminology or underlying notions, using interdisciplinary examples to illustrate certain points, but according to different approaches and understandings. For example, in brief, Jung classifies the unconscious as a combination of both the "personal unconscious" and "collective unconscious", whereas Freud classifies the unconscious as a container singularly connected to an individual to store rejected psychic matter from the "id", "ego" and "superego". This indicates that a concept such as the unconscious is applied by both theorists, but in different ways; this is not to mention the other psychologists who also make use of the unconscious in an alternative manner. According to Meyer, one of the primary differences between Freud and Jung is as follows:

According to Freud, people are perpetually trapped in a conflict between their instinctual drives and the demands of society. Jung, in contrast, sees people as orientated towards a

---

13. Here it is of relevance to refer to the definition of mythology, which is an important element to the discussion at hand. Abrams defines myth and mythology in a literary context: "a myth is one story in a mythology – a system of hereditary stories of ancient origin which were once believed to be true by a particular cultural group, and which served to explain (in terms of the intentions and actions of deities and other supernatural beings) why the world is as it is and things happen as they do, to provide a rationale for social customs and observances, and to establish the sanctions for the rules by which people conduct their lives" (230:2012). It is also further explained by Abrams that Jung regards myth in his study of the "collective unconscious": "Jung regards great literature as, like the *myths* whose patterns recur in diverse cultures, an expression of the archetypes of the collective racial unconscious" (323:2012).

14. Meyer notes the influence of philosophical thought on Jung's work: "Like philosophers such as Hegel and Schelling, Jung ascribes the development of the psyche or consciousness to a dialectical relationship between opposing forces" (2008:95).

perpetual creative development in striving to achieve a complete self. For Jung this is the effect of a religious drive in the human being. (2008:94)

Freud is focused on the biological behaviour of humans, linking the human psyche to natural response; whereas Jung regards the human psyche as a more complex and spiritual phenomenon susceptible to a variety of stimuli. Both views are applicable in the field of psychology, though Freud precedes Jung and was the first theorist to establish and practice the concept of psychoanalysis. Therefore the theoretical opinions of Freud receive higher acclaim than Jung's and are more generally practiced by psychologists today: "His theory plays an important role in the training of psychologists and psychiatrists throughout the world" (Meyer, 2008:88).

Thus, within the politics of the discipline of psychology, theorists such as Sigmund Freud, Abraham Maslow, B. F. Skinner, Victor Frankl and Carl Rogers,<sup>15</sup> are favoured and professionally accepted above Jung. In effect, this may cause students with a background primarily informed by these favoured theorists to misinterpret Jungian concepts, and fail to notice that Jungian analysis is a self-sufficient discipline with its own distinct nature in psychology. It is important to acknowledge the theorists who use the same general terminology that Jung applies in his own work, but it is primarily important to note that Jungian concepts should be explained and related to Jung's own theoretical framework in his *Collected Works* (a principle that should also apply for other psychology theorists, such as Freud). Misinterpretation occurs due to the overlapping concepts that are accepted as joint rather than distinct:

Some critics dismiss Jung's theories as unclear, incomprehensible and contradictory. Such criticism is often levelled by those who do not study Jung's work as a whole, and therefore do not understand the theory. Jung's work should preferably be studied in its totality and within its own framework, and should not be dealt with eclectically. (Meyer, 2008:123)

Specifically in literature, scholars have an over-enthusiastic view of Freud's work, which was popularised by Jacques Lacan, who modified Freud's theory and applied it to postmodern literature and theory.<sup>16</sup> If a scholar overemphasises Freudian concepts and unwarily applies them to a Jungian reading without considering Jung's distinctive descriptions of the terminology in use, Jung's concepts may not make sense in their actual context (unless discretion is used).

---

15. For an example of contemporary sources favouring one theorist above another, refer to Weiten's (2007) *Psychology: Themes and Variations* and Meyer's (2008) *Personology: From Individual to Ecosystem*.

16. A lack of detailed elaboration on the topic of Jungian analysis in literature in regard to psychoanalytic criticism can be observed in Moran's (2010) *Interdisciplinarity*, chapter three; and, Barry's (2009) *Beginning Theory*, chapter five.

This dissertation's use of Jungian analysis does not confine it to an umbrella-term classification of psychoanalytic criticism, but applies it qualitatively in accordance with a selection of concepts derived from Jung's *Collected Works*, and therefore without recourse to alternative psychoanalytic theories *per se*. It is important to note that this will not be done in the context of psychology as a discipline, with reference to a patient case study, since research in the discipline of psychology is usually performed in a practice and, obviously, requires a psychology degree. Rather, this is a literary study that applies Jung's theory to fiction, since the theory is also applicable to certain disciplines and fields of expertise, such as languages and art.

Jungian concepts, such as the "archetype" and the "collective unconscious", are of relevance to a study in literature, because they are believed to be present in the individual (reader or patient) as well as the collective (society, literature or mythology). These concepts can be explained using examples from the novel, and afterwards be studied for the effect their portrayal has on similar elements that resonate within the reader's psyche. For example, literature contains examples of repetitive symbols and patterns such as "mythical figures", which "correspond to inner psychic experiences" (Jung, 1969:256) of an individual and society in general. In this regard, literature acts as a mirror, which reflects familiar unconscious contents of an individual's and collective's psyches that may have become hidden due to repression: "Whoever goes to himself risks a confrontation with himself. The mirror does not flatter, it faithfully shows whatever looks into it; namely, the face we never show to the world because we cover it with the *persona*, the mask of the actor. But the mirror lies behind the mask and shows the true face" (Jung, 1969:20). In other words, literature reflects the individual psyche, which has an unconscious connection to literature through repeated psychic patterns. Reading literature may possibly lead to increased consciousness and, hopefully, individuation. If the novel begins to act in a therapeutic way, and the reader notices the multiple appearances of archetypal components in the collective and self, it becomes possible for him to reflect on the psychoanalytical values of this effect, such as individuation (to be discussed below).

## Section 1: Jungian Criticism

Jungian terminology is based on an interconnected framework, which requires a description of each subject-specific concept in relation to the term discussed. For example, the “therapeutic effect” of a trickster is related to Jung’s concepts of “individuation,” “ego,” “personal unconscious,” “collective unconscious,” “archetype” and “complex”. Therefore, it is of relevance to look at each of these concepts to clarify Jung’s description of the trickster figure and its purpose. In this section a brief description of each specific concept will be provided.

The aim of using Jungian terminology in an examination of Carey’s novel *Illywhacker* is to prove that the trickster figure in literature still remains of value on an unconscious psychological level, despite his tomfoolery (also discussed in Chapter II Section 2 and Chapter III) that may seem unusable due to its more recognisable surface level appearance. Jung claims that the trickster “continues to make its influence felt on the highest levels of civilization, even where, on account of his stupidity and grotesque scurrility, the trickster no longer plays the role of a ‘delight maker’” (Jung, 1969:262). This does not imply that one should become encouraged by the trickster to mimic amoral conduct; in fact, if the reader correlates the trickster’s wickedness with his importance as a character, and uses this as an excuse to re-enact criminal behaviour, the trickster may lose his transformative value (morally or ethically speaking). We should rather determine why people choose to sustain the trickster, despite the risk of misinterpreting his behaviour, in contradiction to the general societal norm, which is to banish amoral behaviour.

### Therapeutic Effect and Individuation

The purpose of a trickster can be listed according to two values. Firstly, according to Jung the trickster’s value and purpose is to create a “therapeutic effect” by holding “the earlier low intellectual and moral level before the eyes of the more highly developed individual, so that he shall not forget how things looked yesterday” (Jung, 1969:267). Secondly, the trickster inspires a process known as individuation; however, in Jung’s commentary of the trickster he does not specifically refer to a related case study of individuation, due to the limitations of his commentary. He provides us with a departure point by referring to “the trickster as a parallel of the individual shadow” (Jung, 1969:270), but leaves it free to explore further the individuating qualities of the trickster. The implication of the therapeutic effect and individuation regarding a

study of *Illywhacker* is to figuratively or symbolically reflect on the Jungian analytical values that can be attained from examples from the novel. This will in effect demonstrate how the novel relates to the therapeutic effect and individuation processes, from which the reason can be determined as to why people choose to nourish the trickster figure through literature, and certain forms of entertainment, despite his inappropriate behaviour.

The therapeutic effect and individuation are two distinguishable Jungian concepts that are both representative of the psychological processes that might occur during a reading of *Illywhacker*. It is important to note the difference between these processes, since literature may contain a therapeutic effect but it does not with certainty inspire recognition of the effect, nor does the effect automatically initiate individuation. It remains an individual's responsibility to discover this therapeutic effect and it is his choice whether or not to use this newfound knowledge as a means of individuation. For example, *Illywhacker* may inspire the reader to individuate through its therapeutic effect, but it remains up to him to discover and integrate the novel's message into his own psychological development.

The therapeutic effect serves as a starting point, or catalyst, of individuation. It informs the reader of psychological contents that impact on his psyche, such as the "subject" and "object". Jung explains:

...it consists in the dissolution of *participation mystique*. By a stroke of genius, Lévy-Bruhl singled out what he called *participation mystique* as being the hallmark of the primitive mentality. What he meant by it is simply the indefinitely large remnant of non-differentiation between subject and object, which is still so great among primitives that it cannot fail to strike our European consciousness very forcibly. When there is no consciousness of the difference between subject and object, an unconscious identity prevails. The unconscious is then projected into the object, and the object is introjected into the subject, becoming part of his psychology. (Jung, 1967:45)

Jung refers to the therapeutic effect as a method for the "primitive mentality" to distinguish the "subject" from the "object" when it is caught up in a "participation mystique" (as explained by Jung, a concept described by Lévy-Bruhl, who is a scholar of mythology). From a generalised view, "primitive" refers to the unaware or undeveloped mind-sets of people, specifically ancient or historical civilisations that are studied through mythology; "mentality" refers to an individual's proclivity to think in a certain manner, in this case one that does not distinguish between "subject" and "object"; "subject" refers to the individual who, say, portrays the

mythology; and “object” refers to the external or internal entity being portrayed. Even though Jung refers to the primitive mentality in the context of mythology, it is applicable to contemporary existence as well as primitive existence. The individual’s primitive mentality surfaces when he fails to realise that subject related psychological matters are unwarily being “projected” from himself as the subject onto the object – “to assimilate all outer sense experiences to inner, psychic events... that is, [they are] mirrored in the events of nature” (Jung, 1969:6). As we’ve seen, due to a lack of consciousness this primitive mentality does not distinguish between the subject and the object, but perceives them as similar (if not congruent), and measures one through the other, generally from a one-sided perspective. As a solution to this participation mystique bias, the therapeutic effect inspires the primitive mentality to develop the ability to determine whether subject matter is being projected onto the object, or to realise when the subject introjects object matter into the personal unconscious.

An example from *Illywhacker* might help clarify the above description of the therapeutic effect. Compare the characters Jack McGrath to Herbert Badgery in a scene where Herbert confesses to Jack that he “lied about the aircraft factory” (Carey, 1985:68). In this scene of Book I, Chapter 26, Jack falls victim to a primitive mentality, because he fails to realise and accept the harsh reality of the truth Herbert unveils. Consequently Jack does not distinguish between his unconscious desire for Herbert to embody the ideal image he wishes for and Herbert’s actual identity: ““You say you’re a liar, but I’ve seen nothing dishonest in you”” (Carey, 1985:68-69). Jack’s unrealistic desire for Herbert to represent the character he wishes for is an example of the subject’s, Jack’s, projection of his unconscious onto the object, Herbert. Also, Jack’s inability to differentiate between his own demands and Herbert as someone independent from Jack is an example of participation mystique in *Illywhacker*. Eventually Jack manages to see Herbert’s actual nature, but he is not psychologically ready to accept the reality of the truth, and presumably commits suicide. From a Jungian point of view it can be argued that Jack is unable to accept that the shadow archetype Herbert resembles is a projected image of Jack’s shadow complex, hence an aspect of his own identity.

Though Jack has a primitive mentality, the novel does not remain in a state of “non-differentiation” or being subject to the participation mystique. Herbert inspires a therapeutic effect in *Illywhacker*, which can be observed in another example where Herbert displays the ability to differentiate between history as an object for the subject to project unconscious material onto, and history as only an object that consist of remnants similar to the subject’s projections of his own identity. He does not view the unconventional bits and pieces of history in

the typical fashion that the subject might, in using it for the projection of a negative complex. For example, Herbert realises that his forefathers were liars, but he confesses that the lies are an evident part of his identity as an Australian and not the only cause of his behaviour. He quotes from the fictional Australian historian, M. V. Anderson: “Our forefathers were all great liars... It is in the context of this great foundation stone that we must begin our study of Australian history’... It was M. V. Anderson who showed me that a liar might be a patriot” (Carey, 1985:429). He does not use history as an excuse to project his shadow upon, but acknowledges his understanding of the flaws made by his forefathers within Australian history, and admits that he remains an inherent liar despite this discovery: “I am a terrible liar and I have always been a liar. I say that early to set things straight” (Carey, 1985:3). He acknowledges the distinction between subject, with his inherent habit of lying, and object, the lies through history, which is one example of Herbert’s ability to portray the therapeutic effect of *Illywhacker*. Unfortunately Herbert’s ability to recognise his mistakes does not make him a hero, since he continues to act amorally despite the wisdom he attains. Symbolically, once again from a Jungian perspective, the difference between Jack and Herbert is an example of the consequences that follow when the ego refuse to accept the shadow, as in the case of Jack, and what happens when the individual over-identifies with the shadow, as in the case of Herbert.

The therapeutic effect of the trickster serves as a tool to symbolically mirror contents from the unconscious onto the reader to make him aware of the differentiation between subject and object, as well as the internal workings of the psyche. This is similar to Jung’s description of “the therapeutic method of complex psychology” that “consists on the one hand in making as fully conscious as possible the constellated unconscious contents, and on the other hand in synthesizing them with consciousness through the act of recognition” (1969:40). The effect *Illywhacker* has on the reader as subject is similar to the therapeutic effect Herbert displays in the novel. *Illywhacker* mirrors the hidden elements of the psyche through figures such as a trickster, who re-enacts the amoral characteristics of society in a controlled medium. For example, the trickster’s actions are in opposition to societal norms, which may reflect on the reader’s own life but which have become an avoided topic, hidden in the depths of the unconscious, due to their taboo nature. By observing the trickster, we may once again become aware of, recognise or reflect on the shadow archetype that has been forgotten or may well have become a projected image, similar to a participation mystique. If the individual recognises the trickster’s effect, he can integrate the trickster’s messages into his own psychological development and understanding of the unconscious’s influence on the conscious.

Individuation follows on the therapeutic effect and is a psychoanalytical process through which “a synthesis of the two positions” (Jung, 1969:40), conscious and unconscious, takes place.<sup>17</sup> Whereas a therapeutic effect serves as a mirroring of the reader’s prejudiced psychological contents to make him aware of the subject, object, and in effect the unconscious, individuation requires the individual to work through, or with, personal psychological contents of the unconscious. In other words it encourages individuals to apply what they learned from the therapeutic effect to their own lives. According to Jung, the outcome of individuation denotes “the process by which a person becomes a psychological ‘in-dividual,’ that is, a separate, indivisible unity or ‘whole’” (Jung, 1969:275). Jung explains that this can be attained through synthesising the opposites of conscious and unconscious:

Conscious and unconscious do not make a whole when one of them is suppressed and injured by the other. If they must contend, let it at least be a fair fight with equal rights on both sides. Both are aspects of life. Consciousness should defend its reason and protect itself, and the chaotic life of the unconscious should be given the chance of having its way too – as much of it as we can stand. This means open conflict and open collaboration at once. That, evidently, is the way human life should be. It is the old game of hammer and anvil: between them the patient iron is forged into an indestructible whole, an ‘in-dividual.’

This, roughly, is what I mean by the individuation process. As the name shows, it is a process or course of development arising out of the conflict between the two fundamental psychic facts. (Jung, 1969:288)

In this metaphorical description, Jung makes use of the denoted characteristics of the conscious and the unconscious in order to depict the process of individuation. It is a process through which the individual, the ego, willingly introspects on his psychological makeup by specifically reflecting on the effect his self, his unconscious (personal and collective) and the contents from the unconscious (complexes and archetypes), have on his conscious behaviour. Therefore individuation is a psychological maturing process through which an individual becomes aware of the unapparent or abstract psychological elements that influence his identity. As explained by Jung, this is done by means of integrating the surface level psychic contents of the ego with the more obscure psychic contents of the self that seem less active in daily life, but nonetheless have an influence on an individual’s identity. This is a noteworthy activity that prevents the manifestation of a perpetual frame of mind that continues to relay conflict to external situations

---

17. Refer back to this description of individuation from pages 83, 92 and concluding chapter.

or represses it as an insignificant internal matter when it should preferably be processed into consciousness.

A brief illustration is necessary to clarify the use of individuation in this discussion, as it becomes an important topic. Take the reader of the novel *Illywhacker* as an example. An emotional response that may have been repressed within the reader's unconscious (perhaps because of society's being repulsed by the response) now becomes a primary concern in the novel he is busy reading. Consider the section of the novel in which Herbert Badgery unveils himself to Jack McGrath, who fails to recognise him for the person he is, because Jack only approves of certain standards (and believes Herbert abides by them) without showing interest in who the real Herbert is, until it is too late (Carey, 1981:68). First, a therapeutic effect takes place in which the reader recognises the influence of the novel's contents on his unconscious. This may be an overwhelming feeling of despair, depression, anger, remorse, or guilt, which is directed towards either Herbert or Jack. A continuous mindfulness of this influence, which resonates with the reader's own unconscious contents, may help alleviate the psychological blockage within him.

Second, the reader decides to determine the cause of his psychological turmoil that has been inspired by a character such as Herbert, and here the cause may result in countless explanations, each involving a specific context of a single individual. A brief example is offered. Herbert's unsound, rebellious or unorthodox behaviour may represent an earlier stage of the reader's own development as an adolescent in which he may have been scolded (in a similar fashion to Herbert and Jack) by his father for apparently unacceptable behaviour. Unfortunately for the reader, his father failed to recognise that the actions he disapproved were his son's way of discovering his identity as an individual. The actions in themselves are not to blame; the complex resides in the emotional state that the actions cause due to the fact that no proper explanation was provided as to why they are unacceptable. Due to the continuous discomfort inflicted upon the reader, he decides to rather repress his emotions surrounding the voicing of his own identity. This repression revolves around the father archetype, since it was his father who made him understand that there must be something wrong with his identity, and due to the negative effect the repression has on the individual's individuation, this is regarded as a negative father complex. Once again, the father is not the primary cause of the complex; the cause is rather the manner in which the son interprets the punishment.

If the reader realises that the situation between Jack and Herbert represents a similar father-son situation to what he experienced, he may determine that the effect the novel has on him is also directly related to a past experience that affects him emotionally. By means of then making himself aware of the deep rooted father complex that has an effect on him through the novel (and there could be many other cases within the novel), the reader may be able to begin an individuation process.

### Ego and Self

To clarify how the reader's individuation process is influenced by the novel's therapeutic effect, it is important to classify the different elements of the psyche that are involved in this process. This brings us to the next part of the discussion, from psychoanalytic processes such as the therapeutic effect and individuation, to the centres of the psyche, which contain the psychological contents of an individual. Regarding individuation as discussed previously, an individual's conscious mind is connected to his ego, which is the centre of his awareness; and the unconscious (and ego, though this might at first-sight seem contradictory) is connected to the self, which is the centre of his psyche. The ego is the developing part of the human psyche that defines the individual's identity as he perceives it and makes sense of reality by use of reason and rationality. Logically the individual perceives the ego as "I", the primary perceiver of reality, and accepts it as the main coordinator of his existence. However, according to Jung the ego resides within the bigger part of an individual known as the self, which is a part of the human psyche that governs the processes people are mainly unaware of, and due to its mysterious nature is mostly classified as irrational. On the one hand, the individual as a human being, who is awake, aware, and governs his decisions and behaviour in the immediate moment of time, is the ego. On the other hand, the self is a compilation of all the factors that enfold an individual, including the ego. Jung explains:

By ego I understand a complex of ideas which constitutes the centre of my field of consciousness and appears to possess a high degree of continuity and identity... But inasmuch as the ego is only the centre of my field of consciousness, it is not identical with the totality of my psyche, being merely one complex among other complexes. I therefore distinguish between the ego and the *self* (q.v.), since the ego is only the subject of my consciousness, while the self is the subject of my total psyche, which also includes the unconscious. (Jung, 1971:425)

The ego and self are in a sense co-dependent: without the self it is impossible for the ego to exist, since the ego is an entity that develops from the self; and without the ego there would be no conscious entity to perceive and interpret the self. However, as Jung explains, they are at war with each other. Human beings' conscious development grants them the ability to perceive and control their egos, but they are only capable to a limited extent of understanding the self and the ego's relation to it. In effect, the ego perceives itself as the primary determiner of its existence, because it remains fixated on the things it has control over, when it is in fact determined by a multitude of factors over which it has little or no control. An unaware ego may even believe he is the single factor that influences his immediate decisions, when they are in fact also governed by contents of the self. Therefore, from a Jungian point the ego is the psychological centre that perceives the novel consciously in the moment of reading; however, the self is the psychological centre that actually contains the unperceived whole, which also defines the ego who perceives the novel and contains the contents that unconsciously help the ego make sense of the novel.

#### Personal Unconscious and Collective Unconscious

The ego is the psychological centre of an individual's conscious mind and the self is the psychological centre of an individual's complete being, and more specifically the unconscious. This unconscious is seminal to the discussion at hand, because it is an important part of the psyche that the individual quite easily misperceives due to its irrational nature, and it is quite evidently portrayed throughout the novel *Illywhacker* if the individual knows where to look for it. For example, Herbert and Leah represent two egos that travel from town to town in Australia; though they are individual beings, they are related to other individuals in history through the unconscious:

I would rather fill my history with great men and women, philosophers, scientists, intellectuals, artists, but I confess myself incapable of so vast a lie. I am stuck with Badgery & Goldstein (Theatricals) wandering through the 1930s, like flies on the face of a great painting, travelling up and down the curlicues of the frame, complaining that our legs are like lead and the glare from all that gilt is wearying our eyes, arguing about the nature of life and our place in the world while – I now know – Niels Bohr was postulating the presence of the neutrino, while matter itself was being proved insubstantial, while Hitler – that black spider – was weaving his unholy lies.

Lies, dreams, visions – they were everywhere. We brushed them aside as carelessly as spider webs across a garden path. They clung to us, of course, adhered to our clothes and trailed behind us but we were too busy arguing to note their presence. (Carey, 1985:304)

The description Herbert provides of the painting is significant to our understanding of the unconscious. Herbert and Leah are two dots that are part of a bigger picture of history as an impressionist painting in which pointillism is used as a technique. If we isolate these two dots, we can only observe two dots on a white canvas, but if we hold them in connection to a compilation of different dots we can see a picture that resembles a certain scene in history. When we observe the painting as a whole it is easy to lose sight of the single dots; the viewers may not immediately realise that single dots make out the bigger picture. However, upon careful observation we may realise that each dot is necessary to ensure a clear image. Therefore the two dots that Herbert and Leah resemble are part of the unconscious that makes out the complete history of Australia. It may also be said that Herbert travels for the sake of his own existence, he does not yet realise that his history is influenced by influential figures such as “Niels Bohr” and “Hitler.” He is concerned about his own existence and in this regard fails to recognise the unconscious; regardless, the influence of these figures clings to him like a spider web that is difficult to remove or to see before walking through it.

