Graham Greene's Labyrinthine "Entertainments"

Characters and Characterisation in *A Gun for Sale, Stamboul Train,* and *The Confidential Agent*

By

Mari Mulelid

Master's Thesis
Department of Foreign Languages
University of Bergen
May 2014

Abstract

Den britiske forfattaren Graham Greene lanserte i 1936 ein distinksjon i samband med sitt forfattarskap der han skilte mellom det han kalla ”entertainments” eller ”underhaldningsromanar” og romanar, som forfattaren sjølv såg på som viktigare. Fleire av romanane til Greene frå 1930-talet blei klassifisert under denne sjangeren, ”underhaldningsromanar”. Dei blei karakterisert som litterære verk der fokuset låg i hovudsak på den spennande handlinga, og ikkje på dei mindre avanserte karakterane. Denne oppgåva undersøker tre litterære verk, klassifisert som ”underhaldningsromanar”, der oppgåva skal utforske aspekt ved romanane gjennom ei nærlesing av hovudpersonane og korleis dei er karakteriserte. Oppgåva vil då argumentere at desse elementa gjer romanane meir komplekse enn kva som er forventa grunna denne distinksjonen. Oppgåva vil fokusere på og analysere verka *A Gun for Sale* (1936), *Stamboul Train* (1932) og *The Confidential Agent* (1939). Oppgåva vil diskutere korleis hovudpersonen I *A Gun for Sale* utviklar seg, og korleis ein kan sjå dette gjennom karakteriseringa av han. Vidare argumenterer eg at denne uventa utviklinga står i opposisjon med korleis Greene sjølv skildra personane i ”underhaldningsromanane”. *Stamboul Train* utfordrar stereotypar ved å byggje opp eit rammeverk av stereotypiske karakteristikkar rundt om hovudpersonane, og deretter bryt med dei. Desse hovudpersonane kommenterer også på viktig sosial samtidsspørsmål. To aspekt av *The Confidential Agent* blir diskutert i denne oppgåva. Det eine aspektet handlar om korleis hovudpersonane i verket bryt med dei tradisjonelle rollene dei har blitt gjevne innanfor thrillersjangeren. Det andre aspektet som blir diskutert er at teksten viser ein medvit for sin status som tekst gjennom kommentarar og refleksjonar frå tekstens personar. På same tid blir melodrama òg kommentert, som er eit sjangertrekk typisk for thriller-sjangeren i tillegg til ”underhaldningsromanen”. Ved å sjå korleis karakterane utviklar seg, kva funksjon dei har, og på kva måte dei blir karakterisert vil eg argumentere at romanane nærma seg å vere ein roman framfor ”underhaldningsroman”.

Acknowledgements

First and most importantly, I would like to thank my supervisor, Jakob Lothe, for his encouraging comments, insightful thoughts and constant interest in my thesis. His knowledge is immense, which has benefited my thesis greatly. Our meetings have been very helpful and fruitful, whether we discussed aspects of my thesis, our equal admiration for Greene or our mutual fascination with Nordfjord.

Secondly, I wish to thank my parents, Rune and Grethe, for their constant and never-ending support and encouraging words. They truly are my foundation. My siblings, Rolf and Kari, have provided me with wonderful and necessary distractions, and allowed occasional monologues on how remarkable an author Greene is, for which I am grateful.

I am also very grateful to J. Jacob Hoffmann for all his useful comments and interesting discussions on Greene's novels. I thank him for taking the time to proof-read and comment on my thesis, and with his fantastic attitude emphasise that there is still hope. I will also extend my gratitude to Karoline Christiansen who has put up with my rants on thesis-related issues, in addition to taking the time to proof-read my thesis and give valuable comments. I also wish to thank Hanne Frafjord for being my trusted reading hall companion, who always greeted me with "Good Monday!" at the start of every week. Her positivity and warm hugs definitely improved this experience.

Further I wish to thank my dear members of "Foreningen" for always supporting me and giving me positive words, and my good friends from Måløy for always believing in me. I also wish to thank my fellow students in the reading hall for the positive environment and encouragement during lunch breaks with microwave-dinners and extensive quizzing.

Contents

Introduction

This thesis will explore three literary works, labelled "entertainments" by their author Graham Greene. By engaging in an in-depth reading of the characters and how they are characterised, I will investigate the complexity of the narratives[1]. I will focus the works *A Gun for Sale* (1936), *Stamboul Train* (1932) and *A Confidential Agent* (1939). I have chosen these three narratives because they were written and published in the 1930s, and due to the similar themes they address. I will analyse the three narratives in order to show that, primarily due to the unexpected facets of the characters and how they are characterised, the narratives are surprisingly complex.

This introduction will present a backdrop of the distinction between the generic terms where I include Greene's own understanding of the terms that he chose to use, and include what critics of Greene have said about this distinction. I think this is a presentation that is important to include, because the label "entertainment" characterises the narratives I have chosen for my thesis in a particular manner. Categorisations of the narratives presented by both Greene and some critics of Greene suggest what to expect from these works. Thus it is important to research what has been said about this generic label. This includes those who agree with Greene's early description, and those who to some degree question the label or think that it is not a purposeful distinction.

Graham Greene as an author had a very productive decade in the 1930s and published eight novels and two travel accounts. During this productive period Greene made the qualitative distinction between what he called his novels and his "entertainments". Greene explains this partition himself in a radio broadcast with Walter Allen in May 1955:

[1] In my chapters I will refer to these literary works as novels as opposed to "entertainments".

> In one's entertainments one is primarily interested in having an exciting story as in a physical action, with just enough character to give interest in the action, because you can't be interested in the action of a mere dummy. In the novels I hope one is primarily interested in the character and the action takes a minor part. (Pryce-Jones 62)

Greene here explains how he understands the distinction he makes between "entertainment" and novel. While in his "entertainments" one would expect an exciting story, with physical action and "dummy" characters, in the narratives the characters are in focus. Greene invites the readers to understand the characters of his fiction in very different ways. By calling the characters in the "entertainments" "dummies", he implies that these characters cannot have depth, development or different dimensions, since the action is in focus. These elements are reserved for the characters in his novels. By defining his books in these terms Greene allowed critics to overlook these "entertainments" or identify them as lesser compared to Greene's other works. Greene said in an interview with Marie-Françoise Allain: "I started making this distinction with *A Gun for Sale*" (148). Greene goes on to explain that he considered writing under another name. He decided against this since his publishers would have paid him a starting salary comparable to what they would have offered a new author. Thus it appears that the reason, why Greene decided to make use of this distinction was primarily financial. *A Gun for Sale* was published in 1936, four years after *Stamboul Train*, although it did not receive the label when published, it must have fit Greene's criteria of what constitutes an "entertainment", thus it was called an "entertainment" in later editions.

It is not a gross exaggeration to suggest that Greene coined a new and challenging term when he chose to define a number of his literary works as something different from a novel. The term novel, though established and widely used in literary studies, is in itself challenging to define, since it includes almost more than it excludes. M. H. Abrams and

Geoffrey Gult Harpham note that "The term 'novel' is now applied to a great variety of writings that have in common only the attribute of being extended works of fiction written in prose" (226). This definition only scratches the surface of what the term entails. In *Litteraturvitenskapelig Leksikon* the term "roman", or novel in English is explained thus: "a longer fictional work of prose […] That the novel is unusually flexible in both form and content makes it sustainable and flexible, but complicates attempts to give the genre a universally valid definition" (217, translation mine). The first part of this definition is similar to that of Abrams and Harpham. Both glossaries start by listing what characteristics can fit within the frame of the novel, which includes such aspects as a narrative text written in prose, substantial length and develops a plot. Inspired by the theorist Mikhail M. Bakhtin, the authors of *Litteraturvitenskapelig Leksikon* not only attempt to define the term, they also underline how challenging it is to precisely describe and delimit the novel. Bakhtin comments: "The study of the novel as a genre is distinguished by peculiar difficulties [...] The novel is not merely one genre among other genres. Among genres long since completed and in part already dead, the novel is the only developing genre" (3-4). Bakhtin emphasises the fact that the genre is subject to constant change and development, thus it is difficult to define. Bakhtin goes on to explain traditional characteristics of the novel, while at the same time identifying significant exceptions. He mentions that the novel is a multi-layered, plotted genre, though there are single-layered descriptive novels without much plot; a complex genre, though "the novel is a complicated genre (although novels are mass produced as pure and frivolous entertainment like no other genre) […] the novel is a prose genre (although there are novels excellently written in verse)" (9). Thus Bakhtin underlines how experimental novels continuously move beyond the boundaries of definitions. The definitions I have included here all support one notion: it is hard to define such a vast, elastic and dynamic genre. This implies

that although it is challenging to define what a novel is, it is also difficult to decide what a novel is *not*.

One could argue that "entertainment" is a sub-genre of the novel, and therefore the distinction is helpful. However, Greene separates the term "novel" from these books entirely. I find this problematic, since, as I have shown above, the term and genre novel is very open and inclusive. The characteristic generic features that Greene links to an "entertainment" are characteristics which the novel possesses too. I wish to highlight what Bakhtin does when incorporating simpler novels and "entertainments" into the definition. This alone identifies Greene's "entertainments" as novels. I will point out that the usage of the term "entertainment" as used in the 1930s by Greene, is not the same as that of 2014. A term like "entertainment" inevitably changes in accordance with, and as a consequence of, historical, technological and cultural developments. Thus, when I refer to the term "entertainment" in my thesis, I mean the term that Greene defined himself in 1936.

Graham Greene was born in England in 1904. According to the authorised biographer Norman Sherry, "The future novelist was born into three small worlds – the town of Berkhamsted, one hour north of London by train, the family home attached to the school, and Berkhamsted School itself – the last being a world into which he was gradually absorbed" (3). The first part of Greene's life was in this little town, and revolved around the school where his father was the headmaster. He lived at the school even before he attended it as a student. Greene may hint at being brought up at a national institution, such as this boarding school, in his works, especially in *A Gun for Sale*. The protagonist of the novel explicitly says that he was raised in institutions. Linked to this information is the horrible relationship that Raven, the protagonist, had with his parents. Although we must be careful not to compare an author's life and his or her fiction directly, this comment can be related to what Greene writes of his father: "I have an impression my father used to smack me as a child though I can remember

only one specific beating at a later age" (*A Sort of Life* 25). It was not only his father Greene had a problematic relationship with: "The only separation that really existed was from his [Greene's father's] children. As a headmaster he was even more distant than our aloof mother" (Greene, *A Sort of Life*, 21). Greene notes, and even criticises, his parents' absence and distance here, something that may have created his fascination for characters with complicated relationships and families. He was not at home with his parents, and his home was a government institution. The more critical and unauthorised biographer Michael Shelden also comments on Greene's attitude towards the school:

> It is hardly surprising that Graham Greene was unhappy at his father's school. The puritanical restrictions were bad enough, but being the headmaster's son made everything worse. His father expected him to be not only an exemplary pupil but also a loyal spy in the surveillance network. (18)

The school's puritan restrictions are illuminated by Greene himself when he reveals that he remembers his father smacking him. Greene must have existed as a form of outsider in his own childhood. He did not feel at home with his distant parents, and he did fit in with his fellow students. These experiences in his childhood may explain Greene's fascination and sympathy for outsiders in society. Being a "spy", as Shelden calls it, would rob Greene from having friendships with his classmates. I find it interesting that Shelden uses the word "spy," since in the 1930s Greene would go on to write thrillers with both spies and agents.

After some unsuccessful attempts at writing in the twenties, Greene successfully published *Stamboul Train* in 1932 and suddenly became a recognised novelist: "*Stamboul Train* was a landmark in Graham Greene's career as a novelist, for in writing it he discovered his true talent – his ability to observe" (Sherry, 407). Because of the success with this novel, Greene finally earned money as an author, and it became possible for him to embark on a literary career.

Greene published his earliest novels at a time of high cultural elitist thinking. He lived and published at the same time as several modernist writers. Alan Warren Friedman explains Greene's attitude towards his contemporaries: "Greene defined his early fiction against high modernism's apolitical and irreligious stance, Bloomsbury's elitism, Woolf's rejection of storytelling" (230). Here Friedman situates Graham Greene much in the same way as other biographers and critics have done. Greene did not care for elitist thinking, nor did he put emphasis on sophisticated, "high" culture. Brian Diemert agrees with Friedman's view:

> Greene's fiction and his decision to use popular forms of discourse demonstrate that he shared his generation's view of the modernism of the twenties […] Greene believed that the artist could be, had to be, serious without being 'highbrow,' and it is in this context that his thrillers and his decision to use the 'entertainment' label have their place. (14)

Greene believed that he could be serious and not only touch on but actually explore important themes and issues without turning "high-brow". I have mentioned the economic intention that Greene could have had in making the distinction between "entertainment" and novels. However, Diemert mentions another possibility: "This vision perhaps explains why Greene described the novels as an 'entertainment', for in so doing he distanced it from the literature of an élite that was identified with both modernist experimentation and political conservatism. The subheading was a signal of political and literary resistance" (133). I can merely speculate at the actual intent behind the distinction, since I think that both explanations are viable. Diemert has discussed both economy and literary culture as possible explanations of the distinction, but seems to consider the latter as the more important. Diemert does not see Greene's distinction as a difference in quality, but relates it to Greene's way of positioning himself in British literature. At the same time, by using the term "entertainment" to distance himself from modernists such as Wolf and Joyce. Greene also opened for the evaluation of these novels as "lower" culture. Probably he did so to a larger degree than he intended.