According to Jung, the unconscious consists of two parts; namely, the personal unconscious and the collective unconscious:

A more or less superficial layer of the unconscious is undoubtedly the personal. I call it the *personal unconscious*. But this personal unconscious rests upon a deeper layer, which does not derive from the personal experience and is not a personal acquisition but is inborn. This deeper layer I call the *collective unconscious*. I have chosen the term ‘collective’ because this part of the unconscious is not individual but universal; in contrast to the personal psyche, it has contents and modes of behaviour that are more or less the same everywhere and in all individuals. It is, in other words, identical in all men and thus constitutes a common psychic substrate of a suprapersonal nature which is present in every one of us. (Jung, 1969:3-4)

The personal unconscious contains previously conscious contents of the ego that have become unconscious, and the collective unconscious contains ever present unconscious material of the self that can only be visualised in theory, but which none-the-less influences the ego and conscious identity. The ego is related to the personal unconscious and concerns psychological

contents such as complexes; whereas the self is related to the ego, personal unconscious, complexes, collective unconscious, and psychological contents such as the archetypes. Jung describes the relation between these elements as follows:

The collective unconscious is a part of the psyche which can be negatively distinguished from a personal unconscious by the fact that it does not, like the latter, owe its existence to personal experience and consequently is not a personal acquisition. While the personal unconscious is made up essentially of contents which have at one time been conscious but which have disappeared from consciousness through having been forgotten or repressed, the contents of the collective unconscious have never been in consciousness, and therefore have never been individually acquired, but owe their existence exclusively to heredity. Whereas the personal unconscious consists for the most part of *complexes*, the content of the collective unconscious is made up essentially of *archetypes*.

The concept of the archetype, which is an indispensable correlate of the idea of the collective unconscious, indicates the existence of definite forms in the psyche which seem to be present always and everywhere. (Jung, 1969:42)

It is important to note that the self reaches beyond the individual (while still remaining connected to him and having an influence on his identity), since it is simultaneously concerned with collective matters as much as it is concerned with individual matters. For example, as mentioned previously, the reader uses the conscious ego, but the self, in relation to the ego, also uses the unconscious; at the same time it contains patterns that are also apparent in the novel, which in turn contains collective unconscious contents from the writer, specifically through its coherent symbols that are applicable to the collective. Therefore the collective unconscious is a component that makes it possible for a mirroring between the reader's psyche and the novel, which are both connected to the self. This implies that archetypes as contents of the collective unconscious are apparent in the novel as well as in the reader.

### Complexes and Archetypes

Psychological processes, such as the therapeutic effect and individuation, and psychological centres, such as the self and ego, are mainly understood through a study of the self's apparent psychological contents. These contents reside within the unconscious, a combination of the

personal and collective unconscious as explained above, which brings us to the archetypes and complexes. Jung explains his formulation of the terms “archetype” and “complex” as follows:

Psychic existence can be recognized only by the presence of contents that are *capable of consciousness*. We can therefore speak of an unconscious only in so far as we are able to demonstrate its contents. The contents of the personal unconscious are chiefly the *feeling-toned complexes*, as they are called; they constitute the personal and private side of psychic life. The contents of the collective unconscious, on the other hand, are known as *archetypes*. (Jung, 1969:4)

On the one hand, “complexes” are personalised archetypes that consist of emotional memories, which have clustered and bound themselves to the complexes during an individual’s lifetime. These complexes specifically reside within the personal unconscious of the individual psyche. On the other hand, “archetypes” are collective psychological motifs that are “archaic” “primordial types” of “universal images that have existed since the remotest of times” (Jung, 1969:5), which unconditionally manifest in the collective as well as the individual psyche. For example, archaic symbols formed as far back as the “Semitic Babylonian” or the “Old Babylonian” (Kluger, 1991:15) period. One may specifically refer to the myth of Gilgamesh, which contains examples of the collective images that have been apparent since humans had the ability to record their thought processes. Due to the complexes that cloud each individual’s understanding of the archetypes, he can never truly grasp the concept of an archetype to its full extent: “The archetype is essentially an unconscious content that is altered by becoming conscious and by being perceived, and it takes its colour from the individual consciousness in which it happens to appear” (Jung, 1969:5). However, by means of comparing independent images the residue of an archetype can be determined by specifically drawing upon the similarities that continue to manifest in these images despite subjective influence. Jung uses mythology as a medium to describe this: “All the mythologized processes of nature... are symbolic expressions of the inner, unconscious drama of the psyche which becomes accessible to man’s consciousness by way of projection” (Jung, 1969:6). In correlation with Jung, this dissertation uses literature as a medium to determine the archetypes and their relevance to the reader, since humans express their psychological make-up through language and imagination.

## Shadow and Trickster, Archetype and Complex

It can be argued that the novel *Illywhacker* represents collective psychological contents recognised as archetypes through a psychological process known as the therapeutic effect; the archetypes are apparent patterns of the unconscious that reside within the psychological centre of the self and ego. The reader whose psychological centre is the ego perceives the novel. If the ego becomes conscious of the therapeutic effect of the novel and recognises the archetypes as a mirroring component of the reader's personal psychological contents, identified as complexes, a psychological process known as individuation is inspired to take place. In order to study individuation as a psychological process, an examination of the psychological contents in relation to the psychological process is in order, which is specifically studied using examples from the text.

In Jung's commentary on the trickster he classifies the trickster as a "character-component" of the "shadow" archetype, which is evidently due to the trickster's defiant characteristics: "On the civilized level, it is regarded as a personal 'gaffe,' 'slip,' 'faux pas,' etc., which are then chalked up as defects of the conscious personality" (Jung, 1969:262). The shadow archetype has remained a psychological content of the individual and collective psyche since the dawn of civilisation, and apparently does not vanish, if we regard all of the studies performed on its reappearance through different mediums of expression.<sup>18</sup> Though the shadow archetype is represented by the trickster figure who opposes the individual's obedience of societal norms, specifically through his amoral characteristics, it remains an important component of the psyche that contributes to individuation. It can even be said that when the unconscious makes use of imagery that is clearly recognisable, the message is regarded as urgent due to the self's use of more apparent imagery to get the ego's attention. However, despite the urgent presence and importance of the shadow, it is used by the ego as a vehicle to project on the discarded aspects of the individual's identity with the hope that it will disappear in the unconscious garbage pile of the self. In contradiction to our expectations, the shadow does not just disappear and the self continues to make its influence felt by means of using relevant images or figures such as the trickster, which more easily relate to the ego's perception of reality, as a means of communication between the ego and self, to transfer the unconscious material.

---

18. Also refer to Shalit's (2008) *Enemy, Cripple & Beggar: Shadows in the Hero's Path*, which provides a useful account of the shadow.

The connection between the reader and the novel is recognised through an archetype-complex relation. The shadow archetype in relation to the shadow complex confronts the ego with contents of the self, which, as explained above, seem unimportant to the ego's conscious mind. However, these contents contain within their unapproved nature remnants of the individual's identity that can be used as a means of individuation. As an example, the ego's processing of a negative shadow complex may be referred to. The shadow archetype becomes a polarised ego complex when the ego represses negative emotional contents onto the shadow, labelled as undesired due to their provocation of a negative response from society. This happens when the individual encounters an event in which he is unable to react upon the shadow archetype in an appropriate manner, clearly in contradiction to his emotions; and without understanding the reasonable implications as to why he cannot act on impulse, he unconditionally rejects the physical act, does not deal with the importance of the emotions experienced, and represses the archetype along with the emotions attached to it into the recesses of the psyche. A negative complex of the personal unconscious generally continues to accumulate repressed emotions, which are easily placed in the same "space" due to the ego's fear to once again receive negative feedback from the collective, when in similar circumstances. In theory, the gradual repression of this complex eventually leads to a sudden burst of undesired behaviour or an unintentional projection of the negative complex on an object, which is primarily released as a form of defence against a psychological breakdown, or potential disorder. Repression will also remain a means of "solution" if the individual denies the presence of a complex in his own psyche. But when the ego becomes open to the confrontation with the self, and addresses his repressed complexes as a serious matter, he gains the opportunity to further explore the recesses of the unconscious and balance the polarised complex. Awareness of this may occur through dream analysis or more objectively by "active imagination," which may be inspired by a reading of a novel such as *Illywhacker*. According to Jung, active imagination can be described as "a sequence of fantasies produced by deliberate concentration" (Jung, 1969:49). By means of recognising the shadow as a component of the psyche, the ego becomes conscious of the influence the unconscious has on his behaviour. This clearer understanding of the dynamics of the psyche contributes to a healthier ego that can now work on the remnants of the complexes that cluster on the archetypes. Jung elaborates upon the dynamics of this confrontation with the self, as well as the benefits that can be obtained:

This confrontation is the first test of courage on the inner way, a test sufficient to frighten off most people, for the meeting with ourselves belongs to the more unpleasant things that can be avoided so long as we can project everything negative into the

environment. But if we are able to see our own shadow and can bear knowing about it, then a small part of the problem has already been solved: we have at least brought up the personal unconscious. The shadow is a living part of the personality and therefore wants to live with it in some form. It cannot be argued out of existence or rationalized into harmlessness... In the end one has to admit that there are problems which one simply cannot solve on one's own resources. Such an admission has the advantage of being honest, truthful, and in accord with reality, and this prepares the ground for a compensatory reaction from the collective unconscious: you are now more inclined to give heed to a helpful idea or intuition, or to notice thoughts which had not been allowed to voice themselves before. (Jung, 1969:20-21)

At this point of the discussion it is important to realise that the focus on the shadow does not revolve around the amoral behaviour of the trickster and whether we should mimic this behaviour or justify its nature in order to individuate. Preferably this should not be the case, unless an examination that specifically focuses on justifying morality is involved. It is absolutely normal to be disgusted by the portrayal of criminal acts that completely disregard social boundaries; in some cases it is absurd to even continue reading if the text completely lacks moral integrity, which may also render it useless in certain circumstances to even consider seeing value in a demoralising text. However, this is not the case with *Illywhacker*, which is a novel that has been peer reviewed, so to speak, by a number of literary critics. For example, we find comments such as: "Carey is a poet of fear, and the tales that he tells explore the blacker recesses of the psyche, both personal and national... For a writer who does not simply exploit traditional genres or cater for conventional expectations, Carey's books have sold extremely well, and he has received many literary awards and prizes" (Hassall, 1994:2-3). Therefore, it is of value to determine whether the trickster in *Illywhacker* does in fact represent an archetype such as the shadow. If this proves to be the case, we can determine if this archetype relates to a polarised shadow complex that for some reason evokes a distinct emotion connected to the ego.

By determining the type of emotion the ego experiences while reading *Illywhacker* it becomes possible to gain a clearer understanding of the reason a complex became polarised by the individual. In effect, the physical act of amoral conduct should be rendered useless, but the discovery of an individual's emotion surrounding this act becomes important. The act in itself becomes trivial, because the complex and emotion it evoked can now be distinguished as components of the personal unconscious and self, and the ego now gains the ability to address the significance of his emotions rather than to repeat immoral behaviour or repress insecure emotions of the past once again; now a more rational reason as to why the physical act is

regarded as immoral by societal norms can also be developed. An understanding of this binary position of the complex sheds light upon the darker regions of the psyche that seem to be forgotten, but still affect daily behaviour.

A literary example from the novel is of relevance in order to explain how the above mentioned process may occur in actuality. It is already evident that the reader can identify an archetype of the shadow in the literary character of Herbert, whose characteristics complement shadow behaviour; however, he is an example of an individual who also suffers from a polarised complex.<sup>19</sup> Two points are of note. First, it is interesting to note the appearance of an archetype within the boundaries of the novel. For example, Herbert alludes to the founding (colonising) fathers of Australia, which despite being from the modern era have already become archaic images of history. He describes the Australian history of “[o]ur forefathers” (Carey, 1985:429) as lies, and he also recognises “thumb print[s]” on the bricks of Charles Badgery’s house, which according to Herbert have been embedded by “convicts” who produced bricks “at Brickfields a hundred-and-fifty years ago” (Carey, 1985:512). Primarily, it is important to note that Herbert recognises the similarity in behaviour between his forefathers and himself. He openly admits that Australian history consists of lies, and regarding the second example it is an evident fact that Australian convicts were imprisoned because of immoral behaviour (real or perceived), reflecting on Herbert’s position and the “years [he spends] in HM Prison” (Carey, 1985:351) because of an immoral act against Goon Tse Ying. This gives a clear depiction of the shadow archetype that appears in both archaic and contemporary form; the forefathers of Australia reflect on the archetype associated with Herbert, and apparently Herbert’s character engaged in similar behaviour before he knew the historical facts of his forefathers.

Second, it can be noted that Herbert is a character with a polarised complex, which can be observed by the repression of his emotional turmoil, specifically due to his lack of consciousness. Herbert is a character who gives recognition to the shadow as a psychological content of the self as well as the ego; however, this does not prevent his being a character who eludes the repression of his negative emotions. A good example of his repression appears in Book 1 of *Illywhacker* when Herbert tries to blend into the household of the McGrath family and in order to receive their approval represses the shadow aspects of his identity, specifically to impress Jack. We can observe this when Herbert tells Jack “the story of” (Carey, 1985:29) his

---

19. There is a selection of complexes and archetypes that can be explained in the novel *Illywhacker*. The most significant archetype, that specifically holds a relation to the shadow, is the father archetype, the potential subject of further study.

life<sup>20</sup> in which he confesses that his father's "Englishness" (Carey, 1985:29) had a negative impact on his childhood, because Herbert was "chastised for the way" (Carey, 1985:29) he spoke. From Herbert's story we can make the assumption that Herbert already developed a negative shadow complex during his childhood years because of his manner of speaking. This was due to his father's rejection of the way Herbert spoke, at an age at which he did not fully comprehend the reasons for his father's response. If Herbert's father had been a supportive figure, the effect might have been different, but due to his not being properly fathered Herbert only understands his father's response as a disapproval of Herbert's entire identity: "He did not like my accent. He did not, I think, like much about me" (Carey, 1985:29).

Herbert elaborates upon this story and explains to Jack that he ran away after the disagreement with his father. He then decided to live with a Chinese family, an ethnic group that Jack cannot "abide" (Carey, 1985:68). In the context of his Chinese family, Herbert had a more positive upbringing and developed the ability to act and talk in a manner that was comfortable to him. But regardless of the Chinese's good deeds to Herbert, Jack retains the prejudiced opinion of the older generation of Australian settlers who do "not abide Chinamen" (Carey, 1985:45).

Herbert's story does not gain Jack's support of the Chinese, but Herbert tries to keep Jack happy and to remain part of the household; therefore, he avoids any referral to the slang he adopted during his adolescent years with the Chinese: "I was now very careful not to say 'ain't' and 'I never done it' and other habits of speech I had picked up working for Wongs at the Eastern Market" (Carey, 1985:38). In general this would have been regarded as a basic adaptation for any individual changing peer groups, through which the individual simply blends into the social demands by means of changing his speech mannerisms; but in Herbert's case his avoidance of speaking in a manner he wishes to, specifically relates to the repression of negative emotions that are tied to a negative shadow complex initiated by his father. After all Herbert's endeavours to become free from his father's dictatorial household, he now once again has to repress an aspect of himself, his style of speech, in the shadow of the unconscious.

We can observe the consequences that follow after Herbert's improvising behaviour and repression of his shadow complex. Jack arranges for a meeting with Cocky Abbot and Oswald-Smith who according to Jack are potential benefactors for the aircraft factory, which he and Herbert have been discoursing about for the duration of Herbert's stay with the McGraths, but

---

20. Regarding the earlier example, Chapter 12 also depicts an example of Jack's emergence in participation mystique: "if Jack McGrath had been a shrewd man he would have seen the pattern of my life already... But Jack did not see it" (Carey, 1985:32).

Jack fails to realise the Abbots' and Oswald-Smith's fundamental support of English commercial empowerment in Australia. Despite Herbert's repression of his natural way of speaking, he remains under the impression that Jack understands his opinion and feelings about an Australian aircraft factory. Therefore, when Herbert arrives in Colac, is introduced to Cocky, and realises the extent of the support for England, he falls under the impression that Jack misunderstood his ideal to produce a national aircraft: "Jack, I reflected, kicking angrily at the rudder bar, had understood nothing. He had gone on in his blundering, amiable way, liking everyone without discrimination, anyone, that is, who was not a Chinaman or a Jew. Jack, who had read aloud the poetry of Henry Lawson, had understood nothing about it. He had let me down" (Carey, 1985:115). At this point Herbert does not realise that his disappointment with Jack is actually a projection of his shadow complex (the emotions he experienced when he was rejected as a child) and a precursor for the release of his negative complex energy. When he is back in Geelong, Herbert unleashes an emotional outpouring of his repressed shadow complex during the meeting: "I cared for nothing. I was beyond it" (Carey, 1985:125). Afterwards he further takes out his frustration on Jack: "If you start out crawling, you end up crawling" (Carey, 1985:127). Devastatingly, Herbert's misunderstanding of his insecurities and his inability to deal with them properly results in a harsh projection on Jack who, presumably, commits suicide after the failed meeting.

In conclusion regarding Jungian terminology the following points have been observed. When the ego as the centre of consciousness perceives the trickster's therapeutic effect through the self that is the centre of the unconscious, he becomes aware of psychological contents such as the archetypes and complexes. These contents are related to elements such as the collective unconscious and personal unconscious, and they are specifically found in Herbert's character portrayal. The initial purpose of an archetype is not biased in a negative or positive manner, but the personal connections made by each individual create a complex that binds itself to the archetype. This complex becomes polarised due to the emotions we attach to it by means of repression. By perceiving the archetypes through a therapeutic effect, the ego gains the opportunity to become conscious of the ego's immediate routine or conditioned behaviour that is complex-driven and rests on an even deeper-rooted archetype that should not be discarded but viewed as an aspect of the self.

## Section 2: Defining the Trickster

The only possible inference to be drawn is that this myth-cycle is an old cultural possession of all the American Indians, which has remained, as far as the general plot is concerned, relatively unchanged. (Radin, 1972:132)

Jung's understanding of the trickster is explained in his commentary on Radin's (1972) *The Trickster: A Study in American Indian Mythology*. The above mentioned passage illustrates through Radin's understanding of the trickster as a myth that has remained part of "American Indians's" mythology how Jung may have benefited from its content as an example of the archetype (previously explained in Section 1). In his commentary, Jung emphasises the Wakdjunkaga's importance and provides an examination of several other trickster figures through the history of medieval alchemy, renaissance religion, fairytales, and content from psychoanalytic patient evaluation. His primary motivation for this study lies in Radin's claim that the Winnebago trickster-cycle is an ongoing mythology, which continues to have an importance for Native Americans in the twentieth century. The question Jung attempts to answer in regard to Radin's study is why the purpose of the trickster continues to have an ongoing importance to society. This brings Jung to the hypothesis that the trickster represents a portrayal of an archetype that resembles the shadow; an indisputable element of the individual psyche. Jung explains this point by examining the different tricksters and their similarities, which according to his observation points to the archetypal existence and importance of a mythological symbol or figure, since it consistently repeats itself in following generations.<sup>21</sup>

This section will discuss Jung's description of different trickster figures, their characteristics and the importance of the trickster to both the collective and individual psyche. From the literary review of this dissertation it is already evident that Carey is not specifically influenced by Jungian theory, and his motivation for *Illywhacker* does not have a direct link to Jung's discussion of the trickster. However, Carey's portrayal of a contemporary Australian trickster in *Illywhacker* serves as an example of the archetypal referentiality of the trickster figure as discussed by Jung. Even in the postmodern Australian context of Carey's novel, we may observe a contemporary trickster from Australia and measure it against previous descriptions of the trickster. Therefore, a coherent study of Jung's analysis of the

---

21. Apart from Jung's extensive referral to different trickster figures and their characteristics, there are a variety of tricksters with similar characteristics not mentioned by him, which can also be observed through writers such as Janik, and Doty and Hynes.

Wakdjunkaga,<sup>22</sup> and other trickster figures, brings us to a clearer understanding of the archetypal trickster that is also evident in *Illywhacker* (further discussed in Chapter III) and the selected characteristics used to assert the presence of an archetype.

### Trickster Figures

Jung's observation is based on the examples of different tricksters and trickster-like characters and figures from Western mythology. This selection of trickster figures are analysed to obtain similarities in appearance and purpose, which are in turn used to affirm the presence of the archetypal shadow through the repeated portrayal of tricksters with resonating character traits that highlight the shadow archetype. In regard to Jung's commentary, it is important to discuss "Mercurius", "fairy-tale characters", the "poltergeist", "shamans", "masqueraders at European festivals", and also the "Wakdjunkaga".

The first and most generalised trickster figure examined by Jung is Mercurius, who is a Roman and an alchemical variation on "Hermes" (Jung, 1967:230) from ancient Greek mythology. In Chapter III of this dissertation, Jung's description of Mercurius is primarily used as a classification for the trickster figure in *Illywhacker*. Second, trickster qualities are apparent in fairy-tale characters such as "Tom Thumb," "Stupid Hans," and "Hanswurst," found in the Grimm fairytales. Jung stresses that such a character represents "an altogether negative hero and yet manages to achieve through... stupidity what others fail to accomplish with their best efforts" (Jung, 1969:255).

Third, Jung claims that "phenomena in the field of parapsychology," such as the "poltergeist," can also be recognised as an example of the trickster image. According to Jung, the poltergeist's appearance and trickster-like qualities can specifically be observed in the context of "pre-adolescent children". The following passage is of note:

The malicious tricks played by the poltergeist are as well known as the low level of his intelligence and the fatuity of his "communications." Ability to change his shape seems also to be one of his characteristics, as there are not a few reports of his appearance in animal form. Since he has on occasion described himself as a soul in hell, the motif of subjective suffering would seem not to be lacking either. (Jung, 1969:256)

---

22. According to Radin: "The Winnebago word for trickster is *wakdjunkaga*, which means *the tricky one*" (1972:132)

Though scientific research has not proven the actual existence of the poltergeist, its general reported characteristics correspond to those of the trickster.

Fourth, shamans are traditional healers whose actions exhibit trickster-like qualities; for example, they can be compared to current day *sangomas* or witch-doctors in South Africa, who up to the present day through certain of their practices exhibit trickster qualities. Jung claims the following:

There is something of the trickster in the character of the shaman and medicine-man, for he, too, often plays malicious jokes on people, only to fall victim in his turn to the vengeance of those whom he has injured. For this reason, his profession sometimes puts him in peril of his life. Besides that, the shamanistic techniques in themselves often cause the medicine-man a good deal of discomfort, if not actual pain. At all events the “making of a medicine-man” involves, in many parts of the world, so much agony of body and soul that permanent psychic injuries may result. His “approximation to the saviour” is an obvious consequence of this, in confirmation of the mythological truth that the wounded wounder is the agent of healing, and that the sufferer takes away suffering. (Jung, 1969:256)

From a base level of human consciousness and practice that relates to the instinctual, the shaman represents through his unique practice and methods a physically present and observable trickster character. For future extended studies, it might be interesting to observe the importance certain communities place on the shaman, who according to Jung represents trickster qualities. Such a character emphasises a certain connection with the shadow and through his practice keeps individuals in harmony with the shadow archetype.

Fifth, Jung turns to traditional European festivals that set aside a certain day of the year, specifically January, to celebrate the New Year. According to Jung this was in commemoration of the ancient “*saturnalia*” festivals, brought into the context, however, of Christian religion. In his analysis, Jung observes apparent examples of the trickster’s appearance during these festivals:

Fools’ Pope (*fatuorum papam*). ‘In the very midst of divine service masqueraders with grotesque faces, disguised as women, lions, and mummers, preformed their dances, sang indecent songs in the choir, ate greasy food from a corner of the altar near the priest celebrating mass, got out their games of dice, burned stinking incense made of old shoe leather, and ran and hopped about all over the church. (Jung, 1969:257)

These pagan rituals, in theory, may have symbolically reminded the collective of the shadow archetype as being a part of their human existence.

And sixth, Jung gives an elaborate account of the Wakdjunkaga in the Winnebago Indian mythology, since his commentary is specifically in collaboration with Radin's study of this trickster. In terms of Jung's research, Wakdjunkaga is the most recent example of the trickster he observed. Jung classifies Wakdjunkaga's characteristics as follows:

He is a forerunner of the saviour, and, like him, God, man, and animal at once. He is both subhuman and superhuman, a bestial and divine being, whose chief and most alarming characteristic is his unconscious. Because of it he is deserted by his (evidently human) companions, which seems to indicate that he has fallen below their level of consciousness. He is so unconscious of himself that his body is not a unity, and his two hands fight each other. He takes his anus off and entrusts it with a special task. Even his sex is optional despite its phallic qualities: he can turn himself into a woman and bear children. From his penis he makes all kinds of useful plants. This is a reference to his original nature as a Creator, for the world is made from the body of a god.

On the other hand he is in many respects stupider than the animals, and gets into one ridiculous scrape after another. Although he is not really evil, he does the most atrocious things from sheer unconsciousness and unrelatedness. His imprisonment in animal unconsciousness is suggested by the episode where he gets his head caught inside the skull of an elk, and the next episode shows how he overcomes this condition by imprisoning the head of a hawk inside his own rectum. True, he sinks back into the former condition immediately afterwards, by falling under the ice, and is outwitted time after time by the animals, but in the end he succeeds in tricking the cunning coyote, and this brings back to him his saviour nature. The trickster is a primitive "cosmic" being of *divine-animal* nature, on the one hand superior to man because of his superhuman qualities, and on the other hand inferior to him because of his unreason and unconsciousness. He is no match for the animals either, because of his extraordinary clumsiness and lack of instinct. These defects are the marks of his *human* nature, which is not so well adapted to the environment as the animal's but, instead, has prospects of a much higher development of consciousness based on a considerable eagerness to learn, as is duly emphasized in the myth. (Jung, 1969:263-264)

The trickster is an impulsive, unconscious and animalistic character. Despite his better judgement he does not use reason to guide new decisions, but relies on instinctual behaviour. He has the ability to change his shape from male to female and from human to animal. For example:

“Trickster now took an elk’s liver and made a vulva from it. Then he took some elk’s kidneys and made breasts from them. Finally he put on a woman’s dress... Not long after trickster became pregnant” (Radin, 1972:22-23). The trickster is also, despite his negative character portrayal, procreative and representative of a saviour. He forces a large waterfall to relocate, since his people are going to live in the same area as the waterfall: “I am telling you that the earth was made for man to live on and you will annoy him if you stay here. I came to this earth to rearrange it. If you don’t do what I tell you, I will not use you very gently’... Then Trickster cut a stick for himself and shot it into the falls and pushed the falls on to the land” (Radin, 1972:52). The Winnebago trickster mythology is the primary focus of Jung’s analysis of the trickster. We can therefore use the description of Wajdjunkaga in relation to Mercurius as a basis for the study of the trickster in *Illywhacker*; however, we picked Mercurius due to the more chronological and systematic description attached to this figure, making it easier to classify similarities between different tricksters.

#### Purpose of the Trickster

At this point it should be apparent that the trickster does not represent a hero character, and he does not precisely fit the description of a villain. He is also not only a secondary character used to fill a gap (there are some instances where tricksters are only used for comic relief<sup>23</sup>); however, in general his appearance usually contains an important message for the reader. In the case of *Illywhacker* the primary story revolves around a trickster, which implies that the trickster becomes the protagonist. This emphasises his importance, but it still does not imply that the trickster now becomes the hero or villain, he only becomes the centre of the story. Another apparent feature of the trickster is his being an amoral instead of immoral or moral character; even though we seem certain of the trickster’s malicious behaviour or actions, these inspire character development and change for the good of the collective. The trickster goes against the natural curve of human development, since he represents an earlier stage of consciousness, which is still in the process of moving itself from the unconscious to the conscious mind. When people evolve from unconscious to conscious beings, the trickster remains trapped in an archaic phase. It is because of this specific element of the trickster that we classify him as representative of an archaic symbol that reminds the individual of his most basic human behaviours that are still

---

23. Consider the character Feste in Shakespeare’s (2006) *Twelfth-Night; Or, What You Will*.

part of his psyche, and influence his general behaviour on a daily basis. Jung specifically refers to Radin to as an example of this point:

Radin's trickster cycle preserves the shadow in its pristine mythological form, and thus points back to a very much earlier stage of consciousness which existed before the birth of the myth, when the Indian was still groping about in a similar mental darkness. Only when his consciousness reached a higher level could he detach the earlier state from himself and objectify it, that is, say anything about it. (Jung, 1969:262-263)

A trickster character takes the reader back to a part of his development that contradicts conventional behaviour, but it reminds him why this necessary change is required, why he should not drop back into primitive behaviour, that he should remain aware of the shadow's archetypal existence, and that the trickster can be used as a method to determine the existence and binary nature of certain complexes.

The trickster represents a character that embodies a symbol from the past, one that has become a part of the collective unconscious and personal unconscious. This is more apparent when the trickster is observed as shadow, an element of the psyche we would like to forget and not associate ourselves with anymore, because it reminds us of ill-behaviour and something immoral that breaks social boundaries. We should distinguish between Jung's descriptions of the shadow and trickster, since they seemingly represent the same subject, but when observed in more detail they actually portray unique concepts in their own right. In fact, the shadow represents different forms of repressed imagery and the trickster is basically a portrayal of a character connected to the shadow archetype. It seems evident that the trickster, also in individual psychoanalysis, appears as a messenger of the individual's or collective's neglect to integrate shadow material from the unconscious with the conscious:

Here the trickster is represented by counter-tendencies in the unconscious, and in certain cases by a sort of second personality, of a puerile and inferior character, not unlike the personalities who announce themselves at spiritualistic séances and cause all those ineffable childish phenomena so typical of poltergeists. I have, I think, found a suitable designation for this character-component when I called it the *shadow*. On the civilized level, it is regarded as a personal "gaffe," "slip," "faux pas," etc., which are then chalked up as defects of the conscious personality. (Jung, 1969:262)

The trickster has an evident effect on individual development, which is a pivotal point that emphasises the need for the continued re-telling of the trickster story. This effect does not

solely remain an individual experience and in individual awareness, but also becomes apparent to the collective, considering its wide ranging influence in literature. Clearly this symbol has been apparent through the ages, which is why it is important to understand its significance and influence on humanity in contemporary times:

The peculiar thing about these dissociations is that the split-off personality is not just a random one, but stands in a complementary or compensatory relationship to the ego-personality. It is a personification of traits of character which are sometimes worse and sometimes better than those the ego-personality possesses. A collective personification like the trickster is the product of an aggregate of individuals and is welcomed by each individual as something known to him, which would not be the case if it were just an individual outgrowth. (Jung, 1969:261-262)

According to Jung, the trickster guides human development and aids the integration of material from the unconscious with the conscious. By means of doing this the individual does not remain fixed in avoidant responses to seemingly illogical and unconventional behaviour, but develops an attuned sense of awareness about actions that have negative results. One who acknowledges the human nature and flaws of life becomes conscious and is more open to transformation. The desired effect of the trickster figure is to remind us of an earlier stage of human development that can still find its way into the current flow of events and cause dire consequences. The trickster may be a character with negative traits and bad intent, but if interpreted correctly may cause transformation when most needed:

The fact is, that this old trichotomous hierarchy of psychic contents (hylic, psychic, and pneumatic) represents the polaristic structure of the psyche, which is the only immediate object of experience... Thus, the living effect of the myth is experienced when a higher consciousness, rejoicing in its freedom and independence, is confronted by the autonomy of a mythological figure and yet cannot flee from its fascination, but must pay tribute to the overwhelming impression... The trickster is a collective shadow figure, a summation of all the inferior traits of character in individuals. And since the individual shadow is never absent as a component of personality, the collective figure can construct itself out of it continually. Not always, of course, as a mythological figure, but, in consequence of the increasing repression and neglect of the original mythologems, as a corresponding projection on other social groups and nations. (Jung, 1969:269-70)

When the above is placed alongside *Illywhacker* it becomes evident that a character such as Herbert, and other secondary characters as well, represent a portrayal of the shadow

archetype, similar to Jung's discussion of the trickster. One noticeable difference is Herbert's intellectual capacity being more developed than mythological trickster figures, which is understandable due to the difference in time period and cultural context. Another difference may be observed through the methods of recording, one being a mythological story transferred orally from one generation to the next and the other being postmodern fiction. Evidently, Herbert represents a contemporary trickster who is more a part of the developmental stages of society in the twentieth century. A trickster such as the Wakdjunkaga is not as accessible or relevant to the Western society and youth of today as Herbert who represents: modern behaviour that differs from conventional behaviour; shares the same inhabitancy as most readers in urbanised cities; speaks the same language with similar dialect more understandable to the modern context, and uses contemporary expressions; and he falls into a time period and historical context of modern society, with which the reader can relate more readily due to his own understanding and experience of a similar context.

### CHAPTER III: THE TRICKSTER IN *ILLYWHACKER*

The word “illywhacker” is synonymous with the word trickster, which is a fact Carey brings to the reader’s attention in one of the epigraphs of the novel by quoting the definition of an “illywhacker” from G. A. Wilkes’ *A Dictionary of Australian Colloquialisms*. To place even more claim on the importance of the theme of the trickster, the opening chapter in the novel starts by introducing the protagonist (who is also the fallible narrator of his own story) as a trickster. Herbert Badgery admits he tricks people and that he will eventually trick the person who reads his history:

Don’t imagine this is any novelty to me – being written up has been one of my weaknesses and I don’t mention it now so that I may impress you, but rather to make the point that I am not lying about my age. But for the rest of it, you may as well know, lying is my main subject, my speciality, my skill. It is a great relief to find a new use for it. (Carey, 1985:3)

Herbert makes us aware of his notorious characteristics that are no secret to the secondary characters in the novel, whom he claims are familiar with his bad habits. He explains how he is not lying about the estimation of his age, but clearly rejoices in finding a new use for his ability to lie, which is to lie about his life story. Herbert’s honesty about this habit of lying contradicts his claim of telling the truth about his age, and thus the reader’s confusion about whether Herbert should be believed or not is an early example of the consequences of Herbert’s trickery. The theme of the trickster in *Illywhacker* is therefore visible from the start of the novel.

An illywhacker is described as a “professional trickster,” “spieler,” “social climber, moron, peter-tickler, eeler-spee,” and “illy-whacker,” who is someone that operates “at country shows,” puts “a confidence trick over,” sells “imitation diamond tie-pins, new-style patent razors or infallible ‘tonics,’” lives “on the cockies,” follows “the show,” and “wacks the illy” (cited by Carey, 1985:i). These references describe a character who lives amongst society in general, and is easily recognised for his distinct amoral (if not immoral) behaviour. The characteristics of an illywhacker are unfavourable from a civilised point of view, but are at the same time valuable because of a selection of elements that will be discussed below (which qualifies why he should be called “amoral” rather than “immoral”). This is why a character who represents an illywhacker is not the ideal hero of a story and also not precisely a villain. The trickster does not act evilly to primarily derive satisfaction from the outcome, but does so more for personal gain and sometimes, unaware of his actions, to inspire development of psychological consciousness in

other characters. He does not plot devastation as an end result, but instead acts amorally upon impulse, feeling, and intuition.

It is specifically the trickster's amorality that makes him an important character for observation. As Doty and Hynes point out:

Street suggests that we ought not to exclude entirely the possibility that such figures may voice anti-social feelings, insofar as the trickster often represents the obverse of restrictive order (86-90), but we must remember that tricksters or cultural clown-figures are not, as they would be considered in our culture, individually motivated deviants, but socially sanctioned images or performers. (cited by Doty, 1993:7)

Tricksters are a societal asset stemming from cultural heritage; they do not remain in the archives of history due to their uncalled-for behaviour; instead they are “actively sustained and fostered by consciousness” (Jung, 1969:265). It is, as previously stated, of value to study such a character, because doing so informs readers of a repressed identity usually kept in the background or margins of society due to his amoral behaviour, but who still remains important regardless of our dislike of his bad habits.

The methodology of studying such a character involves two approaches. On the one hand the above-mentioned intensive examination of the word *illywhacker* with its trickster connotations shows that the word is inherent to the Australian context and provides central characteristics that best depict an Australian *illywhacker*. This definition is also evident from Carey's reference to Twain in the epigraph section, who claims that Australian history “does not read like history, but like the most beautiful lies” (Carey, 1985:i). Twain's passage relates to Herbert as an *illywhacker* who actually claims to be a professional liar who later becomes involved in the history of Australia. On the other hand the trickster represents an archetypal image apparent in the literature of independent cultures through the ages; the *illywhacker* can be examined from the point of view of the preceding tricksters' characteristics through the ages that cohere with the characteristics of an *illywhacker*. This is observed in mythology, fairy-tales and literature that depict characteristics of the trickster, which relate to an *illywhacker*. It is also apparent that the definition of *illywhacker* is derived from words such as “*spieler*” and compared to other figures such as a “*moron*” – notions and figures that precede the use of the term *illywhacker*. Note the difference between these two observations:

The number of studies of individual tricksters has grown, and the range of trickster phenomena is now such that many scholars argue against a generalizing, comparativist

view. Others of us have continued to argue that there are sufficient inherent similarities among these diverse figures and their functions to enable us to speak, at least informally, of a generic “trickster figure.” (Doty, 1993:2)

In combination with an approach that takes into account the Australian context with an illywhacker’s unique trickster characteristics, there is a secondary approach that makes use of a broader analysis to determine the similarities between trickster figures’ characteristics from independent contexts. These complementing characteristics are specifically of relevance to this discussion (explained in Chapter II of this dissertation), since this dissertation aims to assert the “therapeutic effect” (Jung, 1969:267) and archetypal nature of an Australian trickster. However, both approaches are important and help uncover information that is of value to the comprehension of the novel *Illywhacker*.

Chapter III of this dissertation performs a comparative study to explain the shared characteristics between Jung’s archetypal account of the trickster and the depiction of Carey’s trickster in *Illywhacker*. Jung describes the trickster by means of analysing and comparing certain characters from different mythologies, such as Hermes in Greek mythology, Mercurius in Roman mythology, the Fool’s Pope in medieval records, shamans as medicine men, the trickster from the Native American Wakdjunkaga tribe mythology, and several other figures from independent mythologies and fairytales. According to Jung, the best example of a trickster that represents the trickster’s characteristics as an archetype is the figure Mercurius:

A curious combination of typical trickster motifs can be found in the alchemical figure of Mercurius; for instance, his fondness for sly jokes and malicious pranks, his powers as a shape-shifter, his dual nature, half animal, half divine, his exposure to all kinds of tortures, and – last but not least – his approximation to the figure of a saviour. (Jung, 1969:255)

Chapter III of this dissertation makes use of these characteristics as a means of classification for the trickster in *Illywhacker*. This classification is divided into five sections that provide an account of each specific characteristic and its link with the Australian illywhacker. A sixth section is provided to discuss the secondary characters in *Illywhacker* that also exhibit trickster qualities, but not to the same extent as the protagonist. From section six it should become evident that even though certain characters also contain trickster elements, there is a difference between a full-blown trickster and characters that also seem like tricksters. The aim of this analysis is thus to identify the archetypal qualities of the trickster as an illywhacker in the novel *Illywhacker*.

In general, the trickster in *Illywhacker* is most evident through the element of character (as might be expected in fiction).<sup>24</sup> Herbert Badgery is the primary character under discussion, because he is the protagonist and narrator of *Illywhacker* and specifically resembles a trickster. That is, he fits the description of a traditional trickster, since most of his actions are based upon impulsive decisions; however, these decisions are not entirely without motivation. Examples from Book I, Chapter 48 and Chapter 50 are of relevance. In these examples impulse is linked to nationalism, to pride in the country, where Herbert's deadly poisonous snake represents the spirit of the country, which cannot be tamed; his wild behaviour with it mirrors his frustration in the lack of interest of those around him to develop an "Australian aeroplane":

"Anyone can see that the English are as big a pest as the rabbit. No offence, but they're identical. They come here, eat everything, burrow under, tunnel out – look at Ballarat or Bendigo – and when the country is rooted..." I faltered, "it'll be rooted." (Carey, 1985:123)

I swung the snake by the tail towards Cocky Abbot Junior and the snake, beside itself with rage, struck out and got a fang into the farmer's scarf...

"I am trying to say I'm an Australian," I said, "and we should have an Australian aeroplane." (Carey, 1985:125-126)

To prove his point about Australia being subject to exploitation, Herbert acts in an impassioned way, but with malicious overtones. Unfortunately his actions do not have the desired effect and he loses the potential sponsors for the airline project and his primary source of inspiration, Jack McGrath, who as a consequence of his actions commits suicide. The irony is that Herbert's passionate reaction is mistaken for impulse rather than being the product of insight, because he alienates himself from a social context by reacting unethically; thus he loses a once in a lifetime opportunity. Herbert's primitive act is used to clarify a motif that is unapparent to the other characters in the current context; later in the novel his premonition about the exploitation of Australia is shown to be valid. Australia eventually becomes a global commodity rather than a country that inspires initiative: "It was a time when the Americans were making their first big push into Australian industry" (Carey, 1985:525).

---

24. On a theoretical note, it is important to notice that characters may be interpreted as actual examples of individuals who undergo a process of individuation, which may be measured in comparison to real life situations. Characters may also be regarded as symbolic illustrations of archetypes and complexes, since they represent recognisable trends and patterns that may feature in the unconscious activity of a reader.

Herbert represents the primary trickster in the novel *Illywhacker*, since his character is confined to the role of an illywhacker. In the following subsections, apart from section six, Herbert will be the primary example used to illustrate the presence of a trickster that fits the classification derived from Jung.

Before commencing with the discussion, it is important to acknowledge the overlapping qualities between the trickster's characteristics and the different sections of Chapter III in this dissertation. For example, the theme and skill of lying is explained in Section 1, but becomes relevant in most of the following sections. Herbert lies about his status through his malicious pranks and sly jokes, but he also lies by creating false identities that he represents in a completely different way to his actual identity. Another example regards the overlap between Section 2 and Section 3 that specifically deals with the trickster's semi-divine status and shape shifting ability; for example, his ability to disappear and change from the male to female sex. And two final examples regard the overlap between Section 2 with Section 4 and Section 5, since shape shifting often results in self-torture and may also result in saviour related events.

Note that this discussion does not prove that each character completely embodies a trickster similar to that in Jung's discussion. The point is that the trickster is a factor in human existence that does not disappear, but continually manifests in different contexts with both similar and unique characteristics. Therefore characters in *Illywhacker* may not be complete tricksters, but have the potential to portray a unique trickster from their own archetypal connection to the trickster.

## Section 1: Fondness for Sly Jokes and Malicious Pranks

The trickster's tendency to fool people (potentially with consequences) is a recognisable act that is easily identified. This is due to the trickster's mockery that evokes humour, and the sense of disapproval that is paired with most of the trickster's actions – a censure which does not necessarily imply that the trickster is solely a bad or evil character with ill intent but one that arises due to the trickster's unorthodox way of behaving.<sup>25</sup> Actions which go against the norm of society are easily identified, because they upset the individuals who with good intent and best efforts obey societal norms in order to enable smooth societal functioning. The trickster's actions become even more apparent when he manipulates certain situations to fit his needs or to untangle himself from a ruckus by evoking emotional responses such as laughter and pity. The reader should identify and distinguish between these occurrences, because they frequently represent important messages that hold potential for individuation, and in the case of this discussion support the trickster's identity as an archetype. However, it is also important to remember that on some occasions the trickster does not act in a rationally motivated way, but acts primarily out of impulsive behaviour.

### The Theme of Lying

Before examining the characteristics of malicious pranks and sly jokes, it is of note to explain the importance of lies, significant to our understanding of the trickster as an illywhacker and also a theme in the novel *Illywhacker*. Herbert Badgery feels “no more ashamed of” his “lies than” his “farts” (Carey, 1985:1); his lies improve his ability to trick the reader and other characters. To lie without a feeling of remorse increases the possibility that other characters will confuse the truth with a lie, because people find it difficult to determine the truth if a liar fakes his authenticity by not showing any form of suspicious behaviour or hesitation about the possible consequences of his lies. A good example of this can be observed in Book III, Chapter 44, when Charles speaks with Phoebe:

“[D]id he ever tell you how he walked away from the T Model on the saltflats at Geelong? When we were kids we used to ask him to tell us that story. He must have told it to us a hundred times. He ...”

---

25. In relation to Chapter I, note that the trickster's mockery can be viewed in correlation to Carey's use of satire and irony as another literary device to direct the reader as to how he should interpret certain occurrences in the novel.

“There are no saltflats in Geelong,” Phoebe said. “He was lying.” (Carey, 1985:487-488)

This example depicts how easily Herbert fooled Charles Badgery (his son) with stories from his past, due to Herbert’s ability to disregard the consequences of lying. Therefore Herbert manages to keep people in thrall to the extent that they confuse the truth with lies: “Photographs of Ulm never looked like the man I described but people always blamed the photographer for that, not me” (Carey, 1985:27). Lies elevate a story at the moment of occurrence, since they enrich an observer’s experience rather than supply them with what is banal or the undesired or inaccessible truth. A similar example can be observed with a salesperson who “is required to lie”, “because the truth, told thus, is of no interest to the average punter” (Carey, 1985:362). However, tragically, Herbert’s lies lead to Sonia Badgery’s (his daughter) disappearance and Charles’s suicide.

In an interview with Gaile, Carey draws attention to his own use of lies, specifically in *Illywhacker*:

For instance, in *Illywhacker* there’s a passage where they listen to the wireless, and later I found out that there was no wireless in Geelong at that particular time, so I thought: what I am going to do [actual syntax]? Because my narrator is a liar, I have a chapter beginning: ‘They’ll tell you there was no wireless in Geelong and so on, but I’ll tell you they’re wrong.’ So sometimes I use that inclination, but it’s fun, and the reader understands very well – it’s not to deceive the reader, it’s just to make the story work. (2004:8)

As the author of *Illywhacker*, Carey’s use of structural irony can be viewed as quite similar to Herbert’s use of lies as a fallible narrator and trickster in the novel. Carey provides a missing link of an approved and appreciated history, filling up the incomplete parts of history with fictional interpretations of what may have occurred. He gives a story based on certain historical facts, and in the process makes the reader attentive to history. Carey also leaves room to explore different possibilities. In comparison to Carey, Herbert uses lies to play on other characters’ emotions and by nourishing their ambitions he fills an emptiness that evokes temporary happiness. Unfortunately for Herbert these lies do not supply an approved product that guarantees quality, and this regularly leads to his downfall. For example, in Book I of *Illywhacker*, Herbert goes to the O’Hagens to spend time with Mrs O’Hagen, but due to her absence rather persuades Stu O’Hagen to buy a car. However, he drinks too much and tries to convince Stu that he should buy a Summit rather than a Ford (though the latter is of a better

quality), specifically because the Summit is an Australian car. This leads to a brawl after Stu realises Herbert's actual intention in visiting them: "I regretted hitting the small-eared boy. I regretted wishing to put my head between Mrs O'Hagen's legs. I regretted that my actions confused people. I regretted being a big mouth, a bullshitter and a bully" (Carey, 1985:63).