Greene's distinction between "entertainment" and novel has proved problematic, and a number of critics have sought to underline or undermine the distinction. They have done so by stressing certain aspects of the narratives. An aspect that these so-called "entertainments" brought with them was popularity for the author, and as Diemert underlines: "Many literary critics, however, view popularity with suspicion and seldom see it as the mark of a writer's literary worth" (4). Because of his popularity, Greene's "entertainments" were viewed as less substantial than they potentially are. The fact that he was so popular probably made many critics sceptical about his more "substantial" work. Here I ask whether a "proper" novel cannot be entertaining, and, conversely, whether an entertaining novel cannot convey quality. Similarly to Diemert, Grahame Smith states that this distinction to Greene's status: "The cast of Greene's fictional temperament, the pressures of his personal life, and the historical forces of the period conspired to lead him to a form which may have damaged his status in academic criticism, but which ultimately created him a large and admiring public" (22). Smith points out that though Greene gained an admiring public, it damaged his position within academia. Popularity is unfortunate for someone who tried to be taken seriously as a writer. Greene wanted to retract the distinction in 1969 after it had been widely accepted: "Although Greene abandoned this distinction, it is still employed by the editors of Penguin books and by a number of critics" (Diemert 184). As it is pointed out here, when a concept is largely accepted in the literary world, it is hard to alter. Diemert also writes the reason why Greene abandoned his distinction was simply the fact that his early "entertainments" resemble his early novels (12).

Another angle is presented by Neville Braybrooke, who writes that "In the work of Grahan Greene no sharp division can be drawn between his novels, entertainments, and travel books. Throughout them all, in some form or other, runs the theme of pursuit" (1). Braybrooke finds that a sharp division between Greene's works is not feasible. I agree with

this view, and I reiterate that this thesis will question how the "entertainment" label may be unfortunate for the narratives. Braybrooke makes his obersvations as early as 1951, while Frances L. Kunkel writes his interpretation in of Greene's distinction in 1960. I find it interesting that Braybrooke identified the blurriness of the distinction so early, even before Greene himself did. I also find it interesting that the distinction stuck. Michael Rosenthal makes a point similar to that of Braybrooke: "Graham Greene is a major writer of the century who succeeds, through his relatively little-known minor works of the thirties, in catching the period's anxieties, its forebodings about the advent of another war, better than anybody else" (745). Here he implies that these narratives of the thirties are underestimated and function better than other literature from the same decade. Some critics have been able to question this distinction. The label "entertainments" thus became a marker of simplicity and lack of complexity.

Kunkel characterises Greene's "entertainments" thus: "His [Greene's] entertainments can be distinguished from his novels by a greater use of melodrama, by a comparative lack of development in the characters, and by a concession to the happy ending" (57). I agree that some of Greene's characters in my chosen narratives are flat characters that lack development, and some can even be seen as caricatures. However, the most important protagonists are, in my opinion, not undeveloped and they have important functions in the novels. Since I will make use of the notions of the character and characterisation, I find it useful to define what I understand by these terms. According to Abrams and Harpham character is defined as "the persons represented in a dramatic or narrative work, who are interpreted by the reader as possessing particular moral, intellectual, and emotional qualities by interferences from what the persons say and their distinctive ways of saying it–the dialogue–and from what they do–the action" (42). This is the understanding of what a character is, and I will also supplement further aspects of the character by use of such

elements as character traits and dimensions as James Phelan discusses. Characterisation is the presentation of the character's traits, actions and speech, made by the narrator, as I understand it and will use the term. In looking at characters and characterisation, the narrator's role in the characterisation will be discussed. The narrator is Greene's instrument so that he can construct the character as he find fruitful. The narrator is also a construction, which I will take into consideration when I discuss the narrator in my chapter.

If Kunkel means that a happy ending is characteristic for the entertainments, I question what he considers as a happy ending. A.A. DeVitis defines the narratives different than Kunkel: "Greene refers to the happy ending that characterizes the thriller type. But whether or not Greene's endings are happy in the conventional sense is a matter for satiric comment, for the endings of his entertainments are often as pessimistic and gloomy as those of his novels" (52). Here DeVitis argues against Greene's own characterisations of his thrillers, finding that a happy ending would be appropriate for the sub-genre thriller. I will explore how descriptive Kunkel and DeVitis characterisations of these narratives are, in order to investigate the narratives' complexity.

For Abrams and Harpham, "The term 'melodrama' and 'melodramatic' are also, in an extended sense, applied to any literary work or episode, whether in drama or prose fiction, that relies on implausible events and sensational action" (189). The word "extended" refers to the fact that this term was initially connected with the stage, and has later been adopted into prose fiction. The definition of "implausible and sensational action" has laid the foundation for melodrama's bad critical reputation, and the reason why it is connected to lesser literary narratives. In his important and highly influential study of melodrama Peter Brooks writes that the term "has a bad reputation and has usually been used pejoratively" (11). He explains further what connotations most people have with the term: "indulgence of strong emotionalism; moral polarization and schematization; extreme states of being, situations,

actions; overt villainy, persecution of the good, and final reward of virtue; inflated and extravagant expression; dark plottings, suspense, breathtaking peripety" (11-12). Brooks's observations on what most people associate with the term are similar to the generic characteristics presented by Abrams and Harpham. Brooks, however, argues that these descriptions are too simple and devaluating. Brooks points out that in daily use people refer to "cheap and banal melodrama–to soap opera" (12), while melodrama can have additional significance: "In considering melodrama, we are in a sense talking about a form of theatricality which will provide a model for the making of meaning in fictional dramatizations of existence" (13). He also writes that:

> Melodrama is indeed, typically, not only a moralistic drama but the drama of morality: it strives to find, to articulate, to demonstrate, to 'prove' the existence of a moral universe which, though put into question, masked by villainy and perversions of judgement, does exist and can be made to assert its presence and its categorical force among men. (20)

Brooks presents a more nuanced view of melodrama and his definitions imply that melodramatic are not necessarily lesser than their melodramatic adversaries. When I discuss melodrama in my thesis, I will make use of these definitions and categorisations.

Broadly speaking, it seems difficult for publishers to eliminate or stop using the division between Greene's novels and "entertainments". Bernard Bergonzi states with reference to *Brighton Rock*: "Greene originally intended [it] to be an entertainment, until his realization of the book's depths and implications caused him to take it out of that category" (68). I think this comment is very interesting, because it shows that the division between "entertainments" and novels was not clear, neither to the author nor the publishers. The reason why the distinction may not always have been easy to use is because there may not be as clear qualitative differences between them as the different labels, and certain critics, imply. The different labels may suggest the different manners in which the narratives are read, rather than confirming that the novels themselves are different.

I have illuminated these aspects of the character, because I think this is a side of these narratives that have been overlooked due to the expectations connected to the characters of Greene's "entertainments". For example, the protagonists of these narratives are multifaceted in that they show potential for development, both in the characterisation of them and by their actions. Not all the characters in the three novels are equally complex, but they complete different actions that, in my opinion, complicate the simplicity of the narratives' generic label. Melodrama is also an important subject, since critics have said that the use of melodrama is typical for Greene's entertainment, where I will make use of theory by Peter Brooks.

In my thesis I will discuss my three chosen texts through an extensive close reading. My primary texts hold a unique position in my thesis, since the aim of my thesis is to show how these novels are indeed more than their label "entertainment" implies. I will engage in a discussion with other readings of Greene by other critics in order to illuminate my findings. My close reading will allude to the historical frame of the 1930s, since Greene's texts contain themes that comment on the contemporary situation. I see this social commentary as supplementary to the notion that these novels are more than simple entertainment. In writing a thesis on novels that comment on the contemporary situation and politics as in my case, it might be easy to fall into a trap where one pushes political opinions and contemporary history onto the novel. This is why I have chosen to concentrate on my primary texts, and do a close reading alone before I start reading other critics and critiques of Greene.

I will try to explore the narratives' qualities and complexity through the discussion of characters and characterisation in my thesis. The discussion will consist of three different elements. I will through my close readings and analysis see how the characters are characterised by the narrator, how the protagonists develop, and the characters' function. The thesis will inspect complex aspects of the characters in an attempt to simultaneously show aspects of the narratives' complexity. My understanding is that more complicated aspects

with the novel's characters will also influence the quality of the novel itself. I will also view these characters in relation to the following themes: politics, Jewishness and anti-Semitism, social class, and the case with the outsider of society. These are all important themes of the 1930s, and since the narratives actively comment on important aspects of the society, I find this to ass a dimension to these narratives.

Each chapter of my thesis is concerned with one narrative, and the order in which I have chosen to present the texts is connected to the order in which they received the entertainments label. Although *Stamboul Train* was the first novel to be published of the narratives I am discussing, it was not labelled as an "entertainment" until after 1936 and the publication of *A Gun for Sale*. Thus the first chapter will be on *A Gun for Sale*, where I will focus on the development and characterisation of the novel's protagonist, and also how the supplementary characters relate to him, especially Anne. My second chapter will discuss *Stamboul Train*, where I will focus on the two main characters and how the novel creates certain stereotype connected with these characters, and subsequently show how the two characters break with the stereotype and expectations connected to their role. In my third and final chapter will investigate *The Confidential Agent*, and I will focus on how the characters break with the traditional roles of the thriller and how they comment on the generic traits of the novel itself, mainly through comments on melodrama. Although *Stamboul Train* was the first novel to be published of the narratives I am discussing, it was not labelled as an "entertainment" until after 1936.

Chapter 1 – Rise of the Raven: The Protagonist's Development and Increasing Complexity in *A Gun for Sale*

In this chapter I will argue that *A Gun for Sale* is more complex and substantial than the labels "entertainment" leads one to expect. I will show this complexity of this novel through the surprisingly complicated protagonist, Raven, who goes through changes that expose unpredictable sides of him. I will also explore the character in relation to his background, his actions, and his relationships to the other characters in the novel. Thus in this context I find it useful to analyse the characterisation of Raven, since it is through the characterisation the reader learns all information. When discussing the protagonist's characterisation I also find it potent to investigate how the narrator makes descriptions of Raven, and his actions and dialogues. It is through the characterisations of the protagonist that his development is expressed. The characters I discuss in addition to Raven will be viewed in relation to Raven, since all major characters in this novel exist not only in the same context as but in relation to the protagonist. The other characters, settings or events will supplement the analysis of the male and female protagonists. I will try to illuminate through a close reading of the novel how the protagonist's development and unpredictability makes it more complex than the generic label of "entertainment" and the genre "thriller" make the reader expect.

I will structure my chapter in two main parts, where the first part discusses the initial expression Raven's character gives and how his outset is characterised. The second part of my chapter will consist of a discussion on Raven and Anne's relationship and how this influences Raven as a character, through which he develops and changes. Anne is the character with the most substantial influence on the development of Raven.

Raven

The opening paragraph in *A Gun for Sale* introduces Raven in a very direct manner, and at the same time addresses the core conflict of the novel, the assassination of the minister.

> Murder didn't mean much to Raven. It was just a new job. You had to be careful. You had to use your brains. It was not a question of hatred. He had only seen the Minister once: he had been pointed out to Raven as he walked down the new housing estate between the little lit Christmas trees, an old, rather grubby man without any friends, who was said to love humanity. (Greene, *A Gun for Sale*[2] 5)

Murder is not presented as a criminal and punishable act, but just "a new job", which puts the protagonist's morality into question. There is a considerable attitudinal distance between Raven and the reader, since Raven's view on murder and death is very abnormal. It is stated that it is not about hatred, which removes all emotional connection to Raven's own actions. The "grubby man" is said to love humanity, but this is discarded by Raven. He does not care about this, which characterises Raven in way which underlines his lack of compassion for other people and humanity. This is a characterisation of one of his character's "dimension" as James Phelan calls it (9). A character's dimension is "[…] converted into functions by the *progression* of the work" (9). The dimension of cruelty, indifference and lack of compassion characterises Raven's in the early part of the novel. His character first is described as a murderous villain, who spreads fear. Through a change in characterisations of Raven these dimensions become more nuanced later on, thus his function as a character becomes quite different than his outset implies.

Since Raven had such a rough start in his life when it comes to personal relationships, he has developed a cynical view on life:

> 'They have a good time and what do they mind if someone's born ugly? Three minutes in bed or against a wall, and then a lifetime for the one that's born. Mother Love,' he began to laugh, seeing quite clearly the kitchen table, the carving knife on the linoleum, the blood all over his mother's dress. (*GS* 124)

[2] When citing from *A Gun for Sale* (1936) later in the chapter, I will only write *GS* and the page number.

He has such a cold view on how a person is brought into the world. Additionally, his view may explain why Raven does not have a problem in taking a life. Raven has no relations to his victims, since the murders are not personal, thus the act of murdering becomes a triviality, and has no emotional consequences for Raven. In addition, the Minister represents someone with political influence and might improve or have a positive impact on society. However, being outside of society Raven cares not for what destructive force his actions have. Society has excluded Raven, and as a countermeasure Raven excludes society by neglecting social norms and removing sympathetic reflections from his consideration. It is pointed out that the Minister should rather be called a minister of peace than of war, since he was more occupied with working for peace, than for war. Not only did he murder the Minister, but: "He [Raven] snatched the automatic out of the case and shot the Minister twice in the back" (*GS* 7). Shooting someone in the back is not only unjust since he murders someone, but also a symbolic act of betrayal, which is a theme continually presented in the novel, both with Raven as the perpetrator as in this case, but also as the victim.

> He [Raven] felt no guilt about the old War Minister, he was one of the great ones in the world, one of those who 'sat', he knew all the right words, he was educated […] and if he was sometimes a little worried by the memory of the secretary's whisper through the imperfectly shut door, he could always tell himself that he had shot her in self-defense. (*GS* 93)

Raven feels no guilt for the murder of the Minister. Raven's own opinions are expressed in this excerpt. The Minister is described as a man who "sat," meaning someone who is not physically active, but only makes decisions. The characterisation of someone who "knew the right words" may refer to the fact that the Minister is a politician, who, through Raven's perspective, uses words in a manipulative sense. This underlines Raven's negative opinions of politicians, which explains why he feels no guilt at all. It also expresses Raven's own rationalising for the murder of the helpless woman whom he shot in "self-defence". This

formulation does not allude to a conscience that Raven might have, or to a sense of moral that murdering is wrong, which is concluded of Raven's reactions when murdering her:

> He [Raven] supposed she [the secretary] was begging him for mercy. He pressed the trigger again; she staggered under it as if she had been kicked by an animal in the side [...] her [the secretary's] breath going out through her wounds. Raven was satisfied. He turned back to the Minister. (*GS* 7-8)

These extracts characterise Raven's apathy towards his victims. They are no more to him than animals. He leaves no witnesses and, as the passages suggests, he is methodical and emotionless.

Raven's self-centeredness and lack of understanding the causality of his actions are exemplified in the early part of the novel: "A newsboy went by outside calling: 'Ultimatum, Ultimatum.' His [Raven's] mind registered the fact but no more: it seemed to have nothing to do with him" (*GS* 19). It has all to do with him, since his violent actions caused this military ultimatum and the tense political situation in Europe. If Raven were as educated and knowledgeable man as he claims to be, he might have known the consequences of the murders he committed abroad. Raven's lack of morality is central to the reader's initial impression of him. As Raven says: "I don't care a damn whether there's a war or not. I only want to know who double-crossed me. I want to get even" (*GS* 48). Raven does not care about justice, but about his personal revenge against the people who betrayed him. Raven goes even further to suggest that maybe a war is something people need: "A war won't do people any harm [...] It'll show them what's what, it'll give them a taste of their medicine. I know. There's always been a war for me" (*GS* 48). Raven has had a challenging background, and uses the word "war" to characterise the constant conflict that has been present in his life. Clearly Raven has been isolated from knowing people who care for him, and has become an outsider of societal frames, which his occupation as an assassin confirms. Raven's life has always been a struggle. He is constantly mistreated by his fellow people: "She [woman in the

nurse uniform] judged him [Raven] with just the same appraising stare as the doorkeeper at a shady night club" (*GS* 27), and "She [the Jewish girl] wouldn't 'sir' him. His lip was like a badge of class. It revealed the property of poverty who couldn't afford a clever surgeon" (*GS* 14). Not only is the hare-lip something that disturbs Raven's appearance, but it also accentuates his social class. The common denominator of the mistreatments of Raven often starts with his hare-lip. When Alice, the maid, is to describe Raven to the Scotland Yard: "He's [Raven is] ugly through and through. That lip of his. It gives you the creeps" (*GS* 17). Raven's physical deformity is a disadvantage, not only can it be very easy for witnesses to identify an assassin with such an easy recognisable characteristic: "A hare-lip is a serious handicap on his profession; it had been badly sewn in infancy, so that now the upper lip was twisted and scarred" (*GS* 5). He is easily recognised because of this characteristic, and also since it has been badly sewn and scarred it may imply that his parents did not have the means, or perhaps even the care to deal with this properly. The scar is in focus during the entire story, since it is the identity marker. It is more than a marker according to Pryce-Jones: "Raven has never been innocent, for he has been born into a world of corruption and vice, symbolised by his own hare-lip" (63). Raven's lip not only marks that he comes from a poor working class family, but also becomes a symbol of Raven's cruel nature. It is a marker of the unfortunate starting point in his life since he was born into a family of crime and death, and is now the marker of his isolation outside of society: "If a man's born ugly, he doesn't stand a chance. It begins at school. It begins before that" (*GS* 45), here Raven himself narrates what it has meant for him having this inconvenient scar. He even points out that the ugliness of his face worked against him even before he started school, which refers to his bad relationship with his parents. As a result of people's reaction towards this deformity he does not fit in properly within the societal frames: "Raven never had a girl. The hare-lip prevented that. He had learnt when he was very young how repulsive it was" (*GS* 5). Raven is an outsider, given his lack of

personal relationships and a normal upbringing, which eventually drives him to criminal activity and his corrupted view of life, seeding from his lack of consideration for people. His lip has indirectly driven him to crime and corruption, and thus also symbolises it.

Raven has not had an easy childhood even without the hare-lip: "His [Raven's] mother had borne him when his father was in gaol, and six years later when his father was hanged for another crime, she had cut her own throat with a kitchen knife; afterwards there had been the home" (*GS* 67). He is already condemned in this world by his hare-lip, by his father's execution, by his mother by slitting her throat with the carving knife in front of his eyes. Raven had ended up in a governmental institution for orphans. At one point in the novel, the lip is almost described as a means of attack: "He let his hare-lip loose on the girl when she came towards him with the same pleasure he might have felt in turning a machine-gun on a picture gallery" (*GS* 14). Although his lip is described as a weapon, it is not really a weapon which would be used on the girl as much as towards himself: it can ultimately give his identity away since the police knows of this characteristic. This lack of human behaviour and anti-social way of being might be a result of this poor integration into society in addition to the parents who left him.

The focus on the hare-lip also reveals the perspective of the narrator which seems to change from part I to part II in the first chapter. Now the narrator observes: "A man [Raven] passed her [Anne] going up the road […] he had a hare-lip" (*GS* 11). This "man" in this passage refers to Raven, while the following part of the chapter the narrator refers to Raven by name again. Later in the novel this shift in the narrator occurs again: "He emerged from the dark door, mean vicious face, hare-lip, a crude check suit, ominous and aggressive in his submission" (*GS* 151). The reader knows the character is Raven, although, he is described as any other character. The change in narration in this manner is more multifaceted than narrating from just one perspective. Although this manner of writing creates more excitement

and suspense, which fit within the characterisations of the genre, the change in the characterisation of Raven is significant. Through this change in characterisation, a change in narrative perspective is expressed. This variation I argue makes the presentation of Raven more complex, and consequently also the novel.

Raven consults an underground doctor in order to operate his hare-lip, since it is the most revealing aspect of his identity. This wish to change his appearance is similar to that of the Jewish character Stein in *Stamboul Train*, who uses plastic surgery to erase his prominent characteristic as a Jew: his nose. Both characters are born with these features, and both characteristics are in their opinion negative, so they want to be rid of them in order to assimilate into an accepting society. The difference between the two characters is the means they have to make this happen. Where Raven has no money or opportunity to have a proper operation, Stein had both the means and possibility. I will return to this argument in my discussion of Stein and the other Jewish characters in my second chapter. Raven seeks an unlicensed doctor, Dr. Yogel: "His hair was jet-black; it looked as if it had been dyed, and there was not much of it; it was plastered in thin strands across the scalp" (*GS* 29). The doctor's appearance is characterised just as greasy as his personality. His slithery nature is revealed when he does not try to help Raven, but rather intend to betray him and hand him in to gain a reward. The manner in which the doctor is characterised is descriptive of his betraying and backstabbing actions against Raven. Yogel wants to gas Raven with an anaesthetic, but Raven declines in fear of being unconscious, to which Yogel answers: "Better get used to it, old man. We'll all be gassed in a day or two" (*GS* 29). He refers to the inevitable war which is on the march. Although being the educated man that he claims he is Raven does not understand what Yogel means. Yogel explains: "Well, it looks like war, doesn't it [...] The Serbs can't shoot a Minister of War like that and get away with it" (*GS* 29), to which Raven answers: "All that because an old man" (*GS* 29). Raven starts to grasp the

consequences of the job he performed for Cholmondeley[3] and Sir Marcus in contrast to the apathetic way he acted towards the assassination earlier. The development of the protagonist seems to start here in terms of understanding the consequences of his actions. Yogel utters that he regrets not buying munitions shares on the stock market: "I'd have made a fortune in munition shares. They've gone up to the sky, old man" (*GS* 29). Which points to the greedy mind of Yogel, and at the same time introduces the aspect of capitalism's influence on the characters' intentions. It is the same greed that stirs Yogel towards giving Raven up to the Yard. He is not safe even amongst his own people, meaning criminals and outsiders of society:

> He was touched by something he had never felt before: a sense of injustice stammered on his tongue. These people were of his own kind; they didn't belong inside the legal borders; for the second time in one day he had been betrayed by the lawless. He had always been alone, but never so alone as this. (*GS* 30)

Raven is struck by the injustice, since he is betrayed even by those he would consider to be in the same demographic outside of society. Not even other societal outcasts treat him well. Raven is now even an outsider to the outsiders. The notion of the outsider amongst Greene's characters is discussed by Robert Hoskins, who writes that "Greene's grotesque characters express such radically alienated and distorted views of life that in that in the end they cannot learn or change" (62). Greene was no stranger in writing of alienated and estranged characters, as I will show not only in this chapter, but my two following chapters as well. Raven, who is "radically alienated" and isolated from society is the most severe case of the characters that I discuss. Both of his parents abandoned their son, which must have scarred Raven psychologically much like his lip has scarred him physically. He also presents "distorted views" on the value of life, in order to become an assassin, where one takes lives ordered by paying clients. One element of Raven's character that breaks with this

[3] Although Mr. Cholmondeley is also known as Mr. Davis and Mr. Chumley, I will refer to him as Mr. Cholmondeley in my thesis, since this is the name first given to him in the novel.

characterisation of Greene's characters is that Raven's views are not unchangeable. His exposure to kindness and sympathy through Anne makes him feel again. Thus the outsider in this novel does change, as I will discuss in the second part of my chapter.

One significant aspect of the characterisation of the protagonist is his unusual name. The reader eventually learns that Raven's first name is James, meaning that Raven is his last name or family name. The symbol of the common raven is widely used, and is mentioned in the definition of the word "raven": "[…] raven was a near-universal symbol of dark prophecy—of death, pestilence, and disease—though its cleverness and fearless habits also won it a degree of admiration, as evidenced in its noble heraldic roles in the mythology of some peoples" ("raven"). The symbolic interpretation of the raven presented here is descriptive of Raven's character. Initially Raven is quite the bad omen with the presence of murders. His name is a trait that underlines the ominous deathly dimension of his character. It is very interesting that ravens are omens of dark prophecies given that the people that Raven has any social interactions with are in danger after meeting him. Anne ends up in mishaps and danger after engaging in a relation with Raven. Considering the fact that she is the detective James Mather's fiancée, she would normally be in safe surroundings. However, after meeting Raven she is attempted murdered twice, held captive, and eventually breaks the law when helping Raven.

One element of Raven's characterisation during the course of the novel is the importance of education or more specifically the importance of underlining the fact that he is an educated man. Education is commonly connected with social class, since in order to receive higher education, one must be of a certain social background and have money. The repetition of Raven stating that "I'm educated" (*GS* 15, 47, 99) to the people he is speaking with, expresses that he is not stupid or from a lower social class. This division clearly shows the societal context in which Raven exists which is concerned with class and thus education.

Diemert writes: “Indeed, because of Raven’s obsessive boasts in ‘I’m educated’ [...] the social system that shapes him is severely criticize: he, too, is made by England” (120). Although Raven critiques society, he still tries to be a better man, since he repeatedly presents himself as an educated man, in order to gain respect of his fellow people.

Although Raven states numerous times throughout the novel that he is educated, education does not mean intelligent. As I mentioned earlier with the lack of understanding of cause and effect of his own actions, he still does not understand too complicated facts: “There were too many things he [Raven] didn’t understand: this war they were talking of, why he had been double-crossed” (*GS* 30). Raven comprehends simple instincts such as revenge, but the fact that he indirectly started a war is hard for him to grasp. He does know the limitations to his so-called education, as confirmed here: “I’m educated aren’t I, the phrase came mockingly into his mind, but he knew that one of the police out there could discover in this room more than he” (*GS* 99). Raven acknowledges not being smarter or brighter than the police, and questions his own “education”, which crack his hard exterior and another side of Raven is revealed. He cannot lie to his own mind, thus the statement mocks him in his thoughts. Since the reader also learns what Raven thinks, it is exposed that Raven only accentuates his education, but he is not as actually as confident and educated as he expresses. This characterisation of Raven’s own thought helps to nuance him as a character. It cracks the previously emphasised traits of the protagonist, and adds new traits, as this uncertainty and his lack of understanding which stand in opposition to the educated and bold Raven at the beginning of the novel.

After Raven had carried out the assassination of the Minister, the money he had been paid with turned out to be stolen. This meant that Raven could not use the money since the serial numbers of his notes would be flagged. Cholmondeley and his superior, Sir Marcus, wanted Raven to be caught by the police. Raven is not a righteous character. He is not chasing

Cholmondeley and Sir Marcus in the name of justice, but as Pryce-Jones states: "Raven is not concerned with life or after-life: he wants to get even with the men who have betrayed him" (63). Raven wants revenge, since he was double-crossed. He did not even care about the old minister he killed, because primarily it was only a job, and secondly he was of a higher social class than himself. Had Raven known of the fact that the minister was of his same social class he would have acted differently: "I didn't know the old fellow [the minister] was one of us [of the working class]. I wouldn't have touched him if I'd known he was like that. All this talk of war. It doesn't mean a thing to me" (*GS* 126). Thus there is one form of human loyalty in Raven, the one against his social class.

A further interesting aspect of the characterisation of Raven becomes apparent when detectives from the Yard come to look for him: "Raven went on his knees inside the telephone-box in the dark corner below the stairs. He left the door ajar because he never liked to be shut in" (*GS* 16). Raven's expressed attitude here points to the fact that Raven does not like to be shut in a small closed space. The narrator is proficient at providing implicit information on Raven through descriptions and characterisations of him, and it is often through these characterisations Raven's development is expressed. This excerpt implies that Raven was probably locked in small spaces, possibly as punishment when growing up in governmental institutions: thus he has a problem with confinement. This can also be the part of the reason as to why Raven did not want to go to prison:

> Understand this. They aren't going to get me. I'm not going to prison. I don't care a damn if I plug one of you. I don't care if I hang. My father hanged ... what's good enough for him ... Get along in front of me up to my room. There's hell coming to somebody for this. (*GS* 20)

Human lives, including his own, do not mean much to Raven as the opening sentence states. He will rather die than to be confined in prison. At the same time, he can die in the same

manner that his father died, and maybe reunite with him. He can join his father by sharing his fate.

Raven and Anne

Raven was a cruel character prior to socialising with Anne. He was malicious towards people, who he thinks see him in a bad light and discriminate him.