### Jokes and Pranks

Sly jokes and malicious pranks are an essential component of Herbert's lies, because they entertain and simultaneously fool a character, and while they do not realise they're being made a fool the trickster takes advantage of the spectator's vulnerability for his personal gain. The trickster's methods can further be observed in *Illywhacker*. Herbert crash-lands his Morris Farman unexpectedly in Balliang East and arrives without notice in Geelong on "December Monday" (Carey, 1985:34) 1919. Upon arrival in Balliang East he meets Jack McGrath (Phoebe's father), Molly McGrath (her mother), and Phoebe McGrath herself, who immediately aids and invites him to stay with them in their house at Geelong. In this scene of Herbert's arrival he carelessly lies about his identity as an aviator, his reason for crash landing in Balliang East, and life events that caused him to become a conman (an aspect of himself that he also attempts to keep hidden from Geelong society). He lies about not needing money: "I did not wish to admit I needed the five bob so badly" (Carey, 1985:18). He lies about his purpose: "I am surveying.' I paused. 'For airstrips'" (Carey, 1985:18). And he reveals his need for approval and the admiration of others: "In those days I would have done anything to get written up in the papers and anything for the admiration of a woman"; "I let the snake run down my arm, across my trousers, to the ground" (Carey, 1985:19). Therefore, in order to gain acceptance and make people believe his lies are truth, he performs dangerous actions with a King Brown snake, which simultaneously evoke fear in the observer and awe for the performer's bravery. This performance may give a mixed impression, which can be interpreted as a malicious undertone, due to the dangers that may follow certain actions, or the trickster's sly method of convincing other characters about himself with the aim of obtaining something from them.

Herbert's lie about the airstrip and his act with the snake are used to exaggerate the importance of his arrival and to gain recognition from secondary characters. This is most often a temporary effect, because people eventually realise that they are being cheated and force Herbert to "leave" his "houses behind" him (Carey, 1985:24). However, with the McGraths he manages to successfully convince them of his authenticity. Jack's blind enthusiasm inspires the lie about

the aircraft factory, the existence of which becomes a brief possibility, and snake dancing becomes a prominent theme in the novel, to the extent that Herbert, Charles, and Hissao Badgery all perform acts with snakes, a fact which has significant conceptual value. It illustrates the significance of the trickster's appearance from one generation to the next; that a trickster's characteristics may become hereditary, as a certain trait of family behaviour passed on from one generation to the next; and that the trickster's connection with the symbol of the snake is related to all the primary characters, clearly supporting the theme of snake dancing in the novel. The snake is also a significant symbol of the shadow<sup>26</sup> and portrays the trickster's connection with his unconscious.

After the McGrath's selfless act of compassion towards Herbert, he maintains a false persona and imposes himself on the McGrath family and Geelong community by winning them over with his sly jokes:

I even ventured, as few in Geelong would have done, a few jokes at Mr Oster's expense. My familiarity with the Osters served as a better introduction to Geelong than any suit I could have had tailor-made in Little Collins Street. (Carey, 1985:35)

Herbert's ability to lie while making his story look like a joke is an attribute that enables him to get by in life on the basis of little or no experience, because it convinces other characters that he is an experienced person, and if they notice the lie he can fall back on the argument that he only meant it as a joke. For the remainder of the novel Herbert tricks other characters by providing them with some form of sly compensation, for example, by entertaining them: "I was an expert, however, at getting 'put up'. I was not just an expert. I was an ace. I never had to be formally invited and I always left them before my welcome was worn out" (Carey, 1985:24).

Jack and Molly are naïve characters who admire Herbert and blindly believe his stories without considering the truth of the matter. From his introductory meeting with the McGraths, Herbert tricks them into doing things they would not normally do and believing lies:

I enquired whether the mother might not like a ride in the back. Jack was surprised to see her accept – she was always so nervous – but he didn't reckon on my eyes... [H]er daughter was nice enough to say nothing of the third passenger: the king brown snake beneath her mother's seat. (Carey, 1985:22)

---

26. For more information on the symbolic meaning of a snake/serpent, refer to Cooper's (1978:146-151) *An Illustrated Encyclopaedia of Traditional Symbols*.

Herbert displays such confidence in his lies that the assured manner in which he looks at Molly convinces her of his control over the situation. Molly does not realise that this ride actually verges on a malicious prank, because the snake under her seat (which Herbert does not mention) is poisonous and can potentially lead to an untimely death. Herbert also convinces Jack with his confidence; for example, when Jack showed ignorance about the skill of parachute folding and the policeman “Leichardt”, Herbert is relieved, and responds as follows: “‘Perhaps you didn’t [read anything about it],’ I said, being pleased to hear his ignorance was as great as mine. ‘But not all of it is published. He had kangaroos in his top paddock’” (Carey, 1985:43). The last expression is an ironically derogatory one about people with no “presence of mind” (ibid.). Herbert thus clearly reveals how he engages in his trickery. He introduces a topic of relevance in a conversation with Jack and waits for him to provide a response. This response gives Herbert an idea of his host’s familiarity or not with the topic and whether he can lie and so create an impressive story about it to attribute to the false persona he maintains.

By February 1920 (Carey, 1985:50) Herbert has established himself as a well-respected aviator in search of a location to start a new aircraft factory, but the reader is aware of the fact that Herbert owns a rundown Morris Farman with no papers to prove ownership or that he is registered as a pilot. When Herbert arrives unexpectedly he mentions this:

Four and tuppence bloody ha’penny. It was all I had, that four and two pence ha’penny, including the four threepences with old plum pudding still stuck to them...

I owed the RAAF five hundred pounds for the plane and parts.

I owed the publican in Darnham over twenty pounds.

I owed Anderson’s in Bacchus Marsh another fifty pounds for building materials for the house I was building for me and that girl from the Co-op. (Carey, 1985:16)

His awareness of the distinction between the truth and the effects his lies, and trickery, have and had on other characters in the past, is malicious in itself. By concealing the truth and giving people false hope, Herbert’s lies are prone to end in disaster.

In Book I, Chapter 25, Herbert attempts to change people’s impression of him from an opportunistic character who does not have a life goal to one who imagines a future based on the potential in his current circumstances. At this point he forgets that he created a false character inspired by lies, living in a fool’s paradise. His newfound ideal to become good is not clear to the other characters, because they already imagine him to be a sincere person, and are not aware of the fact that he is a conman:

I had shone my shoes before this dinner. I swung my legs beneath the table. I whistled. I brimmed with marriage. It radiated from my skin in heady waves like sweet-smelling gasoline, and I whistled, not even aware that I was doing it, or that my companions at the dinner table (even Phoebe) were starting to smile because of it. (Carey, 1985:65)

The McGraths only recognise the persona Herbert created instead of his true identity, which is possibly why they immediately notice the change in his attitude; the person behind the mask seems unassumingly natural. Herbert then suddenly announces his plans for marriage. Unfortunately his confession does not inspire the desired response, because his announcement is completely unexpected and the generation gap of 16 years between Herbert and Phoebe, the intended bride, is something Jack disapproves of, and Molly is aware of Jack's disapproval. Herbert promptly realises the mistake and repairs it by slyly joking about his previous serious decision:

“No,” I laughed, “no one you know.” And then, in a stroke that saved me, “No one I know either.”

They all laughed (everyone, that is, except Phoebe who carefully divided her slice of pudding into nine pieces and separated them, one from the other). (Carey, 1985:66)

This is another clear example of the trickster's ability to perform sly jokes, but ironically it also portrays the trickster's inability to change from his bad habits, regardless of his honest aspirations.

Herbert manages to steadily keep Jack and Molly enthralled by his lies, jokes, and pranks, and warily adds snippets of information to make them more credible. However, he eventually becomes hasty and acts more upon impulse than reason. This leads to unfortunate events such as Molly's confusion about her mental state:

Molly had not seen Phoebe climb on the roof or me follow her. Yet she had a strong sense that something was wrong. This sense overpowered her and gave her what she called “her symptoms”: a feeling of vertigo, like the panic she felt on high bridges, ledges, winding mountain roads. (Carey, 1985:81)

Herbert's actions can be classified as malicious, because he already knows that Jack disapproves of his intention to marry Phoebe. He disregards Jack's word by secretly having sexual intercourse with Phoebe who is still immature and acts against her better judgement, not aware

of the consequences a relationship with an older man may result in – adolescent behaviour that a man of Herbert's age should be aware of.

Unfortunately, all of the characters connected with Herbert are subjected to the consequences of his actions. Eventually Herbert's subjugation to his sex drive results in bad decisions that climax in a catastrophic scene with the potential sponsors for his and Jack's plan with the aircraft factory. Tragically, this leads to Jack's apparent suicide:

And why, when he was bitten, would he walk out on to the front lawn to die in public (in his pyjamas) rather than raise his family and ask for help? (Carey, 1985:128)

The malice underlying Herbert's lies becomes apparent to the reader through his awareness of the effect certain decisions might have, even though the final result was not Jack's initial intention. Herbert's awareness tells of his irresponsibility, because he went against his better judgement and knew about the consequences his actions might have.

Another example of Herbert's malicious pranks appears in Book I Chapter 42 when he threatens to tear off one of the fingers of a draughtsman who refuses to publish Herbert's aircraft plan that has already been copyrighted "by a Mr Bradfield of Sydney" (Carey, 1985:106). Herbert even boasts about the effect this had on the draughtsman: "This Regan story was, at least for the moment, a lie. Unnecessary, of course, but I enjoyed it" (Carey, 1985:107). The concealed malice behind the lie does not have immediate consequences, but Herbert's lies that eventually become truth later in the novel result in an actual criminal act that gets him imprisoned (this is further discussed in Section 2).

In short, Herbert Badgery can be classified as a trickster who has the ability to summarise other characters' weaknesses in order to use them against their better judgement. He acquires this ability by manipulating them and by performing malicious pranks and sly jokes to convince them of his authenticity.

## Section 2: Powers as a Shape Shifter

Similar to sly jokes and malicious pranks, shape shifting is a characteristic that draws attention because of its unusual nature. We find on the one hand radical shape shifting, which contradicts humanly possible abilities; for example, Herbert possesses the skill to shift his presence so much as to disappear. This is an extreme form of what Wakdjunkaga, the trickster in the Native American myth does, who changes his shape into that of an animal: “he lay down at the edge of the water where the waves come up and took on the form of a large dead buck-deer” (Radin, 1972:35). On the other hand, *Illywhacker* includes more natural types of shape shifting between certain characteristics, or physical shapes and costumes, which influence passing events due to contradictory appearances. For example, Herbert alternates between different personalities, which bears a link again to Wakdjunkaga, who uses an elk skull on his head to claim spiritual authority: “I am an elk-spirit. I am blessing this village... I am one of the great spirits living in these waters” (Radin, 1972:34). Shape shifting is not only performed by the trickster, since one can argue that character development is also a form of shape shifting, and certain hero characters undergo a shift in shape without changing into a trickster. In connection to his other character traits, the distinct difference between the trickster and other characters is the malpractice involved through given powers. He tricks people for his own benefit with, for example, the skill of illusion, which aggravates other characters to the extent that they sometimes drastically react against his amoral behaviour. In effect, tricksters as recognised shape shifters can abuse power in order to trick people and attain personal benefits.

Herbert has three abilities that can be viewed as shape shifting. His first ability, as already mentioned, is to be able to completely disappear; there are only two occurrences of this in the novel (apart from his daughter Sonia Badgery performing a similar act). An act of disappearance can be seen as having a semi-divine quality, and in *Illywhacker* it becomes an important theme that affects the outcome of the novel after its second occurrence. Herbert’s second ability is to alternate between personas, which can happen without supernatural connotations but often literally affects his physical shape. This is quite similar to a good stage performer who can, in protean fashion, convincingly change appearance and character between different acts of a play without the audience recognising multiple appearances of the same performer. The use of different personas is often applied in a sly manner in an everyday context so as not to attract too much attention, and Herbert specifically shifts between different personas to gain trust from other characters who can later be abused or misused. Herbert’s third shape shifting ability is to change from male to female sex in old age, which is a “skill” that once again

goes against human nature, but is not impossible to attain with modern technology and medical practice, though these are never mentioned in the novel. Changing his sex can thus be seen as one of Herbert's lies as an *illywhacker*, because it keeps the reader entertained and creates conceptual uncertainty; for example, is the sex change a lie, a trick, or a fact? In effect, one has to be flexible and open to the different possibilities. All three of these abilities can be classified as the trickster's shape shifting attributes.

### Disappearing Trick

First to be discussed is Herbert's ability to disappear. In Book II of *Illywhacker* Herbert explains how Goon Tse Ying taught him the vital skill of invisibility when he was still a child: "I disappeared and the world disappeared from me. I did not escape from fear, but went to the place where fear lives. I existed like waves from a tuning fork in chloroformed air. I could not see Goon Tse Ying. I was nowhere" (Carey, 1985:203). Herbert's initial use of this skill is an innocent act and necessary to his survival. The attainment of such a skill is beneficial to someone who unexpectedly becomes part of a life-threatening situation, which is why Goon taught it to Herbert, who at this time period is a deserted child facing isolation. As a child Herbert is still naïve and uninformed about life, so he tells the story of disappearing to the Chinese family that looks after him. This innocent act causes dispute amongst family members, after which Goon Tse Ying explains the consequences of misusing the gift of disappearing and Herbert gets banished from the family that looks after him:

"If you make yourself feel the terror when there is no terror to feel, you are making a dragon. If you meet a real dragon, that is the way of things. But if you make dragons in your head you are not strong enough and you will have great misfortune." (Carey, 1985:204)

It is unclear what the precise meaning of Goon's dragon is, since it encompasses lies, fear and a variety of symbolic explanations. If the dragon is viewed as an act of disappearing, Herbert's understanding of it in comparison to Goon's later explanation contradicts the act's credibility: "My English was not as good as I thought it was and you misunderstood me. A dragon, Little Bottle, was my mother's name for a frightening story. Also it is a name they give to liars in my mother's village" (Carey, 1985:347). Before we argue about the meaning of a "dragon" or the credibility of invisibility in *Illywhacker* (that is recognised as a book filled with lies), it is more

beneficial to discuss the “purpose” (Jung, 1969:260)<sup>27</sup> of this act and its consequences. As a child Herbert heeds Goon’s warning, but does not completely understand the significance. Hence Herbert misunderstands Goon by interpreting the gift as a personal possession not to be used irresponsibly, rather than a gift only to be used in cases of absolute necessity and not for personal gain.

By the time Herbert uses his disappearing trick again he is a grown man with a family to look after. He disappears from Sonia’s, Charles’s and Leah’s eyes to prove his worth and to rise above the other characters’ worth with his inhuman ability. A desire to gain acceptance due to one’s low self-esteem is an incorrect reason for the use of semi-divine powers, which is why this act results in an uncontrollable phenomenon:

Thirty-four years of locked-up terror came spurting at me and I knew I would drown in it. I tried to talk, but the dragon had me and dragged me away into the spaces between the mist of Crab Apple Creek while my audience, I must suppose, innocently applauded such a clever trick. (Carey, 1985:216)

From a Jungian point of view we can argue that Herbert is overpowered by his shadow complex, because he has not yet individuated to the point that he is ready to become conscious of his personal and collective unconscious in combination with the complexes that go paired with it. It is evident that he uses his act of disappearing at the wrong moment for the wrong reason, which is why he gets overpowered by it: “I always kept my word to him about making dragons until I was stupid enough to compete with my son for the affection of a woman”; “I felt myself compared to my son and found lacking and I was led by my emotions rather than my common sense” (Carey, 1985:205, 215). His failure to act in a mature and responsible way when tempted to react impulsively causes an irreversible flow of events that drastically affects the outcome of the novel.

Herbert’s misuse of his shape shifting ability consequently influences the characters around him. Leah becomes entangled in Herbert’s life and story; Charles carries the blame for his sister’s disappearance, and suffers a loss of hearing due to his father’s harsh reaction about her; and Sonia re-enacts Herbert’s act of disappearing, which causes her completely to vanish.

---

27. Jung specifically emphasises the importance of determining the purpose of an image rather than placing all the attention on the origin: “In psychology as in biology we cannot afford to overlook or underestimate this question of origins, although the answer usually tells us nothing about the functional meaning. For this reason biology should never forget the question of purpose, for only by answering that can we get at the meaning of a phenomenon” (Jung, 260:1969).

According to Herbert, his misuse of the “disappearing trick” creates a “dragon” that possesses Sonia:

Goon Tse Ying’s dragon was not a great scaly monster that any fool could see. It was a tiny thing, a thread, a slippery worm. It had entered my daughter without me even glimpsing it. It slunk into her viscera and lodged there. (Carey, 1985:271)

Sonia is an innocent child who does not understand the magnitude of this act, but nonetheless consistently attempts to imitate her father. Her persistence eventually results in success; however, what precisely happens to her remains a mystery. Herbert’s brief explanation leaves us in a state of uncertainty; according to Hassall:

[Herbert] blames the disappearance of his daughter Sonia on the disappearing trick, though it is also possible that she fell down a mine shaft, or disappeared in the Chinese manner and failed to rematerialise. It is also suggested that Sonia, who is devoted to the Virgin Mary, and has posed like her for the occasion, may have been assumed into Heaven, like Remedios the Beauty in García Márquez’s *One Hundred Years of Solitude*. (1994:98)

One can argue that either Sonia’s amateur use of the power of disappearance results in her tragic death, or her correct application of it grants freedom from the tragedy still to take place. It is therefore evident that Herbert’s disappearing act is of a semi-divine nature that places him in a different category from the other characters, but his malpractice of it influences the events that follow in a regrettable manner.

After Sonia’s disappearance, Herbert travels around like a nomad and by chance comes across Goon’s house. He sees this as an opportunity to seek an answer for his daughter’s disappearance, but the meeting with Goon does not produce the desired effect. Herbert reacts immorally by stealing Goon’s book and ripping off his finger in the process. Herbert is put in prison, where he later receives Goon’s finger in a Vegemite jar from Reg Moth: “I was disgusted with myself for having torn off an old man’s finger. It floated before my eyes, suspended in a Vegemite bottle with a little torn skirt of skin” (Carey, 1985:387). Against his will, Herbert keeps the finger and notices how it mysteriously begins to change shape. Eventually Charles’s wife, Emma Badgery, gets hold of the jar, and her continual exploitation of it possibly leads to Charles’s suicide: “You could see, anyone could see, it was related to the goanna, and she did not show it to her Charlie Barley to tease him, or taunt him, but she did not mind, either, that this had been the result” (Carey, 1985:536). Herbert’s shape shifting act of disappearance results in

multiple consequences, which once again suggest his identity as a trickster. He acts impulsively with the wrong intent, which eventually leads to inappropriate actions that result in catastrophe.

### Shifting Between Personas

The second of Herbert's shape shifting capabilities is his ability to change his persona according to the specific context he wishes to adapt to. There are a myriad of examples in the novel, therefore a selection of personas will be discussed, such as: aviator, herpetologist, gentleman, car salesman, builder, lumber jack, family man, political activist, prisoner, writer, and old man. It is difficult to determine which of these personas are most relevant, since they all play an important role in our interpretation of Herbert's character as a trickster. However, they can be viewed as shape-shifting roles frequently used to ill effect. Also note that most of these personas or personalities are related to one another.

When Herbert enters Geelong society he assumes the roles of an aviator and herpetologist. These are the opening personas that Herbert introduces at the start of his story (apart from briefly learning of his identity as a possible hermaphrodite, a very old man, and a liar, all of which he proclaims himself to be in Book I Chapter 1). The roles of aviator and herpetologist contribute to the desired credibility of Herbert's character, and the story he lies about to the other characters and reader. Taking to the air and handling a venomous snake are acts that grasp the attention of an audience, because they contradict what is normally humanly possible, are dangerous, and appear in a space that does not contain fixed objects people are attuned to. It is specifically due to people's poor knowledge of aviation and herpetology that Herbert manages to fool them by using these personas; Herbert thus takes advantage of the natural human phobias of snakes and heights.

Herbert explains his role as an aviator:

I was an aviator. That was my value to them. I set to work to reinforce this value. I propped it up and embellished it a little. God damn, I danced around it like a bloody bower-bird putting on a display. I added silver to it. I put small blue stones around it. (Carey, 1985:25)

To the reader it is evident that Herbert's primary use of aviation is to convince the other characters of his importance to them. He tries to increase his sense of importance by adding to

the title of aviator the false identity of herpetologist. In fact, he is more of a snake dancer, with a basic knowledge of the behaviour of snakes, who only handles a snake in a fairly haphazard way, and does not possess the ability to actually discourse about scientific matters regarding herpetology:

When the editor of the *Geelong Advertiser* had used the word ‘herpetologist’ to describe me, I had readily agreed. Later, in an answer to a question from my host, I persuaded him to look it up in the dictionary. At the time it had seemed an interesting thing to be, but now, in the middle of the soak, it did not seem so fine. (Carey, 1985:39-40)

Even though he does not understand the specialised discipline of herpetology, Herbert convincingly manages to put on a front of being a herpetologist:

When I accompanied Jack on his daily round of what he was pleased to call “interests” the story had often preceded me and I was forced to take another step closer to becoming a herpetologist by discoursing on the dietary habits of the brown snake. (Carey, 1985:50)

Herbert’s identities as an aviator and herpetologist grant him free passage to the McGraths’ house and family space. He abuses this privilege to escape his previous circumstances and to avoid commitment; therefore delaying a confrontation with previously arisen problems.

Later in Herbert’s life, when he looks back upon his assumed roles of aviator and herpetologist, he regrets the events that followed. Momentarily it seems as if Herbert shows a form of remorse and so might be classified as a negative hero; however, his awareness of the effects his lies have and had on people before the McGraths, displays the typical trickster’s knowing malpractice of his talents. By claiming these roles, he causes inner conflict for other characters and makes way for a course of events which has devastating results:

And there is no doubt that the greatest mistake I ever made in my life was to keep that Geelong snake a prisoner in a hessian bag, to starve it, to use it for tricks. Had I not been so foolish my whole life would have taken a different course: Jack would not have died, I would not have been permitted to marry Phoebe, and I would not have been troubled by the sight of my son besotted with a snake-dancer. (Carey, 1985:214)

At this point of time Herbert knows about the devastation that took place; however, as a narrator of his life story he is unable to go back in time to change the events, except by lying about them. At this point refer back to the discussion on the consequences of Herbert’s shape shifting act of disappearance, which also considers the effects of Herbert’s malpractice.

Herbert's life is filled with the different personalities he assumes and maintains in order to gain benefits but also avoid unnecessary conflict. He assumes the persona of a car salesman and combines it with several of his other personas; for example, his car salesmanship achievements can be attributed to the benefits he gains because of his reputation as an aviator and herpetologist. Characters notice this identity, but it does not always result in the desired response: "'You're a salesman, Mr Badgery,' he said. 'The country is full of bloody salesmen. You don't have to know anything to be a salesman. All you need to do is talk'" (Carey, 1985:62).