> 'Justice,' he said bitterly, jabbing her between the ribs with the automatic.
> 'You don't need to talk about justice,' she [Alice] said. 'Driving me like I was in prison. Hitting me when you feel like it. Spilling ash all over the floor. I've enough to do with your slops. Milk in the soap-dish. Don't talk about justice.' (*GS* 19)

Alice, comments on Raven's selfishness and appalling actions. She questions that Raven's sense of justice, since he has obviously mistreated her. She would not have any reason not to turn him in to the police. Raven is a wanted criminal and treated her badly. Alice would have acted according to law and her own personal interest if she turned him is. It may be that Raven does not see the cruel actions that he carries out as retaliations, because he is treated badly in return, thus he has more right to act in the manner he seems fit. This way of acting is a contrast to how he treats Anne. This shows that if treated with respect and as a fellow human being, Raven can change his way of treating other people. She gradually becomes a friend of his. By 'friend' I mean that Anne shows compassion, caring and concern for Raven. All characters, in particular women, that Raven has met in the novel have been hostile. Alice reacts harshly to his lip as I discussed earlier, however, Anne is not as superficial as other people in meeting Raven, which is expressed in Anne's reaction to Raven's lip: "I've seen worse things than that" (*GS* 45). Already Anne is compassionate towards Raven, she tries to make him feel better about his own face, by explaining that: "You aren't bad-looking. You ought to have a girl. She'd stop you worrying about that lip" (*GS* 49). In this Anne even implies that Raven could have relationships, something that Raven himself would probably

see as unlikely, since his previous relationships have only ended in misery, which started in his family.

When Raven makes contact with Anne for the first time, he is in admiration of her. He asks to help her on the train with her luggage with the intent of stealing her train ticket. Although he has this ultimately evil intention of initiating contact with Anne, he is still carried away by her looks and her natural friendliness:

> He [Raven] gazed at her [Anne] with faith astonishment: her smile, the small neat face with eyes rather too wide apart; he was more used to the absent-minded routine endearments of prostitutes than to this natural friendliness, this sense of rather lost and desperate amusement. (*GS* 42)

Raven is more used to contact with the likes of other outsiders of society, such as prostitutes, and they become his reference points for interacting with women. He is not used to associate with people who treat him well. The fact that Anne smiled to him is so significant that it becomes a part of the characterisation of her.

Anne is the only character in *A Gun for Sale* who is kind to, and cares about Raven: "'I like you,' Anne said. 'I'm your friend'" (*GS* 128). It seems that Raven has experienced very little of this behaviour. Anne expresses the opinion that Raven had not been brought up right, because he did not know any stories, as normal children would probably know, to which Raven explains:

> You see, I'm educated. In one of His majesty's own homes. They call them that – homes. What do you think it means? … A home's solitary confinement for a kid that's caught talking in the chapel and the birch for almost anything you do. Bread and water. A sergeant knocking you around if you try to lark a bit. That's home. (*GS* 124)

He states that his education comes from "His majesty's own homes". Raven reveals where he has obtained his knowledge, which is in governmental orphanages. He is educated in experiences and life lessons, and not at school or academia. Raven also describes what "home" means to him. He mentions solitary confinement as punishment, which may help

explain Raven's problems with being closed in with Alice in the telephone booth and his preference of hanging instead of going to prison. He also explains the use of physical punishment as a form of disciplinary action. Add this to his comment on "bread and water", and he is describing prison. Raven does not want to go to prison, since he has already lived in a prison. Raven reveals aspects of his past that help illustrate why he is acting as he is. These characterisations put Raven in the role of a victim, thus it invites both the reader and Anne to feel sympathy with him.

Anne has a lot of thoughts concerning the pending war: "she [Anne] couldn't help remembering that war might be declared before they met again" (*GS* 24). The critical European situation is present in Anne's thoughts. The anxiety for the future fate of Europe lays the foundation for her wish to avert the war. This also motivates her to help Raven later on. When Anne is held at gunpoint and threatened by Raven, she tries to harm him in order to escape, but when she learns Raven has information that could prevent the war she want to assist him: "Then there won't be a war if you find Cholmondeley" (*GS* 48). Anne wants to help exonerate Raven of the crimes he is accused of because she thinks he is innocent due to Raven's intentional misleading: "He [Raven] *knew* the murderer, Raven said; he hadn't committed it himself" (*GS* 62). According to what Raven has expressed it seems as though he is innocent, which he led Anne to believe. Anne goes far in her assistance of Raven and finds Cholmondeley: "He [Cholmondeley] waved his hand; the emerald ring on his little finger flashed and caught Anne's eye" (*GS* 55). Raven explains about the double-crossing Cholmondeley with the green piece of jewellery, thus the ring becomes an identity marker similar to that of Raven's hare-lip. The difference between these two markers is the opposition in the social classes that they allude to. The ring with the expensive gem must come from a richer and therefore higher social class. While Raven's improperly sown lip which expresses a poorer and lower social class. Anne investigates Cholmondeley on Raven's

behalf, which shows that Anne feels some loyalty towards Raven. She does not betray him, although he almost murdered her, and she helps him make his revenge.

Anne and Raven's relationship has already started to change them both. Anne is normally a law-abiding citizen and engaged to the detective James 'Jimmy' Mather. She does not turn Raven in and breaks the law when she assists him in his escape. The relationship between Anne and Raven is ironic since her fiancé is the detective that hunts Raven. Raven and Mather's relationship with Anne is not the only thing the oppositional characters have in common. James Mather and James Raven share the same first name, and both of them have people in their life that committed suicide. Raven's mother took her own life in the presence of her son, and Mather brother took his life: "Mather's brother committed suicide. More than Mather he needed to be part of an organization, to be trained and disciplined and given orders, but unlike Mather he hadn't found his organization" (*GS* 88). Interestingly, Mather's brother committed suicide because he could not find a place where he belonged, he did not find a place where he fit in, he is somewhat of an outsider similarly to Raven. Both Mather's brother and Raven are examples of what it might imply to exist as a lonely person outside of society. Mather and Raven's starting points might be similar, but their respective situations are polar opposites since Mather became a law-abiding detective, whilst Raven has become a violent criminal. Raven's situation is to a degree worse than Mather's.

Anne is held prisoner on Cholmondeley's orders, after she confronted him with the stolen notes and revealed her knowledge about Raven and the entire scheme. Both the criminal and the detective act as detectives and make the same observation: an old woman and the co-owner of the house where she was held now had Anne's handbag in her possession. Raven, being outside the law takes immediate action, whilst Mather wants to arrest her. Raven also goes further in his loyalty towards Anne and reacts somewhat like a protector and seems to care about her: "For the first time since his [Raven's] mother died he was afraid for

someone else" (*GS* 94). This is a clear opposition to what Raven's emotional life was prior to his meet with Anne: "He [Raven] had never felt the least tenderness for anyone" (*GS* 67). He starts to feel for Anne, which triggers the development of Raven to much higher degree. James Phelan writes:

> [...] when an author creates a character, she creates a potential for that character to participate in the signification of the work through the development of the character […] that potential may or may not be realized depending upon the way the whole work is shaped. (10)

Raven is characterised as possessing certain qualities in the beginning of the novel, and through his changes he shows potential. How the potential will be realised depends on the type of character that is constructed, in the case of Raven, he is a multidimensional character who shows traits of change especially during his relationship with Anne. I argue that Raven meets his potential perhaps unexpectedly, since he develops from a coldblooded murderer to a characters that reveals compassion and care for another character which also plays in on his intent for revenge.

Hoskins writes that Raven is one of Greene's characters who "create in most readers the contradictory impulses to sympathize and to condemn" (61). Constructing a character, who does criminal acts and at the same time invites sympathy from the reader, complicates the reader's view character, which is typical of Greene. Raven is a character who is initially condemned, because of Raven's reflections on murder and his lack of human compassion. At the same time the reader knows Raven's horrible past with his parents and his background at institutions, and after his interaction with Anne he can function as a more sympathetic character. Because of his development Raven becomes a protagonist that is both condemned and sympathised with. Raven's development is characterised quite explicitly by the narrator: "he [Raven] was cold through and through except in the one spot that had lain frozen in his whole life. That dagger of ice was melting with great pain" (*GS* 67-68). That dagger of ice

was melting because of the thawing that started after his exposure to Anne. She has warmed up a part of him and he has begun to feel again. As Peter Wolfe points out "Anne Crowder separates Raven's brain from his heart. He both fears and craves someone he can trust. Tired of guarding against treachery, he finally gives into his feelings" (57). In Anne, Raven finds someone who he can let down his guard in front of, thus he can also relax and does not think of the consequences. This thawing has two effects: not only does it cut through Raven's thick exterior and lets Anne in, but it also make Raven feel all the betrayal and abandonments that he has experienced prior in his life. These were the reasons why he initially suppressed his emotion. Raven's reactions to these memories are not positive: "He [Raven] dug his nails into his hands, remembering his father who had been hanged and his mother who had killed herself in the basement kitchen, all the long parades of those who had done him down" (*GS* 68). Raven does not have any happy memories to think back on. Thus remembering all these emotions and events is harmful; however, it also means that he becomes more of a human. Raven has grown up and lived in fear, the fear of loss, abandonment, betrayal, and also of being shunned from society because of his lip. He has lived so much in fear that it is his normality. A life with trust in other people and with normal human relationships is what Raven fears. This is where Anne enters to change him, and show that even he has the potential to change. Anne has traits of a very sympathetic character. She does not discriminate against or treat Raven badly. Her kind and smiling traits function as a force to reveal traits of the protagonist that changes him.

Anne explains the why the tense situation in Europe has risen:

> 'Didn't you read about him [the Minister] in the papers? How he cut down army expenses to help clear the slums? […] He wasn't one of the rich. He wouldn't have gone to war. That's why they shot him. You bet there are people making money now out of him being dead. And he'd done it all himself too, the obituaries said. His father was a thief and his mother committed –'
> 'Suicide?' Raven whispered. (*GS* 124-125)

Murder did not mean much to Raven to begin with, but when Anne explains to him that the Minister was a working class man with a background similar to Raven, even though they have ended up in different life situations. Both of their fathers were criminal and their mothers' both committed suicide. They were also both from poor backgrounds, and both had been betrayed by capitalist owners of the armament factory in the guise of Sir Marcus and Cholmondeley. Raven now sees the parallels between the Minister and himself, and his thoughts of the assassination changes. Anne helps Raven in understanding the consequences of his actions, and although he does not take responsibility for the murder, and puts the blame on the rich Cholmondeley and Sir Marcus, and he now does not only wants revenge for himself, but also because of the wrongdoings done to the Minister. At this point it seems that Anne has changed Raven to the extent that had he gone back to do the murder now, it is uncertain whether he would have completed the or not. The protagonist has developed from a cold-blooded murderer to a man with care and emotions for another person. Raven did not have a problem in murdering the Minister when he thought he was a rich upper class man, but had issues with what he has done when he learns of the similarities between himself and the Minister. This shows that Raven actually possesses certain moral values.

Both Raven and Sir Marcus cause death at a level, as stated by Pryce-Jones: "He [Raven] murders because he must live: they murder [the armament production owners] because they have calculated the net financial gain" (63). The difference is that Raven murders for survival, while the industry owner and helper indirectly murder so that they will become even richer. Here there is a strong critique directed at the capitalist production owners. Phelan writes that "The distinction between the mimetic and thematic components of character is a distinction between characters as individuals and characters as representative entities" (13). The difference between Raven and the capitalists is that while Raven is a mimetic functionally character with complex individual traits, the capitalists are characterised

with traits that represent greedy capitalism. They are representatives of the worst kinds of greedy capitalists, which critique capitalism. The original British title of the novel is *A Gun for Sale*, which I use in my thesis. However, in the American edition the title was changed into *This Gun for Hire*. Ivan Melada comments on this translation:

> The ambiguity of the title, for example, is completely lost in the American Screen title, "This Gun for Hire", because of the focus there is wholly upon Raven as a hired killer. The ambiguity of a "Gun for Sale", on the other hand, gives proportionate emphasis upon both Raven and Sir Marcus. (313)

Melada is here referring to the title of the film *This Gun for Hire*, but the title of the film is the same as the American edition of the novel. I agree with what Melada states here, and think this is a very accurate reading of the original title. The original title emphasises both stories in the plot. It includes the sale of guns and ammunition from the industrial owners, and does not only emphasise the story of Raven as an assassin. This ambiguity of the title is lost in the U.S. edition. The original title also implies that there is a connection between the stories. This is the case since Sir Marcus, the factory owner who craves war in order to sell more guns hires Raven to be his gun in order to kill the Minister. The ambiguity I have referred to here can also refer to the ambiguity of who is responsible for the death of the Minister of War. Is it the person who hired the assassin and put everything in motion who is to blame, or the actual assassin who pulls the trigger? This is a complex question that the reader needs to be aware of. However, the American title only incriminates Raven, thus losing the focus on the intentions of his greedy counterparts.

Melada writes that "Graham Greene's Sir Marcus, head of Midland Steel, might be called an 'expository monster', but Greene is not really trying to make a case against the evils of industrialism" (314). These greedy and unsympathetic characters the novel are caricatures of the capitalist industrial owners, and not the workers. They are the worst kind of capitalists, since profits and capital are more important to them than morals and human lives:

> The deaths he [Sir Marcus] had ordered were no more real than the deaths he read about in the newspapers. A little greed (for his milk), a little vice (occasionally to put his hand inside a girl's blouse and feel the warmth of life), a little avarice and calculation (half a million against one death), a very small persistent, almost mechanical, sense of self-preservation: there were his only passions. (*GS* 169)

For Sir Marcus, money is more worth than human lives. He does not care about the people that he indirectly murdered, nor does he care about the people that might get murdered by him passively because he will produce weapons and ammunition for the war. All Sir Marcus cares about is capital in the form of money, the value of his company, and himself. Cholmondeley, similarly to Sir Marcus, cares only for himself and his interests, and does not care about the actions he has put in motion by ordering the murder. The two capitalist owners are characterised in a hierarchal opposition to Raven. Although Raven is similarly cold to the villains, he changes and becomes emotionally attached to Anne. The two villains, however, do not change, and only have the selfish traits they initially have. The novel may also seem to be a warning for an inevitable war, but the main focus is on the greedy industrial owners who will actually benefit from a war. The loss of life and perhaps even land is nothing when they can get a solid profit. This is also the attitude of Sir Marcus, who does not understand the seriousness of the actions he set in motion.

Raven and Anne ends up in a shed in an attempt to escape the police. In the small shed the only characters who are interacting are Raven and Anne. Here Raven lets his guard down and shows that Anne's influence on him during the novel and to this point has changed him. In the shed Raven expresses his appreciation for companionship when he says to Anne: "It sounds good your saying "together" like that" (*GS* 130). He has truly evolved from the initial Raven who intentionally hurt the maid at the hotel to a man appreciating companionship. Raven's actions towards other characters often depend on how they react to his physical deformity. The maid shows disgust towards his lip, thus Raven reacts accordingly. Anne does

not react in a negative manner, and Raven has a complete different reaction. This appreciation of Anne's friendship is expressed when he gives her all the sacks in the shed so that she might sleep more comfortably. At this point he not only has sympathy for Anne, but he also becomes a more selfless. It is the interaction between the two characters in the shed that shows that Raven has indeed changed. Graham Greene himself wrote in *Ways of Escape* that his key scenes often consisted of two characters, and in the case of this novel it was "in an empty house in *A Gun for Sale*. It was as though I wanted to escape from the vast liquidity of the novel and to play out the most important situation on a narrow stage where I could direct every movement of my characters" (29). Thus Greene expresses the need for isolation in order to completely control the characters and therefore the only elements in focus are the two characters and their actions. There are no outside forces that can disturb, neither in the form of the setting nor other characters. This is important for the controlling of the characters' developments. Moreover, the focus is on the constructed situation that the narrator wants the reader to see. The narrator focuses narrowly on the setting and characters and in this way it is easy for the readers to concentrate on the isolated event. The isolation of the events in the storage house, or shed as I have chosen to call it, is vital for the room available for Raven to show his development.

Another result of Raven and Anne's relationship is Raven's increasing mental activity in the form of memory flashes, which he thought he had suppressed: "A small aged voice whispered agonizingly in his memory through a door. Memories had never troubled him" (*GS* 50). Memories "had" never troubled is written in the past tense, thus it expresses that something has altered. Anne functions as a trigger for Raven's previously forgotten memories. This points to Anne as an influential character for the novel's protagonist. Anne is an outside force which pierces Raven. Anne brings forth a more human side of Raven, a side which did not seem to exist. Anne sings a song which sets Raven's memories spinning:

> He couldn't remember where [he had heard it]: he remembered a dark night and a cold wind and hunger and the scratch of a needle. It was as if something sharp and cold were breaking in his heart with great pain. He sat there under the sink with the automatic in his hand and began to cry. He made no sound, the tears seemed to run like flies on their own will from the corners of his eyes. (*GS* 47)

This reaction is quite dramatic, which implies the memory on which Anne has touched must be quite violent for Raven. The description of something "breaking in his heart with great pain," refers to all the heart-breaking events that Raven has had to endure during his life. Anne is at this point starting to get under Raven's skin and even into his heart. By scratching her way through, she changes him. This suppression of bad experiences result in traumatic memory flashes similar to those the character D. experiences in *The Confidential Agent,* as I will discuss further in chapter three. The recurrent use of traumatised characters signifies Greene's preoccupation with states of mental duress, which is a characterisation which also implies complexity.

Raven mentions that the shed with the sacks he has positioned to be like a bed for Anne is "like home". As I discussed earlier, Raven's characterisation of his "home" is more similar to the description of a prison. Thus the shed could as well be recognised as a home. Anne questions this since to her it does not resemble what a normal person would consider a "home". This gets Raven to think of his mother's death:

> […] his mother bleeding across the table. She hadn't even troubled to lock the door: that was all she cared about him. He'd done some ugly things in his time, he told himself, but he'd never been able to equal that ugliness. (*GS* 103)

This is why Raven does not care about other people. He was not shown compassion or a mother's care, so he never learned what it might feel like. The excerpt also expresses that Raven had never equalled that ugliness. To neglect and harm one's own child is crueler in Raven's eyes than all of his cruel actions. This psychological development of a protagonist is more than expected in a thriller. Now that he is to a higher degree treated as a human, he is

more prone to act and think as a human. Anne has stirred Raven's humanity, and also subsequently his subconsciousness, which is presented in different memory flashes and dream sequences. This is something that Raven is not used to, similar to have normal humanly emotions or reflections. The narrator employs dreams and memories to hint at repressed traumas in Raven's mind:

> Quite suddenly he fell asleep and the old Minister was coming towards him and saying: 'Shoot me. Shoot me in the eyes,' and Raven was a child with a catapult in his hands. He wept and wouldn't shoot and the old Minister said: 'Shoot, dear child. We'll go home together. Shoot.' (*GS* 126)

Here Raven's guilt for murdering the minister is expressed. He regretted his actions when he learned what kind of man the Minister truly was. Something to which he later confessed when he said: "I wouldn't have done it […] if I'd known the old man was like he was" (*GS* 169). The image of Raven as a child carrying a child's "weapon", namely a slingshot, may be a symbol of Raven's insecurity and lack of social interactions so that he does not quite function as an adult human being. Raven being a child in this meeting with the Minister can also underline a form of hierarchal relationship Raven had to the Minister. At the same time the Minister could realise a father figure for Raven, and may see this as an opportunity to be reunited with his father. Raven feels a stronger connection to his father, than his mother who mentally scarred him. The Minister also says after Raven has shot him that they can go back "home" together, which foreshadows that Raven will soon die. It may also refer to how similar backgrounds they have. Raven now sees the Minister as someone he can identify with since they come from the same social class, and the similar tragedies they have experienced. Compassion and understanding stand in opposition to the initial impression of Raven, where he does not feel sympathy, responsibility or anything towards his victims or his fellow people. Kenneth Allott and Miriam Farris write that: "*A Gun for Sale* is an 'entertainment' and therefore may be expected to be eminently readable, but it also has shape, pattern and, in the

figure of Raven, something of the novel's dimension of depth" (139). As stated here, Raven indeed contributes to the novel's depth due to his development and change in characteristic traits. Anne is the triggering factor for the change in traits. The narrator allows the reader to see this change in the change of characterisation. This shift in description of Raven reveals his changes. Raven has become comfortable in his relationship with Anne, and eventually reveals to her the entire truth, that he was the perpetrator that took the Minister's life.

The protagonist is first constructed as an evil, unsympathetic character who I presented in the first part of my chapter. Through the narrator's characterisations of Raven his development and changes are expressed, which seems to enhance his complexity. "He [Raven] emerged from the dark doorway, mean vicious face, hare-lip, a crude check suit, ominous and aggressive in his submission … 'Keep Moving,' the small man [Raven] said" (*GS* 151). From the initial impression with a scary assassin to a "small man" is a shift in characterisation. Raven becomes humanised and thus less intimidating: "He [Raven] looked undernourished. He wouldn't have impressed anyone as dangerous now […] He looked humiliated, and he had never accepted humiliation before without rage" (*GS* 136). Raven has been stripped of his dangerous look and is no longer mysterious or frightening to Anne. He is undressed both physically and metaphorically. James Phelan writes:

> Mimetic dimensions […] are a character's attributes considered as traits … Mimetic functions result from the way these traits are used together in creating the illusion of a plausible person and, for works depicting actions, in making particular traits relevant to later actions, including of course the development of new traits. (11)

I have already mentioned that Raven's traits earlier in the novel further one particular character function, that of an evil, murdering criminal. However, as the novel progresses other traits of Raven comes into focus, and the emphasis moves from his horrible traits to his more human characteristics. This change invokes sympathy from the reader. The described new characteristic traits, such as sympathy and caring for someone else, are vital to illustrate the

protagonist's development. His motives for revenge are not only to kill those who betrayed him, but also to avenge the Minister and prevent the war in order to please Anne. The protagonist develops in a manner that is unforeseen, and rattles the readers' assumption when he softens up and changes from his cold outset. Brian Lindsay Thomson writes:

> Novels like *Stamboul Train* and *A Gun for Sale* played fast and loose with generic conventions in order to work out problems that intellectuals did not normally associate with the genres to which they assigned them. Greene's thrillers … made an alarmingly democratic appeal to their readers. They neither produced passive observers of stable genres presented in photographic images, but rather active participants willing to take a hand in dismantling stereotypes and myths. (74)

Thomson finds that Greene uses characters to dismantle stereotypes and myths. I would like to extend his point by arguing that the character of Raven can be seen to dismantle a certain evil type of character. This, I argue, makes the protagonist more complex, and thus the novel becomes more complex too. What Thomson states here is also very relevant for the observations I make in my second chapter, where I discuss how Greene's characters in *Stamboul Train* break with the stereotypes they are presented as.

Raven trusts Anne in the latter part of the novel, and accepts being human before her, something which is a change from his interaction with Alice earlier in the novel. Raven does not want to part with Anne: "He [Raven] tried hopelessly to express the deep pain it gave him to see her go; it felt too much like the end of everything" (*GS* 136). In a way Anne is similar to the beloved cat that Raven left behind. Except for Anne, the cat, is the only other creature he expresses care for: "It's a cat I left back in my lodgings in London when they chased me out. You'd have looked after it" (*GS* 121). Just as Raven wants this creature to live he wants Anne to take care of herself when he is gone. This aspect is further strengthened by Anne being compared with a cat by Mather and the detective discusses who could have broken into the house in question: "'Could a girl do that?' 'A cat could do that. A determined cat'" (*GS* 80). Raven at this point has made a strong connection with Anne, which she does not share

after she learned the truth of the murder. At this point all Anne cares about is to avert the war. Anne cannot accept the morbid actions Raven executed: "She felt a desperate hatred. 'You'll just shoot like that in cold blood?'" (*GS* 133), eventually she ends up betraying him. She helps Raven long enough so that his actions will save Europe. DeVitis writes about Anne: "Willing to befriend him as one of the oppressed, a champion of the poor, she rejects him when she sees him as a betrayer of his class" (57). She wanted to help him as long as she thought he was being framed by the rich industry owners. He betrays his own class, which she cannot accept. Additionally, Raven did not assume complete responsibility for the murder of the Minister, and let Anne believe that he had not murdered them himself.

Knowing what she does, Anne tries to save Europe. When she is apprehended by the police she tries to explain the real reason why the foreign minister of war was killed. Her intent behind this is to blame the true villains in the story, Sir Marcus and Cholmondeley. She wants to act morally and expose the truth in order to save Europe from the "ultimatum" and the certain war.

> What a fool, she thought, I have been, thinking I could save us from war. Three men are dead, that's all. Now that she was herself responsible for so many death, she could no longer feel the same repulsion towards Raven. (GS 186)

Anne has in the latter part of the story broken the law herself by letting Raven go, and she even covers for him so he can reach the chief of the munitions makers and kill him. She does this knowing that men might lose their lives. Anne is not innocent after her encounter with Raven and takes on a vigilant role. She acts by what she thinks is correct and not lawful, which indirectly caused the deaths of other people. She is no longer as different from Raven as she was initially. She also exerts a positive influence on Raven, since he becomes more similar to her in that he starts to feel and act sympathetically. However, their relationship which started to blossom when Raven saved her ended in the shed.

Although some readers might view the novel's ending as a happy ending in concert with the typical pattern of Greene's "entertainments", I question whether the ending of *A Gun for Sale* is truly a happy one. Anne's attitudes at the end of the novel do not express joy: "she [Anne] had lost the only man she cared a damn about" (*GS* 186). It seems that Anne regrets the decision to betray Raven, she clearly cares more for Raven than she wants to admit. She failed because she had let people, including Raven, die. The protagonist of the novel has not only developed himself, but made an impact on Anne in a unique manner, thus suggesting that he is more complex than a one-dimensional character.

At the climax of the novel Raven confronts Sir Marcus, and has finally the opportunity to take his revenge. Raven exclaims:

> 'I've got you where I want you. Even if the police kill me,' he tapped the gun, 'here's the evidence. This is the gun I used. They can pin the murder to this gun. You told me to leave it behind, but here it is. It would put you away for a long, long time even if I didn't shoot you.' (*GS* 170)

It can almost seem as though Raven, after being influenced by Anne, now cares about the war and to stop it, or at least wants to stop it, in addition to fulfilling his personal revenge. He would have gotten revenge in either murdering him or getting him convicted and sent to jail. When they hear the police from outside the door, Cholmondeley points out that Anne has betrayed him: "She [Anne] wasn't a friend of yours. Why are the police here if she didn't… who else could have known?" (*GS* 172). Raven does not want to believe him. He has finally learnt to trust in another person, who then, it turns out, betrays him eventually: "he [Raven] had tried confession, and it had failed him for the usual reason. There was no one outside your brain whom you could trust: not a doctor, not a priest, not a woman" (*GS* 172). Anne did not betray him when he did not trust her, but now that he trusts her she betrays him. This does not mean that Raven has not developed as a character, however. At the end Raven is hurt by

Anne's actions, which I believe the initial Raven would not have been, he would have expected this outcome. His feeling of betrayal must imply that he genuinely did not think she would act as she did: thus he has indeed changed. Raven is at the end of his life betrayed again. The violent manner in which he murdered Cholmondeley is fitting to the state Raven was in after realising Anne's betrayal. It is almost as if Raven holds Cholmondeley responsible for the betrayals and disappointments that he experienced. Raven is subsequently shot by the police who enter Sir Marcus' office: "Death came to him [Raven] in the form of unbearable pain. It was as if he had to deliver his pain as a woman delivers a child, and he sobbed and moaned in the effort. At last it came out of him and he followed his only child into a vast desolation" (*GS* 174). In the moment Raven dies his life has come full circled to the moment he was born. There is pain coming into life, and there is pain leaving life in such a violent manner. Raven dreamed as himself as a boy earlier on, and now in death he feels the pain of a woman delivering a child. These images may indicate a new Raven has been born, or at least the potential for a newborn innocence in Raven had been born. It is stated that he followed his "only child", which is very interesting. Perhaps does the child refer to himself as a child, or simply pain or death. The latter examples add to the darker sides of Raven. His name is an omen for death, and he also causes death, thus it is not inconceivable that his child is death.