In relation to selling cars, Herbert convinces people by acting like a gentleman and by attuning his habit to fit into the specific needs of clients. He walks like a gentleman, which is a human behaviour he studies carefully in order to project a dependable personality and probe the type of person he is currently dealing with: "I had thousands of classifications of walks and I adopted the 'Gentleman's Stroll' because I fancied it would make people trust me without ever knowing why" (Carey, 1985:38). To convince people of a sale and obtain his clients' respect Herbert regularly disguises himself as a skilled worker; for example, Herbert joins the O'Hagens in lumbering trees: "If the O'Hagens were surprised to find a salesman using an axe so well, they didn't say it. But when lunchtime came they shared a tin of bully beef with me and gave me a mug of sweet stewed tea" (Carey, 1985:55). In effect, it can be argued that Herbert's alternation between different personas on different occasions, connecting and relating them with one another, contributes to the reader's understanding of an illywhacker as a shape shifter.

Herbert's actions do not always yield results according to his initial plan, which forces him to identify with unwanted personas. This brings to mind his identity as a prisoner, caused by Herbert's criminal reaction against Goon (note that Herbert's actions are unsound, but he is not a textbook criminal). When he enters prison, Herbert quickly realises the unaccustomed context he placed himself in and makes himself innocuous by assuming the identity of an old man. This persona then helps him to comply with the other prisoners and avoid becoming a target. Since Herbert lacks the expertise for being an actual hardened prisoner, the persona of an old man works well to evoke pity from the other inmates:

I spent no more than one soft month in Grafton during which time I made myself into a nice old man. I shuffled and tottered and you would not recognize the fellow who came cycling up from Nambucca a week before so cocky about his life that he abandoned a pretty widow with a business of her own.

Oh, you would not believe what a brown nose I was, a smiling, snivelling wretch of a thing. I bent my spine and let my dentures clack when I smiled. (Carey, 1985:384)

Also he turns himself into an old man through these physical manifestations to convincingly remain in his fake character. This is a good example of the physical consequences of changing his persona as a trickster.

Herbert's persona as a prisoner is one that does not remain a fixed part of his trickster identity although it almost seems as if he is about to transform himself into a criminal when he plans on killing Leah with a prison knife: "Did I tell you I was on my way to kill Goldstein?" (Carey, 1985:463) However, he has a change of heart and confesses to Leah:

I never did say what it was I planned to do with that blade, but I always assumed she understood. Perhaps she never did, but merely saw it as a symbol of my criminality, something that could be discarded as easily as the dank gaol smell which – she told me later – permeated my clothes and my skin. (Carey, 1985:482)

Herbert detaches himself from his persona as an inmate and for the remainder of the novel primarily associates with the persona of an old man. This proves Herbert's professional ability to trick people, but also to change and adapt to each situation by assuming a role most suitable for the moment at hand.

Herbert's persona of an old man originates early in his life, and according to the stories he heard from the Chinese people he grew up with it is a symptom related to his bowed legs: "I had words to say about the Chinese, observing that bow-legs were a common condition, particularly amongst the old. I had seen it in members of Goon Tse Ying's family, seen it before I realized I shared the same condition" (Carey, 1985:173). Though it might seem like Herbert is superstitious and lies about his physique, characters such as Phoebe also notice Herbert's sudden transformation during his middle age: "He, who introduced himself into my life with all his dreams and ambitions, seems to have become an old man suddenly, weary of trying anything and content to sit in his slippers drinking tea" (Carey, 1985:181). One can argue that the transformation is connected with his identity as a family man, since his life's desire is to actually settle down. Maybe he projects his current age and the feeling of becoming older onto the story he is busy telling. Regardless, the powerful effect his projected identity has on other characters, as well as the reader, helps explain his convincing shift of shape between different personas and the evident influence it has on other characters; for example, Phoebe, who notices his aging process.

There are many examples of Herbert changing his persona, but several of them specifically overlap with the characteristic approximation to the figure of a saviour, such as his desire to be a family man, to be a successful builder, his identity as writer and his fluctuating political activism (also explained in Section 5).

Herbert actually yearns to be a family man, and he assumes Phoebe also wants a family:

Doubtless I expected the same of her. I imagined my passion for building was shared by everyone. I did not doubt that it was understood: that my ruling love was for human warmth, for people gathered in rooms, talking, laughing, sharing stews and puddings and talk. Aeroplanes and cars seemed, in comparison, cold and soulless things, of no consequence in comparison to the family we were building. For the first time in my life I felt I had a place on earth. (Carey, 1985:182)

Unfortunately, he remains irresponsible, even ignorant of the actual responsibilities: “I lived for my family, and for Phoebe in particular, who waited in her room for my gentle cock” (Carey, 1985:145). It is his indifference about responsibility, his selfishness and his continual shift between different shapes and personas, which cause his role of a family man to be a transient one. In relation to his other character traits, his desire and attempt to become a family man also results in disaster, which is evident from the loss of his daughter Sonia and the suicide of his son Charles.

Herbert is under the false impression that he is a good builder: “It was one of the nicest little houses I ever built but she wouldn’t even walk in the front door when she saw how I used the wire netting and mud” (Carey, 1985:16). Throughout the novel he regularly refers to his building capabilities and combines this persona with other personas, such as a lumber jack: “You can build a good hut with only an axe and not much else, so I had plenty of experience under my belt” (Carey, 1985:55). Unfortunately, his buildings in the end only offer primitive “shelter” to “others”, socially ameliorative to an extent, but deeply unsatisfying: “I built my huts wherever we stayed, and left them for others to shelter in. This pitiful charity was hardly satisfying to a man like me. And yet I could think of nothing better” (Carey, 1985:315). But his success in disassembling things and failure to construct other things lead to new discoveries and carry the potential for transformation.

Herbert’s desire to do good and actually contribute something to society can be seen through his political activist persona. Similarly to his identity as a family man, this persona does not remain constant and Herbert’s motives change too easily due to emotional interference. One

instance of Herbert's political acuteness and need to act occurs in the meeting Jack arranged with his potential sponsors for the aircraft factory. It is the Cocky Abbots who provoke an emotional response from Herbert due to their ignorant attitude about globalising matters and the effects thereof. Though Herbert has a good point, he mistakes the Abbots' response for an attack rather than as showing concern about their part in an expensive business. This leads to the failure of the project, when he loses his temper and neglects to maintain the false persona he created as aviator (that is actually crucial at this moment). Tragically, he does not realise his actual potential to use these benefactors to gain political respect, which would have been possible even at a later stage if he remained patient, and in effect influence a larger group of people. Therefore Herbert falls back on his natural means of persuasion, which is to evoke fear and use it in an authoritarian way (refer back to the introductory passage of Chapter III that provides an example from *Illywhacker*).

Another instance of Herbert's ability to act like an influential figure regarding political matters occurs at a railway line "somewhere between Maldon and Bendigo" (Carey, 1985:316). Herbert attempts smooth-talking the police to convince them that the people they are punishing have nothing to do with political matters regarding communism. In effect, we observe how Herbert once again manages to shift between personas and change his shape in order to adapt to the situation at hand:

What I did was not done like a nice man. It was done with spit on my shoe, swagger in my walk, a nasty glint in my eye, a charming smile on my face. As I walked up that railway track to talk to the bully boys I was my father's son. I had a vision of myself that sunny morning as I had not had a vision of myself for years: I could *see* Herbert Badgery again. I was delighted to hear the crunch of railway gravel. I was pleased my shoes were spit-bright, my handsome head newly shaved. I adopted the bearing of a brigadier and swung the silver-topped cane I used in my act as an idiot. I could feel Leah's eyes (wet, bright, big) boring into my broad straight back, but I was not doing this for her admiration. I was doing it for my own. (Carey, 1985:316)

This is an interesting passage, because it gives a clear image of Herbert as an illywhacker and trickster who comfortably shifts between different shapes in a sly manner to convince other characters, as well as the reader, of his authenticity, value, and the care he has for other people. He openly confesses that he sets forth to perform an act, and that he is primarily doing it for his own benefit. Yet again, Herbert's attempt to perform a good deed, even though the deed is for

his own gain, results in failure, and his reaction to the loss results in his spiralling down into melancholia. As his mood drops he becomes demotivated:

And even if I have boasted about how I was a patient man when I sold Fords to cockies, shuffled cards, told a yarn, taught a spinster aunt to drive, I was not talking about anything more than a day or two of my life, and *then* off down the road with the order in my pocket.

[...]

...when the battle was lost, I could not, as Leah begged me to (with tears in her big eyes), return to the struggle. (Carey, 1985:321)

If Herbert had learned from his previous failures and used the repetitive pattern as a learning process that might have improved his life had he remained patient and endured the hardships that go along with any profession, he might have gained the ability to rise above this situation. Unfortunately he remains a trickster and falls back into his natural tendency to become involved in some form of malpractice.

Herbert even adopts the role of a writer: “When I was an author I was party to a book called *Gaol Bird* which claimed I was a prisoner in Grafton Gaol” (Carey, 1985:384). As an author of the book about Herbert’s life that he currently narrates in, in the novel of which Carey is the actual author, Herbert critiques certain aspects of history and gives an alternative version (refer back to Chapter I regarding a detailed discussion on history and historiography by various Carey critics). By providing a revised historical overview of Australian colonial history, Herbert serves the role of a “saviour” (discussed in Section 5). Unfortunately this identity once again remains an unstable one, used to gain benefits or trick people. The reader becomes aware of Herbert’s falsity and secret intention with his book after Leah reveals Herbert’s foul play in a chapter where she accuses him: “So your casual superior tone does not match those great dramas you and I suffered in the name of ‘love’. It is not polite of me to write these words in your own book”; “each one of those books had a purpose, that we tried to do some good things and were not embarrassed about it either... You have treated us all badly, as if we were your creatures” (Carey, 1985:519-520). Clearly Leah establishes that Herbert has a hidden agenda, which proves his identity as a trickster who uses his abilities inappropriately. Herbert’s intention with the book is uncertain, but it appears he uses it as an attempt to gain recognition as a type of iconic figure after his death by breaking down the image of other characters to do so. Also note that the fact of Herbert’s authorship of the story he tells holds potential for a theoretical discussion on approaches such as postmodernism (discussed in Chapter I).

## Change from the Male Sex to the Female Sex

The third aspect of shape shifting is Herbert's ability to shift between male and female sex: "I think I'm growing tits... That'd be one for the books if I turned into a woman at this stage of life" (Carey, 1985:4). As previously mentioned, with modern medical practices and technology, sex-change operations are certainly possible, but Herbert does not undergo surgery to change his sex. Herbert's assumed age and continuous shape shifting perhaps cause this malformation and place him in a parodic semi-divine position, if you will, relating to his disappearing trick and ability to shift between personas. He therefore resembles a hermaphrodite, similar, again, to a character such as Wakdjunkaga, who bears children: "Not long after Trickster became pregnant" (Radin, 1972:23). Compare this to Herbert who at the end of the novel says: "I take the boy – he is light as a feather – and put him to my breast... With my swollen blue-veined breast I give my offspring succour – the milk of dragons from my witch's tit" (Carey, 1985:569).

It is difficult to determine whether it is Herbert's old age or mental instability constantly influenced by his lies and trickery that cause his transformation. He also claims, in a confusing way, that he is lying about his transformation, but contradicts himself when he provides physical samples of milk: "When he discovered my tits he nearly wet himself. I expressed a little milk for him and he put it in a bottle to take away. I told him the tits were just a lie, but he doesn't seem to understand" (Carey, 1985:140). What remains certain is Herbert's ability to change shape, sometimes with semi-divine overtones, and his selfish use of this ability to gain acceptance or recognition. Herbert openly admits how he thrives off the people who come to observe his trickster characteristics: "They journey up the aluminium walkways, they brave their vertigo, they grasp the rail, they tremble to see what a human being can become" (Carey, 1985:566). More interesting, Herbert also makes it very evident that his scheme as a trickster is to keep on living in order to see what comes next in his life story: "I cannot die. I will not die, because this is my scheme. I must stay alive to see it out" (Carey, 1985:568). From a Jungian point of view, we can argue that Herbert's motivation to stay alive is yet another example of the trickster's invaluable existence in society. He cannot die, because people keep his story alive, and his purpose as a vehicle of the shadow archetype is important to the collective's recognition of their own complexes.

A last point to regard before concluding this section is Jung's explanation of the trickster's relation to "the individual shadow [that] contains within it the seed of an enantiodromia" (Jung, 1969:272). Jung's definition of enantiodromia is as follows: "There is no

hallowed custom that cannot on occasion turn into its opposite, and the more extreme a position is, the more easily may we expect an enantiodromia, a conversion of something into its opposite” (Jung, 1956:375). Now, when we compare Herbert’s final words in the novel to Jung’s definition of enantiodromia an interesting parallel appears; for example: “I am, at last, the creature I have so long wished to become – a kind man” (Carey, 1985:569). Herbert’s final form of shape shifting between genders may possibly be described as an attempt to become his opposite, similar in the way Jung describes the term enantiodromia and relates it to the purpose of the trickster. We can argue that Herbert attempts to undergo an enantiodromia due to his need for change after a lifelong devotion to being a conman, a role limited, for the most part, to the male gender. On the other hand the feminine gender is depicted as being kinder than the male gender, and may also possess other distinct traits that Herbert has not been exposed to in his life. By comparing the men and their habits in *Illywhacker* to the women, the reader can see that women have been more kind to him. This perception is shared by Charles, who “would rather, any day, deal with a woman for there was always a soft spot to be found in the hardest of them” (Carey, 1985:359). From Herbert’s need for change here, we can assume he now understands the importance of self-reflection. One-sided opinions result in pain and unhappiness, as depicted elsewhere in the novel.

Herbert’s resemblance to the trickster as a shape shifting character is evident from the variety of different contexts he applies shape shifting to. It is also clear that his misuse of these abilities distinguishes him from other characters that also possess the ability to change their shape. The continuous change brings consciousness of the opposing forces that govern his identity, and this may well indicate his individuation process through his character development. By extension, this may also inspire individuation in the reader, who has the opportunity to identify with Herbert’s growth pattern.

### Section 3: Dual Nature – Half Animal and Half Divine

The trickster's dual nature and powers as a shape shifter are closely related, but are not precisely the same characteristics. Possessing a dual nature does not reduce the trickster to an animal or raise him to a godlike figure, nor does it specifically point to the different shapes into which the trickster can transform himself, as already discussed. Jung notes:

The trickster is a primitive "cosmic" being of *divine-animal* nature, on the one hand superior to man because of his superhuman qualities, and on the other hand inferior to him because of his unreason and unconsciousness. He is no match for the animals either, because of his extraordinary clumsiness and lack of instinct. These defects are the marks of his *human* nature, which is not so well adapted to the environment as the animal's but, instead, has prospects of a much higher development of consciousness based on a considerable eagerness to learn, as is duly emphasized in the myth. (Jung, 1969:264)

Dual nature therefore implies that the trickster exists in a liminal phase, or one of transition from animal instinct to human reason, which makes him unsure about his specific position. He has not moved beyond behaviour that relates to instinctual desire, and struggles to understand why he should comply with the framework of civilisation or use his semi-divine qualities to aid others in need. For example, Herbert does not notice Molly's subtle compassion towards him by giving him "bigger portions" of food, but devours it "with the same indiscriminate passion" he "turned on all of life" (Carey, 1985:42). Herbert also disregards the opportunities offered by the aircraft factory, "which in the end have never been worth a tinker's fart in comparison with a woman" (Carey, 1985:105). Herbert's connection to his instinct can also be observed through his empathy with animals rather than humans; however, his relationship with animals is self-interested, since he abuses them for personal gain. For example, Herbert does "not like the Geelong snake" but remains "stuck with it" (Carey, 1985:37) due to his dependence on the perks he gains from the snake's "feeling" his "admiration" (Carey, 1985:17). On the one hand his acute ability to handle animals better than other characters illustrates the relation he has with his instinct, which other characters seem to repress. On the other hand he does not represent a hero who uses his semi-divine nature to bring world peace, say, but sees it as a means to gain something for himself. As a writer who has the opportunity to change the course of other characters' lives, he observes how they suffer in the pain and agony of his own story: "I knew, that day, that God is a glutton for grief... But what am I saying? There is no God. There is only me, Herbert Badgery, enthroned high above Pitt Street while angels or parrots trill attendance" (Carey, 1985:540).

Once again, what distinguishes Herbert from other characters' dual natures (discussed in Section 6) are the malpractice and trickery that go together with his actions, motivated by his unstable position. Human civilisation has, at least in a superficial way, already moved beyond this instability that contradicts the norms of society, which is why it represses the trickster's identity, with its unwanted and primitive behaviour. In effect, this places the trickster in the shadow of the collective unconscious, but unlike the other characters he becomes conscious of his shadow through his actions. This is also why the trickster should be regarded as an important character, because he represents change, and the difficulty in accomplishing this, being located in the shadow of the collective unconscious.

### Half Animal

There are two ways in which Herbert's half animal nature is presented in the book. In the first instance it is portrayed through his use of animal metaphors to describe his and the other characters' characteristics. These images are not used to physically claim that a character turns into an animal, but illustrate the unconscious connection between humans and animals. In *Illywhacker* there are countless examples of animal imagery, portraying different animals with a different meaning in each specific context, and regularly relating to certain characteristics of different characters.<sup>28</sup>

In Book I, in a scene with the McGraths, Herbert describes himself as a dog: "I was an old dog lying before an open fire, warming myself before them" (Carey, 1985:65). Dogs live in mutual relation with humans, they are also mammals, and are mentally more developed than many other animals. Attuned to the McGraths and having adapted to their way of life Herbert resembles a dog that lives alongside them, intelligent enough to understand their routine, and able to provide sustenance in exchange for their care of him. He is comfortable, feels at home and will protect his new family unconditionally.

In Book II, in a scene with Leah, Herbert describes himself as a moulting snake: "I was a different man... I was an old python with his opaque skin now shed, his blindness gone, once again splendid and supple, seeing the world in all its terrifying colours" (Carey, 1985:315). In contrast to the dog Herbert previously represented, the snake is a reptile, not a mammal, and does

---

28. Here it is of note to refer to the fable-like qualities of *Illywhacker*, which is discussed by Carey critics such as Woodcock.

not live in mutual relation to humans. In fact, fear of snakes is a natural human response, because they are poisonous, dangerous, cold, have scales for a skin, and their biological shape is completely different from the human body. This metaphor illustrates Herbert's transition from an illiterate trickster into a more informed and cunning trickster who should be carefully monitored; in this state he is unpredictable, dangerous and capable of sudden change.

In Book III, in a scene at Charles's pet emporium, Herbert compares himself to Charles's pet goanna: "I sat there on the pile of bricks with a leashed lightglobe circling above my head, an echo, if you like, of the old goanna who lay beneath its similarly moving ultraviolet light elsewhere in the gallery" (Carey, 1985:511). A goanna is more developed than a snake, more-or-less predictable as a pet, and is almost similar to a dog in its close proximity to humans, if made tame. The metaphor illustrates how Herbert once again participates in animal nature, but relates to a deeper meaning of the novel. The discovery Herbert makes of the convicts' thumb prints on the bricks when he intends to renovate Charles's building, places him in the same situation as Charles's goanna behind bars and treated as a pet in a cage. He realises that the foundation of Australia was laid down by convicts and that Australian history is based on lies. If we regard Goon's dragon (refer to Section 1) as a lie and refer to the goanna as a type of dragon, Herbert alludes to himself as the lie being kept alive as a pet behind bars. The light above his head portrays Herbert's newfound knowledge, similar to a "lightbulb moment" in a comic illustration.

In the second instance, Herbert's half animal nature is evident in actions that relate more to his instinct than his reason; still, he cannot completely immerse himself in animal instinct and remains aware of his limitations. For example, upon meeting the McGraths we see his ability to handle a snake while remaining aware of the danger: "I shudder to think of the risk I'm taking. The king brown snake is cranky and cantankerous. It can kill with a single strike" (Carey, 1985:19). That is, Herbert's snake-handling is instinctual, but he still relies upon reason to determine the consequences of his actions. He only half relates to the animal nature; if he related fully with his animal instinct he would not have reasoned about the situation, or used his instinctual nature to manipulate the snake, but let the snake go immediately due to the dangers it holds. This can be classified as malpractice, because he abuses his abilities in order to prove a point rather than relying on his intuitive understanding of his dual nature.

Herbert assumes a primitive lifestyle rather than seeking a better, more sophisticated life. For example, he lives in a hole in the ground: "I even spent one summer in the Mallee living in a hole in the ground. It was cool and comfortable in that hot climate and I would have got married

but a poddy calf fell in on top of us one night and broke the woman's arm... I should have fenced it" (Carey, 1985:24). Inhabiting a hole and assuming that people will accept similar standards contradicts expectations concerning the normal living conditions of humans, especially if we regard his intent to stay there for longer than one night, even though he might well search for a more hospitable dwelling. The humorous irony is that his compelling enough reasons for his primitive choices are hardly geared to be palatable for other characters: "'It's mud,' she said. 'It'll outlast you,' I said" (Carey, 1985:16).

Herbert's dual nature is well portrayed in Book I, Chapter 15, which contains material for a discussion on the trickster's possession of tools other characters do not have, the trickster's representation of the shadow, and the shadow's shadow. In Chapter 15 Herbert explains his understanding of using a snake as a crucial link to keep his story credible. He is therefore in search of frogs to feed the snake, thus keeping the snake well fed and satisfied in an attempt to avoid unnecessary accidents. Still, he remains aware of the fact that no matter how hard you try to keep a snake happy it will "not become tame or even accept its captivity" (Carey, 1985:38). Herbert's awareness is an important point, because it portrays the comparison between Herbert who acknowledges the danger and Jack who remains unaware of the shadow aspect of existence, reflected in the danger associated with the snake: "'You were wrong about the snake... There isn't a creature alive who won't respond to kindness" (Carey, 1985:127). In Jack's attempt to prove Herbert wrong, he fails to realise the significance of the hessian bag containing the snake, and disregards the natural inclination of a snake and the consequences of a snake bite: "Why, at two o'clock in the morning, would he open this bag in the kitchen? And why, when he was bitten, would he walk out on to the front lawn to die in public (in his pyjamas) rather than raise his family and ask for help?" (Carey, 1985:128). Herbert remains conscious of his shadow, handles the snake with caution, and uses the correct simple "tool", a hessian bag, to avoid an accident: "It is my belief that there are few things in this world more useful than a hessian bag, and no matter what part of my story I wish to reflect on I find that a hessian bag, or the lack of one, assumes some importance...Which is why it is surprising that in all the McGraths' possessions I could not find a single hessian bag" (Carey, 1985:39). The bag becomes symbolic of Herbert's "bag-man" status, and the cunning instinct for survival that goes along with it. This observation anticipates the appearance of the "swagman" (stereotypically Australian, as in the song "Waltzing Matilda"), discussed below.

The connection between Herbert as a trickster and the shadow is illustrated in his search for frogs at a soak that lies "in the shadow of a towering redbrick flour mill" (Carey, 1985:39). In

this scene Herbert discards his civilised appearance by taking off his “suit coat,” “trousers,” and “socks,” in order to walk “through the black squelching mud” in his “underwear” (Carey, 1985:39). Herbert physically goes out of sight from the road, which is a manmade object that can be seen as representing human evolutionary progress, and enters a swamp that lies in the shadow of a flour mill, which is also a construction that signifies technological sophistication. It is evident that the swamp is a deserted, inhospitable place that people avoid due to its desolate appearance. Herbert enters this setting – which once again lies in the shadow of the building where “women in white aprons” (Carey, 1985:39) are making a living to maintain their level of civilisation – and becomes conscious of an inherent sense of disapproval associated with his present space: “I got down in the gully out of sight of the road, but the blank windows of the flour mill continued to stare down at me” (Carey, 1985:39). He therefore stands in what can be seen as the shadow of the collective unconscious, since he is hidden from civilised people who use the road and is in the shadow of a disapproving building that is a sign of “normal” humanity.