Allott and Farris state about this scene: "Raven's death is the proper ending of the book" (139). Following Raven's death, the novel focuses turn on the "happy" couple. However, there is a shadow of doubt – a reminder of Raven's unhappy, almost tragic, fate of Raven in the form of Anne thinking about Raven. The subplot, which is the threat of the oncoming war, is later on concluded but it is not as vital for the reading of the novel as Raven's death. The critic Peter Wolfe contradicts what Allott and Farris have noted:

> Critics have either neglected or misunderstood the importance of part 8 within the pattern of *This Gun for Sale* [*A Gun for Sale*]. Allott and Farris voice a typical view when they call Raven's death at the end of part 7 'the true ending of the story. Raven's death,' they add, 'completes the meaning of the book.' This attitude is curious, for it reflects an ignorance of Greene's fictional practice. Greene never ends his books with the death of a main character […] (69-70)

Wolfe points out that several of Greene's novels continue after the death of their main protagonist. More relevant to my argument, however, is to note how closely the plot and the story relate to the character's development, and especially that of Raven. In my reading of *A Gun for Sale* Raven is the most important force which not only drives the plot, but around whom the plot revolves. The events that follow Raven's death are the tying together of loose ends. Since the novel ends with the protagonist being betrayed and killed, and Anne's thoughts on Raven are shadowing her fate, I read it as an unhappy ending. Combined with the main character's development, this contradicts Kunkel's characterisation of the narrative as a mere "entertainments".

In this chapter I have argued that due to its unexpectedly complex protagonist, *A Gun for Sale* becomes a more complex and multi-faceted narrative than the generic label "entertainment" may lead the reader to expect. As we have seen, Greene combines a relatively simple way of writing with the narrative presentation of an increasingly complex protagonist. I have shown this through a close reading of Raven, focusing on his thoughts, actions and attitudes. His development has been discussed by illuminating the initial traits he is characterised with, and then showing how his characteristic traits change in the latter part of the novel. The second part of the chapter has shown that the protagonist starts to change after his initial contact with the female character, Anne. I have highlighted situations that I see as direct correlations between Anne's triggering function and Raven's reactions, and these interactions show the change in Raven's character traits. The characterisation that the narrator, who serves as Greene's narrative instrument, makes of Raven reveals his

development. As this development is significant, surprising, and in a way tragic – both in itself and even more when linked to that of Anne – I conclude that, according to the generic criteria employed in this thesis, *A Gun for Sale* is a novel rather than an "entertainment".

Chapter 2 – Construction and Deconstruction of Stereotypical Characters in *Stamboul Train*, with Focus on 'The Figure of Jew' and 'The Revolutionary Socialist'

Stamboul Train is set in Europe on a train moving from Ostend in Belgium, towards Constantinople, now Istanbul, in Turkey. While in the first part of the novel the narration is set mainly on the train and train stops, as the novel progresses the setting varies to a degree. At the novel's climax, the train has broken down at a train stop, thus the movement of the train disappears in order to turn the focus on the dramatic events happening to the characters. As Bergonzi writes: "*Stamboul Train* contains various basic elements of popular fiction: exotic setting, love interest, comedy, excitement, and crime […] Yet all these elements of plot are subordinated to the fact of the journey itself: the movement of the train and the unfolding of the narrative go together" (27). The journey of the train unravels simultaneously with the development of the novel, thus when the train stops the narrative reaches its climax.

In this chapter I will discuss the two main characters, Carleton Myatt and Richard Czinner. My chapter will show how the two characters are initially characterised in a manner which alludes to certain stereotypes. Thereafter I will discuss how the characters in relation to other characters and their situations fulfil and break with the given stereotypes. Subsequently I will show how these stereotypes also can be connected to a representation of a contemporary social commentary. *Stamboul Train* is complex and innovative in a different way from *A Gun for Sale*. Instead of having one complex and unpredictable main character like Raven, *Stamboul Train* plays with the realisation and break with the "figure of the Jew" through Myatt, and the left-wing revolutionary through Czinner. I will address class and ethnicity as a part of this. In my discussion on the Jewish stereotype I will in addition to Myatt supplement the discussion with other Jewish characters. I will through this explore the complexity of the novel.

The Figure of the Jew

Carleton Myatt is a wealthy Jewish businessman, who is good at negotiating profitable deals. The characterisation of Myatt builds on the stereotypical view of the Jew. George L. Mosse writes in *The Image of Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinity* what characterised the accepted notions of the "Jewish man" in the mid-war period. He writes that the Jewish stereotype was a countertype to the ideal male beauty: "Nevertheless, the Jewish nose, which had a longer European tradition behind it, came to symbolize an untrustworthy, immoral and suspicious character […] the flat feet, the waddling gait (opposed to the manly stride), the neckless body, the big ears, and the swarthly color" (64). The most important stereotypical Jewish characteristic is the nose. Both in the characterisation of Myatt, and with another Jewish character, Stein, the "Jewish nose" as a characteristic is prominent. The characteristic is present both as a part of how the narrator characterises Myatt, and how Stein gets rid of his Jewish identity.

None of the non-Jewish characters in the novel are treated in the same manner as Myatt, neither by the narrator nor other characters. The actions and attitudes expressed towards Myatt illustrate how a Jew would be discriminated against in Europe during the 1930s. Roger Sharrock writes: "His [Myatt's] Jewishness is stressed, partly because his fellow characters are consciously aware of his racial distinctiveness" (57). It is clear that his fellow characters are very aware of his race[4]. The characters, there amongst Janet Pardoe, react and act in a discriminating manner: "she [Janet] was squinting sideways at a Jew who shared a table with a girl [Coral]" (Greene, *Stamboul Train*[5] 42). The other characters assess Myatt. In this example the perspective is expressed clearly through body language which obviously shows a form of disgust. Though it is not expressed explicitly towards Myatt, it is evident for

[4] I use the term race as the character Myatt uses it in *Stamboul Train*.
[5] From here on, I will refer to quotes from *Stamboul Train* as *ST* followed by page number.

the reader since the narrator describes it. This attitude is also extended onto his travel companion, Coral Musker, the chorus girl, who accompanies Myatt: "A dirty little Jew, that's all you're good for […] Jews and foreigners. You ought to be ashamed" (*ST* 97). Coral chooses to associate with a Jew, and thus she also becomes a target of scrutiny. I find the use of "dirty" to describe Myatt as a person very misleading, since he is probably anything but dirty, being a rich businessman. However, as a Jew, this characterisation is common, because of the notion on of the "dirty Jew". The notion of the "dirty Jew", as characterised by Mosse:

> The phrase 'dirty Jew' came to sum up the Jewish stereotype, meaning ugliness, filth and disease. Indeed, Jews were sometimes accused of spreading the most dreaded disease of the century, syphilis, and the Jewish nose itself was at times attributed to the ravages of that disease, as was the Jews supposed swarthiness. (65)

Through this understanding Myatt is "dirty" simply because of his Jewishness. The Jew is according to the stereotype disease-infested and infectious, thus those who socialise with the Jew can also be under scrutiny, since they will have been "infected".

Mabel Warren, the journalist, shows her anti-Semitism against Myatt in conversation with her travel companion, Janet: "Mabel Warren said viciously, not troubling to lower her voice at all, 'I don't like Jews,' and Janet Pardoe, turning her large luminous eyes back to Mabel Warren's, agreed: 'Nor do I, darling'" (*ST* 43). Mabel intentionally does not lower her voice in order to be heard, since she is not worried of showing her demonstrative disgust. Warren does not experience any form of reprimand or negative reaction from bystanders for her expressed opinions. Expressing negative views towards Jews were not frowned upon. I read the presentation of these personal attacks on the Jewish character as not anti-Semitic in themselves, but they are presented in such a manner to invoke sympathy for Myatt. As a reader one is presented with a main character under continuous personal attacks. He is openly discriminated against, although he is a higher class rich man. He is not cruel, and yet receives these vicious remarks. He is somewhat unsympathetic, but this can be explained by this

regular explicit criticism. Shelden has another understanding of this, and believes that readers should not have sympathy for him: "He [Myatt] is coarse and selfish, and the 'help' he gives to the chorus girl Coral Musker is nothing but a convenient way of seducing her. As soon as she is out of the way, she disappears from his mind as quickly as she entered it" (140). I read these elements a bit differently. Myatt tries to take responsibility for Coral, and he tried to find her at the train stop when she went missing. As pointed out by Grahame Smith who describes Myatt's attempt of finding Coral as a "hair-raising drive to rescue Coral" (24). I do not think that Myatt exhausted his options, but he did not discard Coral completely as implied by Shelden. I do not think Myatt would have broken his promises to Coral in taking care of her in Constantinople if she had stayed with him. He also hopes to see Coral at the end of the novel, when he was at the dancing performance by the English dancing company: "he [Myatt] suddenly leant forward" (*ST* 195). Myatt's body language is characterised like this because he hoped to see Coral. This shows more consideration towards her, and makes him a more sympathetic character.

I wish to problematise the fact that Myatt is treated horribly, while the two lesbian women who are very familiar towards each other, do not receive negative attention. Warren herself is probably the one who is most cruel towards Myatt, even though she is also in a social minority because of her sexual orientation. There is no attempt to hide their relationship, neither from the other characters nor from the reader: "She [Mabel] loved Janet Pardoe, she would always love Janet Pardoe" (*ST* 42). The relationship is characterised in a quite nonchalant manner, and they describe their own relationship as being companions, in addition to calling each other "darling". This lesbian relationship was not socially accepted similar to that of the Jews. Jews were so far down the social hierarchy that they were below homosexuals. Mosse discusses both the Jews and homosexuals as outsiders: "Conspiracy theorists haunted outsiders. Whether directed by homosexuals or the world Jewish conspiracy,

their methods and end were, by and large, the same […] Jew were at times accused of being homosexual" (68). The two social minorities were both seen as social deviants, and according to Mosse treated badly in a similar degree. However in *Stamboul Train* Myatt is inferior even to Mabel Warren. Onlookers react to Mabel's vulgarity and alcohol-use, but not on her lesbianism. The Jewish Myatt is worse off. The reader is invited to reflect on the fact that the homosexual couple here is two women, and not two men. It could be plausible that the couple would have been treated differently and more explicitly if they were men.

It is clear that Myatt is a man of means, which is also an aspect that might bring people to view him negatively due to class differences:

> A mirror hang above the desk, and in it Myatt saw the reflection of himself quite clearly for a moment, short and stout and nasal in his heavy fur coat, and it occurred to him that perhaps these people hated him not only because he was a Jew, but because he carried the traces of money into their resigned surroundings. (*ST* 156)

This is Myatt's own wishful thinking: people are not discriminating him because of his Jewish heritage, but because of his wealth. At the same time the Jews were often stereotyped to be rich, thus the wealth can not be isolated from the Jewish stereotype. In Myatt's mind he would rather be discriminated against because of his wealth than his Jewish characteristics. Although Myatt have the means to live a better life, the life of a Jew will still meet explicit negative attitudes from others. He cannot buy himself out of being a Jew. Myatt is a part of society in that he knows the norms, he has economic means and knows how to act, but at the same time he is an outsider of society for the simple reason that he is a Jew. He should be an insider, but is in fact an outsider. "Nasal" is here used to characterise Myatt, which brings focus to his nose and his stereotypical Jewish feature. The narrator is similarly to the characters in the novel aware of Myatt's Jewish characteristics.

Myatt's worst vice, which is also connected to his Jewish background, is his focus on money. This becomes awkwardly apparent at dinner with Coral: "Myatt said, 'It [the wine] costs fifty pounds.' He was back in familiar territory, he was at home, no longer puzzled by the inconsistency of human behaviour" (*ST* 87). It is important to him that the wine is expensive, and to let Coral know. He is more comfortable with money, numbers and prices, than with human contact. This is a further play with the stereotype of the Jew, where he is not used to people acting nicely towards him. This close focus on money makes Coral feel uncomfortable: "'Do you always say what a thing is worth? Do you know what I'm worth?' Her perplexity and fear broke into irritation. 'Of course you do. Ten pounds for a ticket'" (*ST* 88). Everything has a capital that can be bought it seems, even people. Coral expresses that she has a finite value in the eyes of Myatt. The focus on human value is absurd in this setting, but it is also a very important thematic aspect. Myatt makes an estimation of value, which Coral draws further to put a rather cheap value on her own person. However, being a Jew places Myatt further down in the social hierarchy, and thus also in human value. Therefore this measuring of corporal capital is ironic. The measurement of value is presented quite absurdly here, in order to underline the absurdity of putting capital worth on people at all. This view on human value becomes even clearer from Myatt after he has left Coral behind: "But the unlikelihood woke desire and bitterness, for this girl [Janet] was silver polished goods, while Coral was at best a piece of pretty coloured glass, valued for sentimental reasons; the other had intrinsic worth" (*ST* 144), where Myatt compares Coral and Janet to inanimate objects. Myatt does not want to devalue himself, but he does it to the characters that might bring value into his life. Janet has a higher value in Myatt's eyes than Coral. However, it is emphasised that Coral has sentimental value to Myatt, thus giving an emotional aspect of Myatt. Coral would not have been given sentimental value is Myatt did not have certain feelings for her.