In the swamp Herbert meets a swagman who is also a collective shadow image, because he lives in the location previously explained. Though the swagman is shocked to find Herbert walking around in his underpants “nekkid” (Carey, 1985:40), he is not exactly better in appearance:

He was a swagman who had let himself go, a swagman who had long ago given up trying to wash his shirt once a week in summer, a swagman whose natural affection for pieces of string and odd discarded rags had entered a virulent phase where it overwhelmed any of the conventional restraints placed on fashion and became a style of its own.

His face, where you could see it through his rampant beard, was weathered and beaten by the combined forces of sun, rain and alcohol. His teeth were rotting. His bulbous nose made its own confession. His hair was grey and matted and one eye, half closed by a blow or a bee sting, gave him an untrustworthy appearance. (Carey, 1985:40)

Herbert, who is aware of his own appearance and untrustworthy nature, describes the swagman in disparaging terms. That is, in this particular scene the swagman serves as a mirror image of Herbert, upon which he projects his personal shadow.<sup>29</sup> People refuse to accept either one of them due to their abject appearance and behaviour; for example, Mrs Kentwell describes her fear upon seeing the swagman: “She found it impossible to convey to her allies the true nature of this

---

29. An interesting comparison can be drawn with the character Sméagol and his shadow self, Gollum, in Tolkien’s (1967) *The Lord of the Rings*. Usually a single character represents the shadow; but Herbert, who himself represents the shadow, also has his own shadow. This makes the trickster in *Illywhacker* more multifarious and, therefore, dynamic.

character”; and in another scene Jack and his family refuse to accept Herbert as the person he truly is: “But when I took off my cloak they did not like me” (Carey, 1985:48, 68).

The trickster’s half animal nature is therefore apparent in the metaphors that portray Herbert’s character as an animal and his behaviour that is more primitive and contradictory to that of the people who live around him.

### Half Divine

Next, Herbert’s semi-divine nature is most apparent in his disappearing trick, also discussed in Section 2. To become invisible is a supernormal phenomenon that is sometimes portrayed in stories but has no basis in scientific fact. Herbert claims that he possesses this ability and that he has performed it twice: “I disappeared and the world disappeared from me. I did not escape from fear, but went to the place where fear lives. I existed like waves from a tuning fork in chloroformed air. I could not see Goon Tse Ying. I was nowhere” (Carey, 1985:203). Unfortunately, he cannot claim complete superhuman status (related to the semi-divinity of the trickster), since he remains all too human due to his inability to perform this act whenever he wishes: “I retreated, crawling... I crawled off the stage and left the show to Leah Goldstein” (Carey, 1985:277-278). To contextualise, Herbert performed his act of disappearance a second time as a means to gain recognition from Leah and his children; however, when he wishes to aid Leah in her performance on stage, due to the disappearing-trick’s ability to draw the attention of any audience, he fails to re-enact it. We can therefore see how this act works in dire circumstances, as when Herbert was a child and needed to immediately escape from a life-threatening situation, but the moment he abuses the power for personal gain Herbert loses control of it.

Other means of Herbert’s being seen in superhuman terms are through his age of “a hundred and thirty-nine years” (Carey, 1985:3), and his metamorphosis into a hermaphrodite: “I think I’m growing tits” (Carey, 1985:4). Herbert claims that he consciously decides to become old out of curiosity, and that his protandry is used to nourish the characters in his story: “It’s only the curiosity that keeps me alive: to see what my dirty old body will do next”; “I give my offspring succour – the milk of dragons from my witch’s tit. It will give him strength for the interesting times ahead” (Carey, 1985:4, 569). From these exceptional events and circumstances, the reader can see how Herbert participates in the nature of a semi-divine trickster figure, who

according to Jung had an “original nature as a Creator” (Jung, 1969:264), a fact which, on a metafictional level, reflects on Herbert’s (and Carey’s) role as an “author”.

That is, the decision to become old and change sex may possibly relate to Herbert’s desire to obtain control over the other characters in the novel and claim the title of a god-like figure: “I wish I had been able to control them as well as I can now... but now I sit behind my instruments like Christ Almighty summoning up a stolen letter from Jonathon Oakes’s drawer to get the next leg started”; “There is no God. There is only me, Herbert Badgery, enthroned high above Pitt Street while angels or parrots trill attendance” (Carey, 1985:140, 540). If we regard Herbert as the author of his own story in Carey’s novel, Herbert possesses the ability to coordinate the events that influence other characters in whatever manner he wishes. The creation of his story through lies is in effect a type of divine ability that he alone has power over.

Herbert’s ability to manipulate his own story is connected with his ability to imagine life emerging from a lifeless finger in a Vegemite jar. When Herbert originally receives the finger, it is a lifeless object floating around in formaldehyde, but shortly after the solution becomes murky the finger begins to change:

The finger changed. It changed all the time. It changed like a face in a dream.

I will not upset myself by describing the slimy monsters that tried to free themselves from that bottle, but rather tell you about the morning I woke early and found it filled with bright blue creatures that darted in and out of delicate filigree forests, like tropical fish feeding amongst the coral. (Carey, 1985:389)

Life sprouts from Goon’s finger, the one who taught Herbert the disappearing trick, and who told him about dragons and lies. The most significant living creature to come from this jar is the dragon: “The thing that killed my boy was not half goanna and half human at all... It was a dragon, a solid being, two inches tall” (Carey, 1985:547). As previously mentioned in Section 2, this Vegemite jar with its contents may be the cause of Charles’s suicide. Is it the lies that cause Charles to commit suicide; is it the continual harassment of his wife; or does Herbert decide to cause his death? If Goon is right about the dragon representing lies, Herbert transforms his lies into a story and with it he kills off certain characters. In this regard, Herbert’s “divinity” lies in his ability to create life and take it away.

Herbert possesses a dual nature with divine qualities, but his desire for control results in malicious application of his divinity. He can therefore be classified as a trickster who exists in a liminal phase between his half animal and half divine nature, unable to understand the purpose of

his abilities and in effect irresponsibly causing devastation among those around him. However, his appearance and his awareness of the shadow serve as an important message that one should take heed of the shadow rather than suppress it.

#### **Section 4: Exposure to all Kinds of Torture**

The trickster's failure to use common sense and his stupidity regularly result in self-inflicted suffering. At the same time he is also destined to suffer, a fact embedded in the nature of his character. He regularly provokes unnecessary anger through situations that can easily be avoided, and in certain situations his sheer destiny and the mere fact of his existence cause his suffering. If we regard the instances of malpractice in previous sections, the trickster's actions are seen to be a recipe for disaster. Therefore the trickster's behaviour, because of his very being, inevitably leads to pain, punishment or torture.

Herbert's exposure to all kinds of torture is inescapable due to his being an illywhacker. According to Hassall, characters in Carey's novels "struggle to transform themselves" and "cannot escape from meaningless jobs, predatory relationships, corrosive addictions and exploitative social and political structures" (1994:2). Herbert eagerly attempts to break this pattern, but fails to convert his abilities into meaningful acts; he is constrained within the role of a trickster who is subject to torture.

#### **Torture at a Young Age**

Herbert's character is subjected to torture at a young age, specifically inflicted by his father and Goon Tse Ying. The reader sees these role models, who are supposed to educate and inspire a child at this age, mistreat Herbert. For example, his brothers are favoured above him and his father regularly beats him after failed sales that are not immediately influenced by his children, and this eventually results in a really "bloody beating" (Carey, 1985:31). After his father's mistreatment Herbert runs away, filled with rage, to become "a self-appointed orphan... living, thin, half wild, cunning as a shit-house rat amidst the crates and spoiled vegetables at the back of the Eastern Market" (Carey, 1985:193). This exposes Herbert to a new type of suffering as an orphan, but he eventually gets adopted by Goon who temporarily nourishes him. At first-sight this man seems kind and loving towards Herbert, making all kinds of promises about how he will teach Herbert the secrets of life, to use different languages, and to survive in the wild. Sadly, this illusion fades when Goon turns bad and inflicts suffering upon Herbert for a debatably good reason, to teach him the disappearing trick:

The terrible Chinaman leapt from crumbling bank to gnarled root, from root to scoured clay. His face was hideous. The axe handle belted me across the shoulders and sent me sprawling.

I lay across the rocks blubbing, as broken as the beetles I had sought to injure.

[...]

...He hit me time and time again. I wept. I begged. I tried to run away, but he caught me effortlessly. (Carey, 1985:202)

Goon's mistreatment of Herbert during his insecure years as a child has a negative effect on Herbert's development into an adolescent. Probably Herbert's ill behaviour is a direct result of his suffering as a child, which led to a low self-esteem and failing powers of motivation.

### The Torture of Being Illiterate

Herbert never learns to communicate fluently in the languages Goon spoke of: "So I never learned the art of herbalism, nor, for that matter, did I master any of the five languages Goon had promised" (Carey, 1985:197). The inability to read and write causes Herbert great discomfort and pain. This is regularly observed when he encounters dire situations; for example, when Phoebe deserts Herbert and he is in a state of deep melancholy, he does not possess the ability to read the only letter she left him: "I stared at this crumpled paper as if I could take in its meaning by the sheer force of my will. It would not reveal itself. It contained nothing I recognized, neither the word Badgery or Ford, and it was two hours before Molly arrived to read it to me" (Carey, 1985:189). It is only later in the novel that Herbert confesses his sense of humiliation and insecurity to Leah: "I admitted I could not read and that the landscape had, indeed, always seemed alien to me, that it made me, in many lights, melancholy and homesick for something else" (Carey, 1985:287-288).

### Physical Drawbacks

Not only is Herbert destined to suffer because of unnecessary mistreatment, but he has a physical disability that affects his appearance. His bowed legs are a deformity that restricts his capabilities, and people's reaction to this slight disfigurement damages his self-esteem: "But my bowed legs mortified me and I turned sideways to the staring windows, presenting myself at my least ludicrous angle" (Carey, 1985:39). He also guardedly asks a doctor about the possibility

that one of his children might suffer from the same condition, which indicates his insecurity about his disfigurement. When the doctor drives away he clearly shows an awareness of and deep rooted dislike for his appearance:

As he reversed he caught me in the full glare of his lights. I had no idea whether he was looking forwards or back, but I turned my left foot sideways and stood with my hand on my hip, in such a manner that my deformity, looked at from the doctor's point of view, to all intents and purposes, disappeared. (Carey, 1985:173)

Herbert's physical deformity and the suffering it causes is one of the setbacks he is destined to live with.

### Inability to Change Bad Habits in order to Become Successful

In Book I we encounters an instance where Herbert sincerely attempts to change his life for the better, but fails to do so due to unsuitable circumstances. He fails to understand the aversion people have against older men marrying younger girls, specifically in the case of Phoebe, who is still a minor and fourteen years younger than Herbert. In conversation with Jack McGrath, Herbert explains how the world refuses to allow him to be the person he is and how they reject his decisions:

It was the trouble with the world that it would never permit me to be what I was. Everyone loved me when I appeared in a cloak, and swirled and laughed and told them lies. They applauded. They wanted my friendship. But when I took off my cloak they did not like me. They clucked their tongues and turned away. My friend Jack was my friend in all things but was repulsed by what I really was. I admired and loved him, even though he could not abide the Chinese; but he could only like the bullshit version of me. (Carey, 1985:68)

It is tragic that Herbert fails to attain a change of character and personality despite his honest intent. This is an example of Herbert's inability to rise above his circumstances despite his good intentions.

The suffering associated with Herbert's inability to change worsens when the potential chance to improve his lifestyle and attain financial stability fails, shortly after the accident Phoebe had by falling off the roof. Herbert manages to keep Jack enthralled with his stories, but,

as already discussed, fails to impress the sponsors Jack arranged. Not only does this cause him to lose financial support, but it results in Jack's apparent suicide and actually Herbert's loss of a friend: "It was I who found poor Jack, poor grey-faced dead Jack. I could not bear his staring eyes. I can bear few memories of that dreadful day" (Carey, 1985:128). Herbert loses the one chance to rise above his circumstances and once again becomes subject to financial and emotional suffering.

Herbert's failure to rise above his circumstances, indicated, for instance, by his inability to hold down a job, causes his regression into adverse behaviour and hopelessness. A hopeless chain of events is observed, when Herbert fails to change his false appearance, loses his opportunity to establish a respectable business, loses his partner, and loses his job on the same day Phoebe deserts him; and all this ties in with an actual, specific historical moment, as if to give his personal history an added, overbearing, weight to shoulder, that of the Depression: "As far as I am concerned that day was the first of the Great Depression" (Carey, 1985:187). After continual failure, Herbert remains down and defeated, unable to regain motivation. Whereas he usually found reassurance in making a car sale, he does not manage to regain his confidence in being able to convince customers. This is probably the most apparent when he attempts to make another sale during that time of financial austerity, to a mad woman who accuses him of foul-play when in fact she prompted the bad situation. Herbert is unable to cross a river with the car he assured her would be able to make it across the previously slow flowing river, but which suddenly came down in strong force a few hours after they crossed it: "'You pesky little tinker,' she said. 'A tinker's trick,' she roared. 'But I,' her eyes were hard, hostile, her mouth suddenly thin and severe, 'shall not buy'... At that moment I abandoned any hope of the sale. That was my disappointment, a disappointment so great I could have cried" (Carey, 1985:250).

Herbert's continual failure intensifies the state of depression he falls into:

I had a salesman's vanity and could not bear rejection. I could not tolerate talking to men who would not even open my book of yellowed write-ups. Those Ford and Dodge agents in Ballarat, Ararat, Shepparton, Kaniva, Warragul and Colac finished off the work that Phoebe's poem had begun and I entered my own private depression and kept away from anything that might damage my pride any more. (Carey, 1985:206)

Herbert is in a dire mood and struggles to keep his children happy with the little he can provide through his poverty-stricken situation. The situation becomes even worse when he attempts to improve this mood by proving his worth to Leah through his disappearing act. Unfortunately, as

we've seen, the abuse of his act and its influence on people around him eventually leads to the disappearance of his daughter Sonia, and the loss of Sonia causes mental and psychological suffering for Herbert. So a previously unsympathetic trickster becomes an emotional wreck after losing his daughter. For example, later in conversation with Goon, Herbert makes it clear that he cannot process the idea of losing his daughter: "But my shaking hand had nothing to do with sugar, either fine or coarse. It was a condition I had not been free of since my time in Sunbury. 'I lost my little girl,' I said. 'I made a dragon and lost my little girl'" (Carey, 1985:347). When Goon fails to provide Herbert with closure, he retreats and realises that he is "not well" (Carey, 1985:348). After Herbert's meeting with Goon he decides "to steal *The Book of Dragons*" (Carey, 1985:348) from Goon, but gains nothing from it, and is placed in prison for his criminal behaviour. Herbert's reaction towards the realisation that he failed to restore Sonia is an example of the suffering he endures: "When they took that sticky brown book from my hands I had begun to weep" (Carey, 1985:351). He also realises that most of the suffering he endures is self-inflicted: "So it was, at a time when it seemed too late, that I began to have some understanding of the power of lies" (Carey, 1985:351).

#### Failure to Establish Fixed Relationships and a Family

Constant obsession and failure with women also serves as one of Herbert's existential cruxes. He admits early in his story that he would have reached much higher goals if he had not been obsessed with women: "In those days I would have done anything to get written up in the papers and anything for the admiration of a woman" (Carey, 1985:19). Four instances come to mind in which Herbert's devotion to women, due to various reasons, results in failed relationships and marriages. The first woman he fails with is Phoebe (though we can also refer to his wife Marjorie Thatcher as his first marital failure, but she does not actually appear in the novel): "She left me with two children and a savage poem" (Carey, 1985:188). The second woman that he had to abandon, after she cared for and supported him after Phoebe's abrupt departure, was Molly (Carey, 1985:312-313). In a third instance, he failed to fight for Leah: "She saw dry-eyed Herbert Badgery standing waving, hiding his emotions in the shadow of his Akubra hat, grey, formal, unsmiling" (Carey, 1985:327). And in a fourth case, Shirl banished him: "Naturally it wasn't long before she wanted to marry me... But the impediment to marriage was nothing

technical. It was a dog” (Carey, 1985:501).<sup>30</sup> Every instance in which Herbert becomes the victim of a failed love life, he falls into a depression that affects his well-being.

Herbert’s failure with women also leads to his failure to be a family man (a title he explains is important to him), a direct result of his inability to commit to long-term relationships, or to court a suitable wife. Herbert confides to the reader his previous relationships and his intention of becoming a father: “We were going to have babies but she thought I was a liar” (Carey, 1985:16). Later in the novel, Phoebe reveals the truth that he was already married when he got engaged to and married her: “‘You were married,’ she said, ‘to Marjorie Thatcher Wilson in Castlemaine on October 15th, 1917, and you were never divorced’ ... I remembered Marjorie Wilson very well. She was a nice woman, and I was sorry I left her but the problem was not her but the screeching mother she would bow and scrape to all day long” (Carey, 1985:486). From Herbert’s own words, and Phoebe’s additional confrontation, it becomes evident that he does not take responsibility for his actions, but nevertheless claims that he longs to be a family man. And once again, the inappropriate action Herbert takes against societal norms provokes anger from other characters and results in self-inflicted suffering.

### Imprisonment

A final form of Herbert’s suffering as a trickster become apparent after the loss of his daughter, which leads to his physical imprisonment sometime in “November... 1937” (Carey, 1985:348). To have to become a prison inmate may be seen as a primary example of a form of “torture”; all forms of freedom are suspended or removed in society’s attempt to punish criminal behaviour, so that inmates either learn from their mistakes or are prevented from causing further harm against society. Herbert’s being a prisoner serves as punishment for his actions; however, he also endures physical suffering caused by his use of an old man’s identity to gain immunity from the other prisoners who otherwise threaten him. When he gets released sometime in “February 1949” (Carey, 1985:484), Herbert does not resemble the same person he once was; and this perhaps shows the extent of his physical suffering.

In conclusion, the reader can argue that Herbert’s suffering is a direct result of his nature as a trickster, compounded, extended, and confirmed by his anti-social behaviour. As a character

---

30. It is interesting that Shirl already has a dog. If we compare Herbert’s reference to himself as a dog living with the McGrath’s, it might be that Shirl already accepted her shadow and integrated it, not needing the trickster’s guidance at this specific time of her life.

in the novel he is exposed to suffering that is virtually predestined, considering his character type, but suffering is also caused by his typical trickster habits and behaviour. As explained in the previous sections, the trickster's actions are distinguished from those of other characters because they have the potential to lead to malicious consequences. This then is a possible reason as to what primarily leads to Herbert's suffering as an illywhacker.

## **Section 5: Approximation to the Figure of a Saviour**

Up to this point in discussing the trickster's characteristics, we can see his natural tendency to act maliciously – certain actions give a negative impression about his nature. In this section it is important to note that even though he disregards the rules of society, he also has the ability to inspire growth through amoral behaviour, especially when it is least expected; however, certain manifestations of the trickster enclose significant messages that may be overlooked due to their immediate elicitation of undesired emotional responses. For example, an abject appearance that contradicts society's expectations, regarding ideals of what is acceptable, provokes people to react according to their conditioned counter responses. These are usually negative responses that have become routine reactions of aversion, understandably so, for those who sympathise with the trickster and also disregard the norms become outcasts who are similar to the trickster. This societal conditioning prohibits people from leaving their comfort zones – due to their fear of condemnation and exclusion – and from searching for new experiences, or answers to questionable behaviour. Little do they know that no easy answers are to be found as to why one should not behave in certain ways; the trickster provides exemplary illustrations of the consequences. In short, people are antagonistic towards the trickster due to their limited understanding of and conditioning against behaviour classified as unacceptable, but unconsciously the trickster plants an idea that hopefully aids the individual to individuate, whether conscious of the trickster's influence, or even whether unconscious that certain changes take place which affect everyday events in a positive way.

It is significant to realise that the trickster, if not necessarily the most pleasant character to encounter, may have a noteworthy point, and to disregard a possible important message due to the trickster's negative image would be a mistake. The trickster inspires or provokes growth even though he represents the complete opposite in his own character. Ironically, the positive aspects of a trickster are usually recognised after catastrophic events through which the trickster dies or changes appearance. Due to this polarity in our perception of him, it is difficult to determine the actual purpose of a trickster since he falls between being a villain and a hero.

### **Remorse despite Amoral Nature**

Herbert at times represents a trickster who approximates to the figure of a saviour, even though it may not seem so at first-sight. It is evident from Herbert's character description as, for example,

trickster, liar, cheater, pervert, and idiot, that he is far from being the ideal hero of a story. Generally a character who has no remorse for his immoral behaviour can be classified as a villain, but Herbert suffers because of being blind to aspects of his immorality, complicating our conception of him. For example, problems arise when his acute awareness of being a remorseless liar is suspended by the delusion that his lies can become true: “I had never been in a situation before where my lies looked so likely to become true... the nasty speck of grit was fast becoming a beautiful thing, a lustrous pearl it was impossible not to covet” (Carey, 1985:50). This inability to keep his story straight and avoid unnecessary complications, leads to tragic events that are mainly brought upon by Herbert. And yet he is able to reflect on the above delusion. And we return to the following passage:

[T]here is no doubt that the greatest mistake I ever made in my life was to keep that Geelong snake a prisoner in a hessian bag, to starve it, to use it for tricks. Had I not been so foolish my whole life would have taken a different course: Jack would not have died, I would not have been permitted to marry Phoebe, and I would not have been troubled by the sight of my son besotted with a snake-dancer. (Carey, 1985:214)

Note that it is not the cause of these tragic events, but Herbert’s reflection upon the cause that disproves his identity as a mere villain. Although this may seem like the trickster’s way of once again tricking the reader by playing on his observer’s emotions and trying to slyly convince him that he has had a change of heart, the reflection seems sincere enough and shows another side of Herbert’s character that is related to his having the potential (at least in his own case) to perform the offices of a “saviour” in relation to his own misdeeds and disasters. The passage serves as a good example of Herbert’s being able to reflect upon his actions with a degree of remorse that might lead to better things, a fact at first not considered a possibility. Carey critics such as Hassall also perceive Herbert’s brief moments of remorse (quite in contradiction to previous impressions of the trickster): “Herbert lets his guard slip for a moment and reveals... an emotional depth that is normally concealed behind the brash salesman he pretends to be” (1994:102).

### Inspiration for Individuation

Perhaps the biggest saviour aspect of Herbert’s character can be observed in his ability to ensure a therapeutic effect that may potentially lead to a reader’s individuation. At this point of the discussion it is however simpler to look at examples from the novel, such as Herbert’s

unconscious contribution to other characters. Through his lies and falsity, Herbert inspires characters such as Phoebe, Molly, Jack, Leah, Charles, and Hissao, to accomplish their goals or to become aware of themselves and their circumstances. In Book I Herbert claims that he affected the whole household without even being aware of the full extent of his influence: “The whole household was in love with me, and although I knew it I doubt if I knew how much” (Carey, 1985:42). In Book II Herbert claims that Leah’s encounters with him enabled her to see the world from a different point of view, through Herbert’s eyes (Carey, 1985:328-329). In Book III Herbert claims to have been Hissao’s inspiration and guide in his career as an architect: “I began his education in April, on the day I marched him up the five hundred and eighty steps inside the South Pylon of the Bridge ... [W]e were not doing it for pleasure. I was showing him that the pylon was a trick, that while it appeared to hold up the bridge it did not such thing” (Carey, 1985:516) 1949.