Shelden comments on the fact that it can be challenging to identify one clear protagonist or main character in *Stamboul Train*. He writes that it is easy to assume that the main character is Myatt because his point of view, or perspective, is dominant at the beginning of the novel, but then the perspective changes, and he argues that Richard Czinner is the main character (140). I agree with this reading to a degree, but I will question whether one protagonist can be identified in this novel. The tension and the dramatic apex are largely connected with the character Czinner, and Myatt is more anonymous regarding the dramatic events. However, while Czinner dies before the end, Myatt is present through the entire novel. I read both Myatt and Czinner as main characters of this novel. They are both in focus to a larger extent than any of the other characters. Both characters are vital for the development of the novel's plot. Czinner's fate is similar to the fate of the protagonist Raven in *A Gun for Sale*, since they are both prominent characters and murdered before the end. The two central characters fulfil different agencies in the novel. While Myatt presents the situation of the Jewish character and thus invites a discussion on race as a social issue. Czinner's character touches the subjects of politics and social class. I will discuss Czinner's character and ideology further in the second part of this chapter, which is centred around him.

The negative attention Myatt receives gradually sinks in, and he is not indifferent to it. At one point these comments makes him reflect:

> It was Myatt who was flurried, sunk in his fur coat, remembering the woman's cry of 'Dirty Jew,' the sentry's eyes, the clerk's insolence. It was in some such barren quarter of the world, among frozen fields and thin cattle, that one might expect to find old hatreds the world was outgrowing still alive. (*ST* 170)

I will argue that Myatt's reflection on his experiences invites sympathy from the reader. He is presented as a victim, who finds himself in a cold hostile environment. It states that the world is still outgrowing these hatreds, they are still alive. The emphasis on "old hatreds" underlines

the fact that these attitudes have existed for a long time, and are embedded in society's norms. At the same time, the phrase can signal that hatred is so "old" that Myatt has experienced these prejudicial actions all his life. The exposure of discrimination over time makes it sink into Myatt's consciousness. There is another dimension to this quote. According to Bergonzi Myatt's reflection is "in an almost prophetic fashion" (26). This disturbing image became a part of reality during the Second World War. The screaming of phrases like "dirty Jew" would be daily experiences. Being a captive in the Nazi death camps became a reality for many Jewish people, and it would have been especially horrible in the winters, since it would be so cold and thus an even more horrible place for the prisoners. The "thin cattle" might be seen as a reference to how thin and malnourished the Jewish prisoners would become during the unspeakable events of the Holocaust. Also "cattle" can be read as referring to the treatment of the Jews as cows since they were transported to the camps in cow train carriages. It is fascinating how an extract can be so ominously foreshadowing.

At the beginning of the novel Myatt's attitudes towards his own Jewish background is problematised as even he shows certain ways of thinking towards Jews:

> He [Myatt] wished that his dealings were with Englishmen or Turks, but Eckmann, and somewhere in the background the enigmatic Stein, were men of his own race, practised in reading a meaning into a tone of voice, the grip of fingers round a cigar. (*ST* 10)

Myatt hesitates with doing business with those of his own people. This is not necessarily negative attitudes towards Jews. Myatt is reluctant in doing business with them since he expects the Jews to be as skilful as himself in business. This mentality indicates that Myatt himself acts based on the stereotypical features that people seem to follow. The treatment that Myatt has experienced as a Jew, has infiltrated his way of thinking. Myatt acting on these feelings puts him in the same group with people who act on stereotypes. The victims of

stereotypicalisation submit to the stereotypes rather than oppose them. Myatt makes another reference to the Jewish stereotype by characterising a non-Jew: "Moult was not a Jew; he had no subtlety, no science of evasion; if he wished to lie, he would lie, but the lie would be confined to words. He had no knowledge how the untrained hand gives the lie to the mouth" (*ST* 12). It is stated here through the perspective of Myatt that non-Jewish businessmen are not as competent as Jewish ones. This can be read as a sincere perspective on how he perceives himself. The Jewish stereotypes have penetrated so far into Myatt's mind that he identifies with and actively acts after them. As a result Myatt has an intricate relationship with his own ethnic identity: "I [Myatt] could not talk to her [the strange woman] easily as I can to Coral; I should be conscious of my hands, of my race; and with a wave of gratitude he turned to Coral" (*ST* 88). He tells himself to be aware of his own race, meaning that the hostile attitudes expressed by his fellow people have not only reached into their mentality, but also into his own mind as a Jew. This is another example of the outer pressure that becomes Myatt's own internal attitudes. He thinks that his race is something that he needs to be aware of. He is grateful to Coral, since she is the one character who treats him with respect and sees past his Jewish side. Coral's sympathy and caring for Myatt and disprove to some extent the anti-Semitic attitudes Shelden argues is present.

Myatt meets a fellow Jewish business-man, Leo Stein, at the end of the novel who takes the step of minding his own race even further:

> Very English, but his [Stein's] nose betrayed him, the nose which had been straightened by an operation and bore the scar. The hostility between the open Jew and the disguised Jew showed itself at once in the conjuror's smiles, the hearty handclasp, the avoidance of the eyes: 'I had expected our agent,' Myatt said. (*ST* 182)

Stein has gone so far as to alter his face with surgery in order to hide his Jewish characteristic. The external forces of discrimination have manifested internally within Stein's mentality.

Stein took it further than Myatt has considered doing, since he has altered his appearance in order to escape the stereotypicalisation and discrimination. However, Myatt thinks that Stein's solution to the problem is cowardly. Myatt also comments on Eckmann: "I [Myatt] never trust a Jew [Eckmann] who has turned Christian" (*ST* 182). There are thus two Jewish characters in the novel that are mentioned in addition to Myatt: Stein who has undergone plastic surgery to alter his Jewish appearance, and Eckmann who has left his religion altogether. Stein and Eckmann have gone through drastic measures in order to assimilate into society, and lose their Jewish identity, since they probably have seen it as a hindering factor. This Myatt has clear strong opinions against, thus complicating the situation of the Jewish character in giving three sides of situations of Jewish men. They all have experienced discrimination and cruelty, and have coped in different manners.

Bergonzi writes that this presentation of Myatt as a Jew has caused literary critic and biographer Shelden to condemn Greene for being anti-Semitic (26). Shelden writes in his biography of Greene, that he presented Jewish characters in a negative manner (124-126). Of *Stamboul Train* he writes: "There is also the rich Jew in Stamboul Train, whose thick fur coat, Savile Row suit, and first-class compartment help to insulate him from the pains suffered by ordinary people" (126). Myatt might be more comfortable than people in third class on the train, but at the same time they are not under the constant scrutiny that Myatt is. Although Shelden has a point in that he is somewhat privileged, Myatt is in no manner shielded by the verbal assaults on his Jewish person. As I have previous shown, the battery of the "dirty Jew" does hit Myatt. I agree that since the narrator characterises Myatt as "the Jew" in addition to other characters in the novel, makes the reader aware of Myatt's Jewish identity. However, this also reflects the internalisation of stereotypical attitude, which has happened to Myatt. Bergonzi writes further: "There is no doubt that Greene was mildly anti-Semitic, if in an unthinking way, since it was the default position of large areas of English cultural and

intellectual life before the advent of Hitler and the Second World War. After that, like many people, Greene changed" (26). I agree with Bergonzi in that the presentation of Myatt may to some degree be constructed by the stereotypical aspect of the "Jewish figure", but it is not as anti-Semitic as Shelden implies. Shelden writes that if one is to have sympathy towards Myatt, "but to do so you must ignore a great deal of what the narrative reveals about him" (140). I do not think this is the case. If sides of Myatt seem apathetic, they may have originated as a form of retort for his character's constant badgering. Through the relationship between Myatt and Coral we see that not all people hold anti-Semitic attitudes, and in my reading Myatt is not as cold towards Coral as Shelden thinks. John Atkins writes that "A girl was expected to repay, that was the point of all advice; one never got anything for nothing" (32). Both Shelden and Atkins have quite cynical views on the relationship between Myatt and Coral. I argue that the characterisation of Myatt after their intercourse opposes this, since when Myatt realises that she had made him her first lover it touches him: "There was such warmth in the carriage now between them that, without closing the window, he knelt beside her the berth and put his hand on her face, touching her features with curious fingers. Again he was overwhelmed with the novel thought, 'How sweet, how dear'" (*ST* 110). Chorus girls had a less than respectable reputation, thus Myatt did not expect this. This explanation may have been the reason for his poor behaviour at first, but he then changes and become more caring. This caring or tenderness goes beyond the expectations connected to Myatt's character, and it breaks with the stereotype of the Jew. The breaking with the Jewish stereotype differs from a simple anti-Semitic presentation.

By differentiating between different kinds of Jewish characters the narrative implies that stereotypes are not to be taken literally, and that in reality people are more nuanced. Myatt is not the blueprint of a Jewish man. This issue also comes into focus through Coral's observation of Myatt when talking to Czinner: "He's quite different from other Jews. They're

generally kind, but he–well, he's quiet" (*ST* 130). Although Coral refers to a general view of Jews she also sees Myatt different from this, thus confirming that stereotypes do not always fit with individual characters.

Myatt becomes interested in the new girl, namely Janet Pardoe. He is unsure on how to act around her since he is not too familiar with interaction with people, until he learns: "The knowledge that her [Janet's] mother had been a Jewess made him feel suddenly at home with her" (*ST* 184). This new fact stands in opposition to the anti-Semitic attitudes Pardoe expressed with Mabel Warren, as I mentioned earlier. Janet being exposed as half Jewish makes her attitudes earlier in the novel ironic. She clearly follows the general opinion, which according to Bergonzi, also Greene did. Wolfe writes: "Lacking conviction, she [Janet] always takes the easiest road" (40). I agree with this observation, since Janet passively accepts her surroundings without question, even at the end when Janet has been arranged to marry Myatt by her uncle and Myatt's business associate, Stein. Myatt's mind is not one of love or marriage in a romantic way: "She [Janet] nodded and their hands moved together. He [Myatt] wondered whether Mr Stein had the contract in his pocket" (*ST* 197). The engagement with Janet is almost a business transaction and not emotional, which alludes to the Jew as a business man. The reader is presented to the fact that Myatt is holding hands with his fiancé, but still keeps in mind the business contract. This stands in opposition to Myatt describing Coral to have sentimental value. Myatt thus has somewhat conflicting sides characterised in the novel, which both fit and challenge the stereotype of the Jewish figure.

The Revolutionary Socialist

Richard Czinner, or John Richard as he is initially introduced, is a doctor. While Myatt is largely characterised in accordance with a Jewish stereotype, Czinner is largely identified with his political ideology, as he declares: "I am a Socialist" (*ST* 100). He expresses that he

largely identifies himself with this political ideology. I understand ideology as "[…] a system of ideas that aspires both to explain the world and to change it" ("ideology"). These ideas are not only what Czinner identifies with, but what he expresses that he aspires to live after. However, he does not actively live up to it. It is interesting that Czinner is from a working class family, but is educated to be a doctor. Though he chooses to follow the Socialist ideas, he is more privileged than the working class. Czinner wants to fit within the frames of the stereotype of the Socialist revolutionary, but he does not achieve it.

I consider Czinner one of the main characters in *Stamboul Train*, because the dramatic events in the novel follow his character development to a large extent. The plot develops in accordance with the events surrounding Czinner, and it is after Czinner's identity has been exposed that the dramatic climax occurs in Subotica. The novel reaches its high point when Czinner is shot and later dies due to the exposure by the journalist Mabel Warren. Dr Richard Czinner has assumed an English identity with an English passport in order to escape from persecution in his home country, Yugoslavia. Warren, the journalist, who covered the Kamnetz trial where the doctor testified five years earlier, was on the same train and recognised him. She confronts him, but he does not allow her to expose him. In her confrontation, she also presents the real Czinner:

> Of course you've heard of Czinner. They had tried to shoot him for a week before while he sat in a café. He was the head of the Social Democrats. He played into their hands by giving evidence against Kamnetz; they had a warrant out for his arrest for perjury twelve hours before the trial ended. They simply sat and waited for the acquittal. (*ST* 34)

In this presentation there is also an expression of judicial corruption in his home country, in that justice does not rule, but the people in power hold their own truth as the judicial reality. The fact that people with the right connections can be exonerated illustrates how corrupt the government is that the revolutionaries like Czinner want to overthrow.