The first character, Phoebe, begins to mature and individuate upon Herbert’s arrival; even though Annette can also be seen as the initiator of Phoebe’s inspired transformation. Annette Davidson claims that Phoebe is “waiting for something to happen”, but should rather “do something” to avoid the destiny of a housewife who “doesn’t need to work, or think” (Carey, 1985:9). Regarding the history of Australia during 1919, despite the end of the havoc caused by World War I, women had been in “contest” since “the turn of the century” in “the more elemental conflict between men and women” (Mcintyre, 2009:133). Thus Australian women were already standing up for their rights at this moment of time: “The labour movement fought for the rights of labour, the women’s movement for control of women’s bodies” (Mcintyre, 2009:135). In parallel to Australian history, Herbert unwittingly inspires Phoebe to become an independent woman, free from the contained and constrained life her mother lives and free from her father’s one-sided opinions. Though her parents “spoil her” (Carey, 1985:13) and the reader may therefore think that they support her decisions, she remains bound by her parents’ orders. Jack and Molly also seem unconcerned about her development: “Jack was indulgent, and Molly distracted, and I could get no commitment from them to do anything” (Carey, 1985:104).

Phoebe regards Herbert’s arrival as the something she has been waiting for and secretly made “a number of decisions that were to affect her for the rest of her life. The first of these was that she would learn to fly and the second was that I should teach her” (Carey, 1985:28). She plans to use this opportunity to rise above her current circumstances, and when she approaches

Herbert to have intercourse with him she writes of how they “will invent” (Carey, 1985:80) themselves. In this scene where Phoebe approaches Herbert, an analogy can be drawn between the “semen... full of life... dying in the sun” (Carey, 1985:72) and Herbert’s transformational influence upon Phoebe. The semen dying in the sun depicts the potential life that sprouts from Herbert that simultaneously effects Phoebe, but also that he should only be observed and kept at bay as an initiator, rather than be in full possession of Phoebe’s potential. Later in the novel living semen brings about an actual, biological, development of life. For example, mention is made of: “a seemingly endless flow of semen... [which signals the] auspicious beginning for Charles Badgery”; “I ripped forth a joyful sob of semen, a throb, a dob, a teeming swarming flood of life” (Carey, 1985:148, 183). But the semen in effect imprisons Phoebe and makes her subject to male domination, twice resulting in pregnancy against her will.

Due to her fear of being trapped within the role of a housewife, she abuses Herbert’s naivety, lawfully claims ownership of his aeroplane, and forces him to teach her how to fly. Herbert faithfully “assists her in every way he can” (Carey, 1985:149). When Phoebe gains enough knowledge about piloting, she deserts her family in order to attain independence. Phoebe’s character can be seen, in part (she also exemplifies the historical liberated woman of post-World War I Australia), as an example of someone who over-identifies with the trickster, fails to integrate the significance of the trickster’s messages, and projects subjective material upon the trickster, which is similar to being at the mercy of a participation mystique.

The second character, Jack, is inspired by Herbert to establish a new dream. Herbert’s arrival in the guise of an aviator encourages Jack to invite Herbert to live with him and his family. In Jack’s conversations with Herbert he initiates the lies and stories created by Herbert and uses them to inspire new ideals. Eventually the stories become a reality for Jack, whose nature never allows them to remain mere stories, and he actually attempts to start a new method of transportation by establishing an aircraft factory in Geelong.: “Jack was arranging his expedition to Colac and he could not leave the telephone alone” (Carey, 1985:69); “Jack... was chasing timber suppliers in Queensland and waking up squatters in the middle of the night to talk about investing in a wonderful new enterprise” (Carey, 1985:50).

At first-sight it seems as if Jack understands Herbert’s intentions regarding the Australian aircraft, but later it becomes clear that he only heard, rather than listened to Herbert: “I was disappointed in Jack too. How could he make an Australian plane with Imaginary Englishmen?”

(Carey, 1985:112) The main point Herbert tries to make, though he is a thieving cheat who steals aircraft plans from other designers, is that the Australians should produce their own aircraft. Herbert not only initiates transformation in Jack, but has a nation-changing scheme that may contribute a great deal to Australian society. However, his methods are unsound and the fact that he lies about his aviator status eventually dawns on Jack, who afterwards falls into a state of depression: “Jack, who had loved every war service story I told him, recognized the voice of truth – His great face folded in misery... But Jack felt ill and his deep depression, normally kept at bay by the company of other men, pushed its way into the room and claimed him in public” (Carey, 1985:122-124). As we’ve seen before, Jack’s realisation about Herbert’s true character devastatingly results in the loss of their dream, Jack’s suicide, and possibly Herbert’s disastrous marriage. Similar to Phoebe, Jack begins to project his unconscious upon Herbert, fails to integrate the trickster’s message, and through his association with the trickster as a friend rather than a psychic messenger becomes depressed.

The third character in this discussion is Molly. Jack’s death, though, does not only have negative consequences, but in league with Herbert’s influence initiates Molly’s transformation into a successful businesswoman. Molly’s taxi business would have been impossible if Jack were still alive, since she remained dependent upon him: “She clung to Jack as a giddy person... She held his hand, patted his knee, tugged his sleeve, tucked his shirt tail, filled his glass, took lint from his shoulder” (Carey, 1985:65). After Jack’s death she initiates the step to recovery: “I cannot remember how long this little hell went on for, only that Molly finally expressed a desire to go to Ballarat” (Carey, 1985:129).

Molly’s new found enthusiasm surprises Herbert: “Molly was not bored or lonely as I feared, but was busy shopping for a business to buy” (Carey, 1985:150). Not only does she buy a new business but she becomes quite successful in her endeavours, to an extent, indeed, that cannot be anticipated: “It was still twelve years before Molly McGrath would come to public notice by refusing to sell her three electrical utilities, those of Ballarat, Geelong and Bendigo, to the newly formed State Electricity Commission. In 1921, however, we had no inkling of Molly’s abilities” (Carey, 1985:163). Evidently Herbert’s presence encouraged Molly to develop her own ideals and to become independent of male dominance; however, she remains devoted to her religion, Catholicism, where a masculine God and priest still dominate her decisions: “Molly... at last made her full confession... [and] the Irishman had done his work and it had been decided

that Molly must not keep me from my wife” (Carey, 1985:312). Molly relies on her religious guidance to determine the fate of her relationship with Herbert after Phoebe’s departure.

An analogy between the transformation Molly experiences and her act of defecation is also apparent in the novel (take in consideration that defecation is a regular theme in trickster myths and tales). Similar to Phoebe who observes Herbert’s excreted semen full of life, Molly’s act of defecation also signals new life through her transformation. At first the passage in question seems merely vulgar, but we realise it has a crude symbolic significance, to do with the purgation of what blocked her in the past:

Somewhere between the first mouthful and the last she decided that she could not live in Geelong any more...

This decided on, although not yet spoken of, she rose from table, went upstairs, packed her case, and, when the urge took her, bustled noisily down the passage to the toilet.

She sat in the huge white-tiled room whose high window contained a perfect square of sky. She grunted happily, pursed her lips, and expelled a turd of such dimension that it would not be flushed down no matter how she tried. (Carey, 1985:139)

That is, when Molly finally makes a decision to relocate from town, her character-transformation takes shape and is portrayed through her immediate act of defecation. She leaves behind an old unpleasant and useless part of herself to develop something new.

After Herbert’s failure as husband, aviator and salesman in Book I, he meets Leah Goldstein, the fourth character, who eventually becomes his new lover. Rather than suppressing Leah’s ideals in a similar fashion with characters such as Sid Goldstein (Leah’s father) and Izzie Kaletsky (Leah’s lover), Herbert, possibly unaware of his actions, encourages her to discover and develop new ideas. He also unwittingly causes her to react against him, and so obtains her spiritual freedom through his overpowering influence. She begins to understand her motivation for being on the road, and from her discussions with Herbert she gains insights about unanswered questions. For example, in conversation with Herbert she admits her obsession instead of continuing to deny the truth: ““And what sustains you, Mrs Kaletsky?’ ‘Movement,’ she said... That is why I can’t return with my husband as he wishes... because I am selfish, addicted to movement”” (Carey, 1985:302).

Leah's new found knowledge specifically occurs to her when she leaves Herbert to look after her disabled husband. On the train, heading towards her husband, Leah reflects on her changed personality:

The train shuddered down through the hills of Ballarat and travelled through the greedily cleared land which produced in her a melancholy unrelated to her own experience in this landscape. (It is true that she had danced in all these towns between the barren hills, first with Mervyn Sullivan and then with Badgery & Goldstein, bleak halls in frost-clear nights, potato farmers clapping (a padding noise) on thick callused hands.) But she saw the landscape with Herbert's eyes. It was his, not hers. She could feel nothing for the place, and only sense the things he had told her: how he had flown there, crash-landed here, sold a car to a spud cockie there, at Bungaree. Even Ballarat had been like that. She had seen it as one might see a triple-exposed photograph:<sup>31</sup> streets in which Grigson drove, Mrs Ester strode and through which the horse dragged Molly's mother's coffin. All of this she saw, but it was nothing to do with her. (Carey, 1985:328-329)

Leah realises that Herbert had a major effect on her observation of the world around her. Suddenly she views the world from Herbert's point of view, but more importantly from a historical point of view that is other than an academic history. By means of knowing about all the smaller events not mentioned in history, Leah grasps a fuller notion of Australian experience. This means of objective argument from different points of view aids Leah in later acquiring a more fictional writing style:

Yet she was saved, as she had been saved before, by her letters, and when she continued her correspondence with me she used some of the art I had taught her and which she had once so vigorously rejected. Now she began to invent a life outside her walls, to send squares of sky to me (cobalt blue and saturated with life) to invent joy, to sustain it, and to write a hundred times about Silly Friends she must first manufacture. She arranged them on the mustard-yellow sand of Tamarama – indigos, crimsons, violet and viridian, people who were never born, walking on a beach she had stolen from 1923. (Carey, 1985:343)

Herbert therefore influences Leah to write more intuitively, and to observe the world from multiple angles. This causes Leah to notice the truth, through Herbert's lies, and better discern the history and political unrest of Australia. Her new insights lead to a more objective view of

---

31. This reference might make an interesting observation in regard to intertextuality in *Illywhacker*, specifically in relation to the example of a palimpsest.

her circumstances; however, she also over identifies with the trickster and by trying to contain him instead of using what he imparts as a means of individuation, she also becomes imprisoned in Herbert's story.

When Herbert is released from prison he returns to Charles, who is the fifth character under discussion. We know that Charles is a character who strives to build a better country. Through his actions of integrity, Charles is the character who attempts the hardest at being good: "He was generous to his staff, he never cheated on his taxes, he supported any charity that asked him, voted for the political party which would tax him the most heavily and distribute his money fairly. He was scrupulous in his business affairs, always meeting the requirements of the Health Department, the Customs Department, the rights (real and imagined) of his customers" (Carey, 1985:534-535). Sadly, Charles fails to realise the truth about certain aspects of Australia, and his naivety leads to self-destruction when he fails to integrate the shadow or acknowledge the natural inclinations of human nature.

Herbert attempts to enlighten Charles through his skill of building. Ironically, as already noted, Herbert is not the expert builder he thinks he is, but can rather be classified as a great breakdown agent who unveils hidden messages. Through this ability Herbert unveils a truth about the building-up of Australia to Charles:

"You see the thumb print. You know how that got there? Some poor bugger working at Brickfields a hundred-and-fifty years ago did that... All around you, in your walls, you've got the thumb prints of convicts. How do you reckon that affects you?" (Carey, 1985:512)

Through this action, Herbert shows Charles a different perspective on Australia and reveals a certain truth about Australian inheritance. Herbert attunes us to the fact that Charles strives to tell the truth: "he was so eager to tell the truth that he could never simplify... with Charles the truth was an obsession" (Carey, 1985:362). In effect, Herbert does not fail as a father to bring Charles to a realisation of the mistakes he made, or the human nature to err from time to time; however, similarly to Jack, Charles's ideals are crushed because he is unable to cope with the reality of the truth. He also commits suicide.

The last character whom Herbert motivates is Hissao Badgery, his grandson. When Hissao is still young, Herbert attempts to educate him in matters regarding Australian society and history: “He was only six years old... I showed him, most important of all, the sort of city it was – full of trickery and deception” (Carey, 1985:516). Herbert teaches Hissao to acknowledge people’s ability to be cruel and selfish, making Hissao aware of the shadow early in his life. By also educating Hissao in matters regarding architectural designs and functional integrity, Herbert motivates Hissao to later study to become an architect:

An architect must have the ability to convince people that his schemes are worth it. The better he is the more he needs charm, enthusiasm, variable walks, accents, all the salesman’s tools of trade.

[...]

... I bought him a blue book with unlined pages and I had him do drawings, of buildings that lied about their height, their age, and most particularly their location. There was not one that did not pretend itself huddled in some European capital with weak sun in summer and ice in winter. (Carey, 1985:516-517)

By means of providing his grandson with a framework that the other characters in the novel seem to be missing, Herbert makes Hissao more aware of his unconscious and the true history of his family timeline. Hissao also inspires a therapeutic effect in the reader, since it is he who establishes the final great image of *Illywhacker* and the key to Carey’s motivation, the pet emporium turned into a human emporium, which is another metaphor of history being a product of Australia and Australia being a product of globalisation.

### Transformative Qualities

Initially Herbert seems like a character who primarily uses trickery as a method to gain personal gain, but in some respects he clearly contributes to transformation. On an unconscious level he even contributes to the reader’s understanding of controversial topics not related to individuation, which almost to a slight extent compares with the characteristics of the politic court jester in mediaeval times (satire may also be noted in this instance). For example, Herbert highlights the discriminative behaviour and attitudes against the Chinese, who are an ethnic group in Australia that also struggle to create a future for themselves in a way that is similar to the Australian settlers from the United Kingdom: “It was from my father that I learned about the Chinese and he painted pictures of such depravity that when I met my first Chinaman I expected

him to kill me”; “It was too much for Jack. He could not abide Chinamen, no matter what I told him” (Carey, 1985:30, 45). He reveals Australia’s misguided admiration for the products from other countries, especially England and America, when Australia should rather be focusing on its own particular traits and products.

Herbert shows his transformative value by pointing out to a character such as Stu O’Hagen that it is better to buy an Australian car than a foreign one in order to improve the country’s economic state: “‘It’s not the point about [a] better [product],’ I said, ‘it’s a question of where the money goes. You’d be better off with a worse car if the money stayed here’” (Carey, 1985:62). Despite his best efforts, the country is still subject to the Great Depression. On a political level, Herbert also claims to be against oppressive parties from both Right and Left. He highlights the discriminative behaviour of those parties against the members of society who do not only suffer the consequences of political unrest, but may not even understand the reason for being treated differently. He even attempts to physically stand up against police that act as political activists, instead of protectors of the community:

I slandered the communists for mindlessness and the Labour Party for racism...

I would not have minded the railway police if they were weak or unprincipled men trying to survive... But the railway police did not have the grace to lower their eyes in the face of decency, acquitted themselves like bully boys, enjoying the thwack of their three-foot batons. They evicted human beings from carriages carpeted with sheep shit and thought themselves righteous for doing it. (Carey, 1985:315-316)

Later in the novel, Herbert’s influence as writer and historian also underlines his role as a transformative trickster. He is always present as some type of objector who highlights the hidden aspects of matters we regard as done and dusted: “It was M. V. Anderson who showed me that a liar might be a patriot and although, at the time, I thought this a lesson learned too late, it was not so” (Carey, 1985:429).

To conclude this section on the trickster as saviour, we can see that Herbert influences other characters in what can be seen as a saviour-like way. This initially amoral influence does not at first-sight appear to be positive, but it is evident that certain characters make life changing decisions after Herbert becomes part of their lives. Also by making apparent how characters should acknowledge the shadow instead of disregarding its influence on everyday events, Herbert as a trickster portrays the therapeutic effect of *Illywhacker*, and inspires the reader to

individuate. By becoming aware of the shadow as an aspect of the self, the reader obtains a more objective viewpoint and the ability to psychologically reflect on matters that are subjectively orientated and not only initiated by external factors.

## Section 6: Secondary Characters Who Reflect Trickster Qualities

In a study of the trickster, it is difficult to determine which character is the most relevant to examine, since almost every character who initiates transformation through rebellious actions or contradictory behaviour against the rules of society appears to be a type of trickster. This is why Section 6 is included, only as a concluding discussion, to show that certain characters in *Illywhacker* might also be classified as tricksters, at least in certain respects. However, the reader should remain aware of the difference between secondary characters (who in each distinct case do not reflect all the trickster elements discussed above) and the protagonist, who primarily represents a dynamic trickster in contemporary Australian literature.

### Swagman

The swagman is a good example of the trickster who nourishes the unconscious of other characters: “When he arrived at Western Avenue he entered the kitchen without introducing himself to Bridget who was nervous. Then he began to show her frogs... [and] emptied the whole lot on to the floor” (Carey, 1985:49). Similarly to Herbert, the swagman reveals the shadow to society, making them aware of the hidden elements of humanity, which in this instance are represented by the symbol of the frog. The frog lives in mud, in the swamp, and can live both under water and on land, which gives it an otherness yet related to humanity, as in a fairytale such as the *Frog Prince*, collected by the Grimm. It represents the instinctual nature of human beings, and as a symbol of the unconscious it serves as a messenger of a necessary change in the psyche.

The swagman also relates to the dual nature of the trickster that is more animal than divine. By living in the swamp, where Herbert comes across him, he forsakes a domestic dwelling in exchange for a primitive lifestyle that requires an animalistic need for survival. For example, instead of eating the conventional meats of mutton, beef, chicken, and fish, the swagman makes use of whatever form of sustenance he can find for his hunger: ““We ate roof rats in Albury but we never tried the frogs, never even thought of them. I’m much obliged to you for the information, I must say, much obliged”” (Carey, 1985:41).

More interesting, the swagman serves as a transformative agent for Herbert who meets him in the soak of Geelong, where no civilised person sets foot. This can mean that Herbert, the trickster who portrays the shadow in *Illywhacker*, also actually meets his own shadow. The

swagman, indeed, as suggested above, might also be seen as a collective shadow figure for Australia. The socially inappropriate context already serves as a sign of the collective unconscious, and this sense is amplified by the swagman's appearance. Despite this awful appearance and the setting in which he is found, he has the ability to see Herbert for the person he truly is: "I felt the swagman had looked at me and seen something less attractive in me than my bowed legs" (Carey, 1985:42). After this event, Herbert reflects on matters regarding his emotional state and treatment of other people, which can be seen as a form of individuation through realisation of one's negative traits. Through the swagman's deflation of Herbert's inflated ego (after recently becoming part of the McGraths' household), the swagman initiates self-reflection.

#### Phoebe Badgery (McGrath)

Phoebe is an example of a female trickster. In the opening meeting between them, Phoebe notices Herbert for the person he truly represents, whereas the other characters fail to see his lies as a conman: "'You hold that snake,' she said, hardly moving her lovely lips, 'as if you are frightened it will bite you. I don't think,' she smiled, 'that it is a pet at all'" (Carey, 1985:19). Clearly it takes one to know one. Phoebe is also a character with a fondness for malicious pranks. She acts promiscuously and seduces Herbert who unwarily steals her virginity. After this first act of intercourse with Herbert, and being aware of her parents' opinion about her and older men, she encourages risky behaviour at the table with her mother and Herbert present by walking around with an exposed bloodstain on the back of her dress. She also accuses Herbert of being a liar; both these actions could have resulted in Herbert's banishment: "'Frankly,' Phoebe said... coming to address her mother with dangerous green eyes. 'Frankly, I think he's lying'" (Carey, 1985:73).

She also has a fondness for sly jokes, which is clear when she harasses Annette by joking about her awareness of Herbert's intentions with her: "'A man paid to slide his rod,' Phoebe whispered, closing her eyes and rocking slyly on her haunches... 'Oh God,' she said. I'm so miserable'" (Carey, 1985:138). In this scene, Phoebe is well aware of Annette's homosexual affection towards her, but intentionally disregards her emotions by making Annette feel jealous and helpless. Phoebe's constant playing upon Annette's emotions eventually leads to her suicide, which is a clear example of the consequences of malicious behaviour: "the love she gave in

return was of such a brittle quality that Annette Davidson would finally take her own life rather than endure its cutting edges” (Carey, 1985:189).

### Jack McGrath

Jack McGrath and the snake as ghosts also serve as comparative figures to Jung’s description of the trickster as poltergeist who has the ability “to change his shape” and appear in “animal form” (Jung, 1969:256). After Jack’s supposed suicide, Herbert experiences a moment in which he sees the ghost of Jack. Later, when Charles seems to resemble Jack, Herbert wonders “whether Jack’s ghost had mounted Phoebe in the night... or whether he sent the snake... to insinuate itself between her legs whilst she slept” (Carey, 1985:180). We recall that in Native American mythology, the trickster also instructs his penis to swim across a lake to have intercourse with the chief’s daughter (Radin, 1972:19). Herbert, in a way weirdly suggestive of this, suspects that Jack uses the snake to impregnate Phoebe. Therefore Jack’s alleged or imagined reincarnation represents his ability to change shape as a type of trickster.

### Leah Goldstein

The next character, Leah, is a more intelligent trickster who knowingly stands for a cause (once again quite similar to the court jester). Similarly to Herbert, she uses the persona of a trickster because of her suppressed status in society, and to help her avoid public scorn; but in contrast to Herbert she has the ability to read and write. Leah is also more educated in social and political matters than Herbert, which may suggest the character development or evolution of the trickster from the first to the second book of *Illywhacker*. Leah, though drawn to the superficial trickster-like elements of her profession as a dancer (she wants “publicity” and is engaged in comic shape-shifting, as she wears an emu outfit for her dance act), is a semi-activist, and so is a potential agent of transformation:

“[T]hey don’t understand publicity. I need all this,” she gestured at the blackwoods, blackberries, the cow dung, the dead winter grass, “for atmosphere... Look at my shoes. Look at them. How in the hell do I get a break? Mervyn Sullivan has stolen my act.” (Carey, 1985:209)

“It’s not personal,” she said. It may have been a trick of the light but I imagined I saw her eyes flood with tears. “Why do people always take it personally? I try to have an intelligent conversation, but there is no tradition of intellectual discussion here. When a subject is discussed the women simper and say they have no ideas and the men want to settle it with a fight. I am not attacking you personally, Mr Badgery.” Her voice was half strangled. “I am attempting to analyse the history of this country and point out why the working classes have always acted as if they’re going to be bosses tomorrow. I’m trying to point out why we’re in this mess.” (Carey, 1985:213)

First, she demonstrates her potential to transform others when she confronts Herbert about gold mining. The enchantment surrounding gold is a historic phenomenon that immediately gets the attention of other countries and accelerates the process of colonisation; however, Leah is focussed on equality between people rather than economic power, which might be what she is trying to point out about gold, which only enriches a small percentage of society. A second important point that gets highlighted is Leah’s pro-feminist reaction against Herbert, specifically in an era when women were not yet allowed to express themselves. And third, Leah points to the academic value of her argument, which may also be regarded as pro-feminist. Leah is bound to the identity of a trickster in order to survive her circumstances, but she is also an individual who attempts to reach high goals.

Leah represents the primary character in Book II and complements Herbert’s use of sly jokes and malicious pranks. However, in contrast to Herbert as male trickster and salesman, Leah is a female trickster who performs onstage and makes her living by travelling from town to town to entertain people:

She wrote to Rosa: “The lesson I have learned is that what you say will happen, *will* happen. I declared myself a dancer when I had no right to. I had no skill, no experience, nothing. And yet, today, here I am writing to you from Ballarat and telling you about our show, and that I have spangles on my tits and a regular Yank to tell me when I am out of time.” (Carey, 1985:326)

Leah’s lifestyle reflects her trickster character, because she relies on her ability to perform onstage to receive a payment, and similarly to an illywhacker she follows the show and lives on the cockies. This behaviour is trickster-like, a display of an assumed character who contradicts who she is in reality – despite the fact that certain onstage performances go against her morals and make no concessions to her own personality.

Similarly to Herbert as a protean figure that has the ability to alternate between different personas onstage, Leah, as already mentioned, wears a mask to cover her identity and to entertain people:

...the fleas will feed off you and you will stop yourself going to sleep because when you are asleep you will scratch yourself, and if you scratch your belly or your legs... then the customers see it... You are so tired you stop listening to the drunks in the street calling out your name. You are too tired to be frightened when they break their beer bottles in the gutter and call out filthy things about the body you showed to them... you have scratched yourself all over and you will have to do the show with make-up all over your body... (Carey, 1985:265-266)

The spectator is tricked into believing the show, and enjoying Leah's act as entertainment at face-value, since he assumes the actor onstage truly has the same enthusiasm displayed to him. Emotions of fear, joy and laughter are evoked by the performer and the spectator becomes entangled in the act without noticing that the person who performs it also has a personal life. In effect, this can be seen as an ironic form of trickery.

Leah also has the ability to perform sly jokes, which border on dangerous. Her satiric performances are executed with the use of Australian animals, and ironically prove how Australians find it amusing to attend shows that portray aspects of the Australian context, while they are contradictorily more orientated towards the British Commonwealth countries. Leah performs several acts that display Australia as a unique country: "I do the Emu Dance, the Fan Dance, the Snake Dance, the Dance of the Seven Veils. It is the snake that gets them in" (Carey, 1985:216). The irony is made evident by Herbert who, as we've seen, makes apparent to the reader that Australians are rarely satisfied with domestic products and prefer imported products. With Leah's act people find entertainment in a portrayal of their own country by an Australian, but fail to recognise its significance. From a Jungian point of view, these spectators feel comfortable with the idea that they do not have to participate in the act, since participation in a complex matter such as nationalism would cause controversy and require energy; however, on an unconscious level they feel their desire coincide with Leah's message. Sadly, they wish to reflect on a part of themselves that they wish to discover, but do not want to spend the energy on developing.

Leah, though bound by her obligation to "feed the stubborn Kaletskys", is driven by the desire "to do One Fine Thing" (Carey, 1985:259); she does not realise that her contribution is

apparent in the awareness she brings through her acts and writing. Leah sacrifices her abilities in order to help the Kaletsky family, whom she met shortly after leaving her family home in order to study. Rosa Kaletsky (Izzie's mother), Lenny Kaletsky (Izzie's father), and Izzie Kaletsky fail to take responsibility for their actions, and parasitize off Leah (who cares for them like a mother), rather than support her in endeavours that may eventually help lead to wider social changes. Unfortunately, Leah ends up making irrational decisions that place her in a situation where she has to expose herself to exploitation in order to receive recognition, but this is eventually what causes her greatness. She is therefore not the typical trickster who acts in a malicious way.

Onstage Leah stomachs criticism, despite knowing more than her critics; however, when she performs with Herbert and his children, she becomes enraged by one of the spectators who makes false accusations about her act, and criticises her political orientation, an issue that does not have a direct relation to any of her performances. Leah reprimands this character publicly in front of all the other spectators, and in effect illustrates her ability to make sly jokes while also maintaining a satirical edge:

“I'm a Jew all right,” said Leah... Leah took the tin and emptied all eleven shillings into the canvas snake bag. Then she took the two remaining black snakes, who had remained gently entwined around their mistress's warm body during the entire argument, and lowered them with their fellows. “I'm a Jew all right. I don't take money from fascists...”

Barry Edwards, previously flustered by a philosophically literate snake-dancer, could now smile confidently...

[...]

Barry Edwards's hands reach out, greedy for the shilling, are nearly there, the nicotine-stained pincers, when Charles (you little bastard!) drops the shilling back into the sack. (Carey, 1985:279-280)

Leah reacts promptly when Barry accuses her of foul play and being a stereotypical Jew, only in it for the money. She angrily makes a joke of him by displaying his fear and by showing that his accusation is based on matters he does not fully comprehend. Also, note that her criticism is mounted on a grander scale, because it is an act in front of a crowd of people. The reader is well aware of the fact that the snakes are actually poisonous. When Barry is too frightened to retrieve his money from the bag Leah unveils his unnecessary discriminative behaviour. The impression

of other characters in the book, and society in general, may imply that she acts immorally, but her reasons are entirely moral and just.

Leah is a stage performer who travels from town to town to make a living from her act:

“Movement,” she said, displaying her white feet. “I admit it. I am really the one dancing on hot macadam, not you: town to town, dancing, writing letters. I cannot stay still anywhere. It is not a country where you can rest. It is a black man’s country: sharp stones, rocks, sticks, bull ants, flies. We can only move around it like tourists. The blackfeller can rest but we must keep moving.” (Carey, 1985:302)

From this extract we can see that she represents a trickster with similar characteristics to the swagman, that shadow figure in the background of Australian society, as already discussed. It is apparent that colonisers are continually on the move with bag and baggage, in a way that is similar to the swagman, but the Australian colonisers who are already settled by the “1930s” (Carey, 1985:304) do not regard themselves as colonisers anymore. These Australians are now fighting a war with the rest of the world for freedom, democracy, and *their* country, specifically against communism. For example, Herbert, his children and Leah are not communists, but a rumour about Izzie being a communist alarms the police force of Bendigo to such an extent they want to deport all of them as suspected communists: “They were here to advise a communist agitator and his collaborators to move out of town” (Carey, 1985:300). Their attitudes are barbaric, a fact implicitly reflected back at them in the covert contrast between them and the sensible and intelligent Leah. Thus Leah’s embodiment as a type of swagman is a portrayal of the therapeutic effect of a trickster, because, for the reader at least, she “holds the earlier low intellectual and moral level before the eyes of the more highly developed individual, so that he shall not forget how things looked yesterday” (Jung, 1969:267). The purpose of Leah as trickster is to remind Australians, such as the above mentioned police men and the crowd she performs to, that the country they are fighting for has also been colonised by their forefathers and that their ideal for a continued civilization also originates from a more primitive source based on similarly “low intellectual and moral” behaviour. She gives the reader and Australia a reason “not to forget”.

## Charles Badgery

Charles is depicted as primary character in Book III and represents a naïve trickster. Charles yearns to be a good person (hence the trickster as saviour) who does not follow his father's way of life, but he is destined to follow the path of an anti-hero:

Yet he also harboured an idea of himself that contradicted all of this: that he was someone special, someone who would one day do great things not just for himself, but for his country. And these contradictions, the triangular tensions between his shyness, arrogance, and hunger for affection, made him a difficult person to get to know, made him belligerent when nervous, a stammerer when confident, weepy when approved of, brash when he would be better off being quiet. (Carey, 1985:362)

“I haven't *been* done, Father. I *have* done. I've done more than you ever did. You lied and cheated and passed dud cheques.” (Carey, 1985:491)

Though Charles became independent of his father's way of life, he ironically fell subject to the same mockery as his father. Sadly, Charles is an idealist and represents an image of failure in his father's story, which is a repeated motif in Carey's works: “Though they struggle to transform themselves, these characters [of Carey] cannot escape from meaningless jobs, predatory relationships, corrosive addictions and exploitative social and political structures” (Hassall, 1994:2). Charles attempts to develop Australian initiative by establishing the “Holden” (Carey, 1985:489) as an Australian car and developing “the Best Pet Shop” (Carey, 1985:402) in the world, but ends up exploiting his business as well as his Australian identity. A good example of this is when Charles enrolls for war and when Leah unveils the undesired truth about Charles:

On the one hand he considered England and the English the scourge of all humanity; he knew them as hypocrites, snobs, snivellers, and past masters of the economic swifty; but on the other hand who was it (she asked) who, on that clear September Monday when the newspaper declared Australia would stand side by side with England in the war, who was it who went to enlist in the company of that well-known urger and bulldust merchant, Harry the rabbitoh? (Carey, 1985:433)

“It's tragic. He loves them all so much and then he cages them. He turns them into a product and you can look at it, if you want to as a perversion.” (Carey, 1985:445)

Evidently Charles wishes to support his country, following in the footsteps of his father but actually doing something instead of only criticising. It is also evident that Charles has an acute empathy with animals, which helps suggest his half-animal nature.

Describing Charles as a character who makes sly jokes and performs malicious pranks seems like an injustice to his innocence. However, as a child Charles is subject to a poverty-stricken family life that is caused by his father. This encourages him to become an opportunist, and this makes his childhood quite similar to Herbert's depiction of his own childhood. At first Charles follows the example of his father and Leah, which is to perform on stage by means of daring acts that provoke fear in the audience. When Charles realises that this lifestyle will not satisfy him, he starts to use his acute empathy with animals to gain acceptance and possible nourishment:

He could not hug his little sister without awkwardness, but when he confronted this steel-beaked bird his affection issued from him readily, like a net, a finely knotted gauze which the bird felt and stayed still to accept. As he took the bird it emitted a small noise, not the loud raucous noise of a yellow-tailed black cockatoo, but a small grizzle, like a new puppy will give, as it surrendered itself to the webs of Charles's affection. (Carey, 1985:284)

Unfortunately this talent is later abused to make a living and money. According to Charles, Leah has godly abilities, but Charles himself has an unusual ability to handle wild animals, which might be seen in a similar light to the trickster's dual nature.

Despite the trickster-like characteristics of secondary characters in *Illywhacker*, it seems fair to conclude that Herbert represents the best example of the trickster in regard to Jung's discussion of the trickster and his classification of Mercurius. The trickster is a prominent character whose nature may even seem like a single character trait; but a distinction can be made between a holistic representation of a trickster and a character with some trickster-like qualities.

## CHAPTER IV: CONCLUSION

In conclusion to this dissertation, it can be argued in substantial terms that Carey's novel *Illywhacker* portrays an Australian trickster, who may also be regarded as an example of the shadow archetype as this appears in relation to Jung's discussion of the trickster. This traditional trickster depicted as an illywhacker may be viewed as a figure who depicts the outdoor Australian, without euphemising any of his dubious characteristics for the sake of a "sophisticated" version of history. As is evident, such characteristics are valued as important on a historical plane, since they suggest that history is also influenced by the pieces of information usually disregarded due to their unconventional appearance. The study also suggests that such characteristics are important in the case of individuation centred in the collective unconscious, which is influenced not by the mimicking of unconventional characteristics, but by the possibility of an emotional response evoked in the reader.<sup>32</sup> An emotional response in connection to a certain archetype may lead to the discovery of a binary feeling-toned complex that has become polarised due to the individual's repression of its emotional connections. The novel's ability to mirror this response within the reader is recognised as a therapeutic effect, and the reader's willingness to integrate this effect into his own psyche is called individuation.

*Illywhacker* is a postmodern novel that deals with an array of topics. Blaber and Gilman discuss its relation to picaresque narrative; Hassall regards its extra-textual qualities as postmodern; Todd discourses on its magic realist approach; Woodcock approaches it from a postcolonial point of view that is influenced by a postmodern context; Edwards goes into more detail about its deconstructive elements; and Gaile specifically deals with its historical aspect and Carey's use of a new mode of writing referred to as mythistory. Therefore, Carey's novel *Illywhacker* can be viewed from many different angles; however, a Jungian approach has to date not been applied to the novel *Illywhacker*. This dissertation uses the fact of this absence as a good reason for a Jungian analytical reading of *Illywhacker*, specifically in combination with a literary point of view, to assert that the novel portrays an example of a trickster figure that represents the shadow archetype. This approach is applied by means of acknowledging the novel's multidimensional background, in relation to the different approaches mentioned earlier, in order to avoid a merely reductionist, short-sighted approach.

---

32. As this study is not based on an empirical methodology, it is important to remain aware of the asserting qualities based on theory and not physical observation.

We shifted from the different critical approaches to *Illywhacker* in Chapter I into a more specific discussion that deals with Jungian terminology and its relevance to the novel in Chapter II. It is important that we notice that a single psychoanalytical approach has its subject specific explanations and understandings, which may cause misperceptions in the case of the terminology in use. Therefore, the specific Jungian terminology referred to in this dissertation has been explained in relation to Jung's *Collected Works* and his interpretation of it. One part of this dissertation is devoted to a discussion of Jungian theory, in order to clarify possible uncertainties attached to the use of a Jungian analytical approach, which is notorious for its seemingly arbitrary academic elements. To further understand terminology such as the archetype, a section in Chapter II also provides an examination of the different tricksters as discussed by Jung. The presence of an archetype is asserted by means of viewing archaic symbols from different cultural mythologies to compare their characteristics with one another in order to determine possible similarities, and primarily to determine similarities in the reasons for societies' continued interest in certain figures. This material affirms the presence of universally similar deep-rooted patterns, which Jung recognised as archetypes.

The overview of the Jungian approach in the dissertation provides the reader with a clearer understanding of the terms used and the statements made regarding these terms. This is specifically of relevance to Chapter III, in which the terminology explained is now brought in relation to Carey's depiction of an Australian trickster in a literary context. Two points are of note. Firstly, it is of relevance to describe the similarities between Jung's description of the trickster and Carey's depiction of an illywhacker as a trickster. The mythological figure Mercurius, derived from Jung's discussion, is used to measure similarities, since he consists of the most general characteristics of trickster figures. To contextualise, he has a fondness for sly jokes and malicious pranks; he has the ability to shift his shape; he represents a dual nature, half animal and half divine; he is exposed to all kinds of torture; and he also approximates the figure of a saviour. These characteristics are measured against examples from Herbert Badgery's character in *Illywhacker* in order to examine comparative features; also, we further discuss secondary characters from *Illywhacker* who reflect semi-trickster qualities. However, one should note that the trickster does not have to be reduced to only these elements, which are a general indication of the trickster's characteristics. Secondly, after discussing the similarities between an illywhacker and Mercurius, we can draw the conclusion that a type of archetype becomes apparent. This archetype is of use to help determine the novel's individuating qualities by means of its comparative general purpose in the collective unconscious, which provides its meaning to the psyche.

The conclusion drawn from this study of *Illywhacker* as containing a trickster figure who portrays a shadow archetype, is that the ongoing appearance of the trickster as a symbol for the shadow in a contemporary work of fiction is an indication of its continuing importance. This importance may be registered in the trickster's ability to help contribute to the psychological transformation of the reader. This observation would, surely, provide a single instance to help justify the general sense that there are great benefits to be derived from reading literature of a high quality, such as that regularly produced by Carey.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abrams, M.H. & Harpham, G.G. 2012. *A glossary of literary terms*. 10th ed. Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Andersen, H.C. 1973. *Die keiser se nuwe klere*. Translated from the Afrikaans by Freda Linde. Kaapstad: Kinderpers.
- Bakhtin, M.M. 1985. *Literatur and karneval: zur romantheorie und lachkultur*. Translated from German by Philip van der Merwe. Ullstein: Frankfurt am Main.
- Bakhtin, M.M. 1984. *Rabelais and his world*. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Barry, P. 2009. *Beginning theory: an introduction to literary and cultural theory*. 3rd ed. Manchester: Manchester University.
- Bassil-Morozow, H. 2012. *The trickster in contemporary film*. New York: Routledge.
- Baumlin, J.S., Baumlin, T.F. & Jensen, G.H., eds. 2004. *Post-Jungian criticism: theory and practice*. New York: State University of New York.
- Blaber, R. & Gilman, M. 1990. *Roguary: the picaresque tradition in Australian, Canadian and Indian fiction*. Springwood: Butterfly Books.
- Bly, R. 1990. *Iron John: a book about men*. New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Byatt, A.S. 1990. *Possession: a romance*. London: Vintage.
- Calvino, I. 1981. *If on a winter's night a traveller*. Translated from the Italian by William Weaver. London: Vintage.
- Carey, P. 1981. *Bliss*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Carey, P. 1985. *Illywhacker*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Carey, P. 1991. *The tax inspector*. London: Faber and Faber.

- Carey, P. 1994. *The unusual life of Tristan Smith*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Carey, P. 1995. *Collected stories*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Carey, P. 1997. *Jack Maggs*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Carey, P. 1998. *Oscar and Lucinda*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Carey, P. 2000. *True history of the Kelly Gang*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Conrad, J. 2007. *Heart of darkness*. London: Penguin.
- Cooper, J.C. 1978. *An illustrated encyclopaedia of traditional symbols*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Cooper, H. 1989. *Oxford guides to Chaucer: the Canterbury tales*. New York: Oxford University.
- Currie, M., *ed.* 1995. *Metafiction*. London: Longman.
- Doty, W. & Hynes, W.J., *eds.* 1993. *Mythical trickster figures: contours, contexts, and criticism*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama.
- Edinger, F.E. 1972. *Ego and archetype: individuation and the religious function of the psyche*. Massachusetts: Shambhala Publications.
- Edinger, F.E. 1994. *Anatomy of the psyche: alchemical symbolism in psychotherapy*. Open Court: Illinois.
- Edinger, F.E. 1994. *The mystery of the coniunctio: alchemical image of individuation*. Toronto: Inner City.
- Edwards, B. 1998. *Theories of play and postmodern fiction*. New York: Garland Publishing. (Comparative literature and cultural studies, 3).
- Eliot, T.S. 1954. *T. S. Eliot: selected poems*. London: Faber and Faber.

Gaile, A. 2004. *Fabulating beauty: perspectives on the fiction of Peter Carey*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Gaile, A. 2010. *Rewriting history: Peter Carey's fictional biography of Australia*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. (Costerus new series, 184).

Grimm, B. 2002. *The complete fairy tales*. Translated from the German by Jack Zipes. Vintage: London.

Hassall, A.J. 1994. *Dancing on hot macadam: Peter Carey's fiction*. 3rd ed. St Lucia: University of Queensland.

Hollis, J. 1994. *Under Saturn's shadow: the wounding and healing of men*. Toronto: Inner City.

Hunter, J.W., *ed.* 2008. Peter Carey: 1943-. (*In* Hunter, J.W., *ed.* 2008. *Contemporary literary criticism*. Vol. 294. Detroit: Gale. p. 37-129).

Janik, V.K., *ed.* 1998. *Fools and jesters in literature, art, and history: a biographical sourcebook*. Westport: Greenwood.

Jensen, G.H. 2004. Introduction. (*In* Baumlín, J.S., Baumlín T.F. & Jensen, G.H., *eds.* *Post-Jungian criticism: theory and practice*. Albany: State University of New York. p. 1-30).

Jones, R.A. 2007. *Jung, psychology, postmodernity*. London: Routledge.

Jung, C.G. 1956. *The collected works of C. G. Jung: symbols of transformation*. 2nd ed. Vol. 5. Translated from the German by R.F.C. Hull. London: Routledge.

Jung, C.G. 1967. *The collected works of C. G. Jung: alchemical studies*. 2nd ed. Vol. 13. Translated from the German by R.F.C. Hull. New York: Princeton University.

Jung, C.G. 1969. *The collected works of C. G. Jung: the archetypes and the collective unconscious*. 2nd ed. Vol. 9, pt. 1. Translated from the German by R.F.C. Hull. New York: Princeton University.

- Jung, C.G. 1971. *The collected works of C. G. Jung: psychological types*. Vol. 6. Translated from the German by R.F.C. Hull. New York: Princeton University.
- Kesey, K. 2002. *One flew over the cuckoo's nest*. London: Penguin.
- Kleiner, F.S. 2009. *Gardner's art through the ages: a global history*. 13th ed. Boston: Thompson Wadsworth.
- Kluger, R.S. 1991. *The archetypal significance of Gilgamesh: a modern ancient hero*. Einsiedeln: Daimon Verlag.
- Leitch, V.B., *ed.* 2010. *The Norton anthology of theory and criticism*. 2nd ed. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Macintyre, S. 2009. *A concise history of Australia*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Marquez, G.G. 1970. *One hundred years of solitude*. Translated from the Spanish by Gregory Rabassa. London: Penguin.
- McHale, B. 1987. *Postmodernist fiction*. London: Methuen. [Kindle ed.]. Available: [http://www.amazon.com/Postmodernist-Fiction-book /dp/ B000OT830Q/ ref=sr\\_1\\_1\\_bnp\\_1\\_kin?ie=UTF8&qid=1376399892&sr=8-1&keywords=postmodernist+fiction](http://www.amazon.com/Postmodernist-Fiction-book /dp/ B000OT830Q/ ref=sr_1_1_bnp_1_kin?ie=UTF8&qid=1376399892&sr=8-1&keywords=postmodernist+fiction)
- Melchert, N. 2011. *The great conversation: a historical introduction to philosophy*. 6th ed. New York: Oxford University.
- Meyer, W., Moore, C. & Viljoen, H.G. 2008. *Personology: from individual to ecosystem*. 4th ed. Johannesburg: Heinemann House.
- Moran, J. 2010. *Interdisciplinarity*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Owen, M. 2010. *The Maya book of life: understanding the Xultun tarot*. Tauranga: Kahurangi.
- Radin, P. 1972. *The trickster: a study in American Indian mythology*. New York: Schocken Books.

Samuels, A. 2003. Jung and the post-Jungians. [Kindle ed.]. London: Routledge. Available: <http://www.amazon.com>

Shakespeare, W. 1997. King Lear. (In Foakes, R.A., ed. 1997. The Arden Shakespeare: King Lear. London: Thomson Learning. p. 153-392).

Shakespeare, W. 2006. Twelfth-night; or, what you will. (In Anon. The complete works of William Shakespeare, volume 1. New York: Tess. p. 411-450).

Shalit, E. 2008. Enemy, cripple, & beggar: shadows in the hero's path. s.l.: Fisher King.

Snodgrass, M.E. 2010. Peter Carey: a literary companion. Jefferson: McFarland & Company.

Todd, R. 1995. Narrative trickster and performative historiography: fictional representation of national identity in Graham Swift, Peter Carey, and Mordecai Richler. (In Zamora, L.P. & Faris, W.B., eds. 1995. Magical realism: theory, history, community. Durham: Duke University. p. 305-328).

Tolkien, J.R.R. 1967. The lord of the rings. 2nd ed. London: HarperCollins.

Twain, M. 1897. More tramps abroad. 2nd ed. London: Chatto & Windus.

Van der Merwe, P. & Bekker, I. 2015. E.L. Doctorow's fictional autobiography: World's Fair (1985) as a carnivalesque bildungsroman: original research. *Literator*, 36(2):1-9.

Waugh, P., ed. 2006. Literary theory and criticism: an Oxford guide. New York: Oxford University.

Weiten, W. 2007. Psychology: themes and variations. 7th ed. Belmont: Thomson Wadsworth.

Winterbach, I. 2002. Niggie. Cape Town: Human & Rousseau.

Woodcock, B. 1996. Peter Carey: contemporary world writers. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Young-Eisendrath, P. & Dawson, T., *eds.* 2008. *The Cambridge companion to Jung*. 2nd ed. [Kindle ed.]. Cambridge: Cambridge University. Available: [www.cambridge.org/9780521685009](http://www.cambridge.org/9780521685009)

Zoja, L. 2001. *The father: historical, psychological and cultural perspectives*. Translated from the Italian by Henry Martin. New York: Brunner-Routledge.