Mabel Warren represents the tabloid journalist who is controlled by what the readers wants to read and what story sells the best. This alludes to capitalism, where the reader's demand for certain news contents defines the market. Informing the public of the situation in Europe is not as important as discovering something exciting that would sell the more. This becomes very clear after Czinner has been found dead, when Warren reacts: "Exclusive [...] I want it exclusive. It's my story" (*ST* 176). She does not care that her man hunt cost a man his life, as long as she has her story. This is a critique of tabloid journalism, the marked controlled culture, and the capitalism that Czinner opposes. Warren reads to Czinner in German about the communist outbreak in Belgrade, which was probably an attempt to make Czinner reveal his identity. Czinner reacts: "'They were three days to early.' Miss Warren snapped at him, 'What more could you have done?' 'The people would have followed me'" (*ST* 59). Here Czinner let his true identity shine through, but he quickly covers himself when Warren is ready to report him. After Warren had gone Czinner thought: "The muddling fools, he thought, and tried to feel hate for the men who had destroyed his hopes" (*ST* 60). He wanted to transfer his ideology into action and come into a leading position amongst the Socialists. It may seem as though Czinner does not feel quite as equal to the other revolutionaries. The focus on "they" destroying "his" hopes, underlines Czinner's wishes and needs, but not that of the country or the people. Mabel comments on Czinner, and why he is heading home: "He's trusting the people perhaps. He was always popular in the slums. But he's a fool if he thinks they'll remember him. Five years. No one's ever remembered for so long" (*ST* 41). Czinner is similar to the Minister who was murdered in *A Gun for Sale*, since they both originate from the slums, and have moved across the social class system. Czinner and the Minister have moved upwards to a higher class, but still remain faithful to their ideological values. Raven, the protagonist in *A Gun for Sale*, on the other hand, has moved outside the social system, being a professional criminal. In the two novels *Stamboul Train* and

A Gun for Sale it seems as though Greene make use of a certain type of character, which I have identified as the outsider. Both Raven and Czinner are without a social class. Raven is a criminal, and Czinner moves up from the working class, but still chooses to sympathise and place himself in the working class. Myatt is as I discussed earlier, also an outsider because of his Jewish heritage. Czinner's struggles with the lack of social role: "I [Czinner] am not a son, he thought, nor a doctor, nor a believer, I am a Socialist; the word mouthed by politicians on innumerable platforms, printed in bad type on bad paper in endless newspapers, rang cracked" (*ST* 100). Czinner's character is used to represent the Socialist. At the same time the Socialist character is problematised since Czinner is technically a part of the bourgeois. Czinner want himself to be a representative character, as I discussed in my previous chapter when quoting Phelan, but his actions break with this. His opinions are underlined when he starts talking about the bourgeois:

> 'They are always the same, the bourgeois,' he said. 'The proletariat have their virtues, and the gentleman is often good, just, and brave. He paid for something useful, for governing or teaching and healing, or his money is his father's. He does not deserve it perhaps, but he has done no one harm to get it. But the bourgeois–he buys from the worker and sells back to the worker. He is useless.' (*ST* 98)

This excerpt presents the ideas of socialism in a descriptive manner. A colloquial understanding of what socialism is, where the proletariat is elevated and the bourgeois is criticised. According to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* "socialism" is: "social and economic doctrine that calls for public rather than private ownership or control of property and natural resources. According to the Socialist view, individuals do not live or work in isolation but live in cooperation with one another" ("socialism"). Coral strives to be an upper-class lady, and does not understand Czinner's attitudes towards the upper-class bourgeois. Subsequently, Czinner tries to convert Coral to his own political conviction. Although he is a Socialist, he does not belong to the working class as a doctor. He is an educated man and has moved into a

new social class, which Raven in *A Gun for Sale* strives to. Czinner's education backlashes in a way. His sense of duty is also very visible:

> There had been his duty to his parents who had gone hungry that he might be educated. He remembered the day he took his degree, and how they had visited him in his bed-sitting-room and sat quiet in a corner watching him with respect, even with awe, and without love, for they could not love him now that he was an educated man; once he heard his father address him as 'Sir'. (*ST* 99)

The movement across social classes occurred the moment Czinner obtained his position as a doctor. His parents gave up much in order for him to do so, and he became more than their son at this point. This shows a society completely centred on the class system, which dictates that one can only exist in one social class. If there is to be social mobility one can move from one social class to another, but not between classes back and forth. There are absolute lines that separate the classes. This brutal fact might be the reasoning behind Czinner's decision to become a Socialist, because he wants to express his sympathy and affiliation with the working class. It seems as though the familiarity and love towards their son changed with the same degree of development as his education. Czinner feel the duties he has towards his responsibilities: "he [Czinner] had his duties to his patients, his duty to the poor of Belgrade, and the slowly growing idea of duty to his own class in every country" (*ST* 99-100). Here is a very collective idea with the notion that all lower classes in every country is the same: an idea of united classes across borders. This alludes to the notion that there should be an international cooperation against the class system, which, and the bourgeois.

The distinction of the different social classes becomes very apparent when Czinner enters the third class carriage on board the train: "There was a smell of cheap red wine from the empty bottles under the seat, and a few scraps of sour bread lay on the floor. When he came near the lavatory he turned back, the smell was too much for him" (*ST* 103). This extract shows the doctor's reaction towards the working class. Czinner might want to believe

that he follows the Socialist ideology, but his actions indicate the opposite. He is not taking a part in the collective, but rather accepts the boundaries between the classes. Judith Adamson comments on Czinner's ideology:

> Though he is a good man, his 'socialism' is reduced to the neurotic examination of his own motives for taking a first-class ticket on the Orient Express. If he is able to help Coral when she is ill, he is also the cause of her arrest, and though he explains class relations to her, when he says to himself 'I am a Socialist,' the word 'rang cracked' (24).

I agree with this observation that although he thinks he is a Socialist, the word "rings cracked" as I quoted earlier, thus they are mere words. He feels that he should be with his fellow "comrades" in the class he wants to belong to, but ironically he cannot go back because it is too disgusting for him. This breaks with the Socialist role. Czinner thinks: "I [Czinner] belong there, he thought with conviction; I should be travelling third class. I do not wish to be like a constitutional Labour member taking his first-class ticket to cast his vote in a packed parliament" (*ST* 103). He thinks that he is a hypocrite. However, he tries to convince himself that if he were a passenger in third class, he would be caught since it would be expected of him. Czinner feels that he belongs with the working class, but his education, occupation and also his attitudes presented in the previous excerpt oppose this. He is a Socialist who wants to fight for the rights of the lower social classes, but he still cannot fraternise with them on the train. As I have shown here Czinner does not fit within the frames of a stereotypical revolutionary Socialist. He challenges the concept of this character. Although he wants and aspires to be more similar to this stereotype, his actions express that he cannot actually be this character. The breaking with the Socialist stereotype further indicates that the novel has unexpected complex aspects.

Czinner does not feel complete without his ideology: "The ghost had memories; it could remember the Dr Czinner who had been so loved that it was worth while for a hired murderer to fire a revolver at his head" (*ST* 60-61). The ghost that is referred to here is quite

interesting. The ghost can be seen as representing Czinner's real ideas, memories and ideology. The ghost is what he hoped that he would come back to when he returned home: "the ghost of Czinner found itself touching the body of Czinner" (*ST* 61). The previous Czinner, the ghost, is gradually coming closer to the Czinner that has been away for five years. The returning sensation of his ghost is linked to the movement of the train. The body of Czinner is moving geographically towards his home country, to his ideology and what he used to be. The memory of what he was is returning to him as he moves with the train: "absorbed by the idea that the ghostly years were over. I am alive again, he thought, because I am conscious of death as the future possibility, almost a certainty, for they will hardly let me escape again" (*ST* 62). He has nothing to return to since the revolt has already happened. For the last five years he has not existed properly. His body has existed in England, but his ghost was confined in his home country. At the same time he is most certainly travelling towards his own demise, thus he will become a ghost in the words original meaning in the close future. The use of the word ghost has a foreshadowing effect. Although Czinner thought: "Now there was nothing left than to but to leave the train at Vienna and return" (*ST* 61). He still pointlessly continues the journey towards Belgrade to return to what he had left behind. His appearance is described in a ghostly manner aboard the train: "Out in the dark nothing was visible, except the occasional flash of lights from a small station, the rush of flame in a tunnel and always the transparent likeness of his own face, his hand floating like a fish through which water and weeds shine" (*ST* 11). The apparition of Czinner is soon to become complete. The characterisation of Czinner as a partial of his person underlines the need Czinner has for his identity as a Socialist. Simultaneously the part is characterised as a ghost alluding to something dead. This may underline the futility of Czinner's ideology, since he cannot carry it out. He will never again become the character he aspire to be.

Before escaping and reaching the shed at the station, Czinner, Coral and Grünlich interacted with the soldiers stationed at the train stop. Czinner engages in a conversation with the soldier, Ninitch, who is presented more nuanced and questioning than the rest of the soldiers. This is the soldier who ultimately provides an opportunity for the prisoners to escape. Czinner exploits Ninitch's situation with his sick father, and tells Ninitch that he gave his father medication in order to help with the pain. Czinner takes advantage of the one soldier who is given a face, and seems more compassionate. Czinner does not feel bad, his view on soldiers is presented when he speaks with the colonel Hartep and captain Alexitch: "Those medals you won in the service of war. I have no medals, because I love my country too much. I won't kill men because they also love their country" (*ST* 148). Czinner sees himself and the other revolutionaries as the true soldiers of the country. He continues: "When all were poor, no one would be poor. The wealth of the world belonged to everyone. If it was divided, there would be no rich men, but every man would have enough to eat, and would have no reason to feel ashamed beside his neighbour" (*ST* 149-50). Czinner's ideology is expressed again, along with a critical attitude towards the soldiers who are loyal to a corrupt government.

Ninitch is not an ordinary soldier, and expresses doubt about the military when discussing the uprising in Belgrade: "but they were, weren't they, our own people? It was not as if they were Bulgars" (*ST* 116). There are the two different types of soldiers. Ninitch's doubt is evidence of a more critical thinking mind. He questions orders, and does not follow them blindly.

> No, I [Ninitch] am glad I was not in Belgrade, he thought. It was all very puzzling; they were poor and he was poor and he was poor; they had wives and children; he had a wife and a small daughter; they must have expected to gain something by it, those Reds. (*ST* 117)

Ninitch sympathises with the uprisers, and compares himself to them. He wonders where the line is between them and him, because they have several similarities. He questions whether he wants to gain the same as the "Reds", and wonders if he has the same values and ideas as the Socialists. The presentation of a soldier like this suggests that soldiers are different individuals too, and not just a single mass with one unified thought. Ninitch gives the soldiers an individual face, which ordinary people might not remember. A soldier does not lose his identity with gaining the uniform, since it does not uniform him completely. Ninitch is an example of such a soldier, thus it is unfortunate that he is the soldier who gets exploited by Czinner. Ninitch stands in opposition to his officers and fellow soldiers, who do not seem to question their actions or orders. One may argue that Ninitch also breaks with the stereotype of the soldier.

During their attempt to escape Czinner is shot, and slowly bleeds to death in the shed. In his last moment Czinner sees "[h]is mother and father bobbed at him their seamed thin faces, followed him through the ether, past the rush of stars, telling him that they were glad and grateful, that he had done what he could, that he had been faithful" (*ST* 168). In this hallucination, he gives himself the proud feeling from his parents, where he feels he has achieved something in staying with the Socialist cause. However, I question why he continued his journey towards Belgrade. The attempt at revolution had already happened, thus he did not have anyone to lead. I also question whether Czinner would have been content if the revolt succeeded, and he would have lived in a Socialist state, since he could not bear the smell of the third class carriage on the train. When he dies it seems as though the narrator points out this impossibility to change Czinner's ideas: "In the light of the spill she was again surprised by the doctor's knowledgeable stare, but it was a frozen knowledge which never changed" (*ST* 172). There will always be a need for revolution it seems. His ideology never changed, and that is why is continued on towards Belgrade and his imminent demise. He

could not change his knowledge or ideas, because they were frozen in him. He would still cling to his ideology, even in death.

I have mentioned in my introduction that according to Kunkel, these narratives by Greene are characterised to have a happy ending. My readings lead me to conclude that neither *A Gun for Sale* nor *Stamboul Train* have a happy ending. In my reading the end of *Stamboul Train* is rather bleak, where Czinner ends up dead and his ideas are stopped. The communist outbreak in Belgrade failed, thus Czinner dies in vain. Myatt gives up finding Coral, and finds someone new to settle with, and Janet has to accept since she has no say in what happens to her. Neither has Coral, who is now stuck with Mabel Warren in Subotica, without her job and without Myatt. According to Allott and Farris "hints of Greene's fallen world already appear in *Stamboul Train*" (84), which I think, is an adequate characterisation of Greene's bleak ending.

In this chapter I have shown how the main characters in *Stamboul Train*, Myatt Carlton and Richard Czinner, invite certain stereotypes as a framework for their characters, but subsequently break with these stereotypes in different manners. I have discussed Myatt's complicated relationship to his own Jewish background, and how he even acts according to the stereotype, in order to show how the presentation of him gradually makes him a more complex character who is more than a stereotype. I have supplemented the discussion on Raven with the two other Jewish characters, Stein and Eckmann, who have both become assimilated into society in different ways. I have done this to illuminate that the novel presents different Jewish individual characters to underline the break with the Jewish stereotype, since neither of them fits the figure of the Jew. I conclude that not only does this show a difference between characters, but it also provides a social commentary on the Jewish situation in the 1930s. Myatt is under constant scrutiny and discrimination, something which the other characters try to avoid in their assimilation. I have discussed Czinner in relation to

his wish to be a Socialist, and sympathise greatly with the working class and loathe the bourgeois. Through this discussion I have shown that although he expresses the political attitudes that he wishes to follow, his actions reveal that he cannot stand to fraternise with lower class people. Czinner identifies with socialism, but later breaks with this ideology. Thus I conclude that by moving these characters beyond the stereotypical framework presented, the novel becomes more complex than the label "entertainment" makes the reader expect.

Chapter 3 – Entertaining Melodrama: Challenging Generic Conventions in *The Confidential Agent*

Graham Greene wrote *The Confidential Agent* in a very short time-span, as mentioned in Shelden's biography of the author: "in September 1939 he [Graham Greene] managed to squeeze in a book that was written in six weeks" (231), and further he writes quite critically that the novel was "[w]ritten in record time, and under the influence of Benzedrine breakfasts […] *The Confidential Agent* was meant to be a popular thriller that would earn some quick cash, and Greene was not sure it was worth calling his own" (235). Here Shelden explicitly points out that the novel was written for popularity and to make money, and it was probably not worth being associated with Greene. Greene himself mentioned the Benzedrine when he wrote about the creation of the novel in his autobiography *Ways of Escape*: "I was forcing the pace and I suffered for it. Six weeks of a Benzedrine breakfast diet left my nerves in shreds and my wife suffered the result" (89). Greene presents this as a challenging time with a negative impact on his personal life. At the same time he mentioned that: "*The Confidential Agent* is one of the few books of mine I have cared to reread – perhaps because it is not one of mine. It was as if I were ghosting for another man. D, the chivalrous agent and professor of Romance literature, is not really one of my characters" (*Ways of Escape* 89). Here the author expresses that the novel is different and separates itself from his other novels. Since Greene states that he actually have reread it, he hints to it being more intriguing than Shelden implied. Diemert also comments on the short time in which the novel was created under the influence of a narcotic, stating that "this explanation has proven itself sufficiently persuasive for most critics in their accounts of the novel's weaknesses" (150). The nature of the circumstances in which the novel was created made critics write off the novel. *The Confidential Agent* was intended and received as an "entertainment". However, it has qualities beyond what the labels implies, which I will illuminate and discuss in this chapter. Firstly I will explore how the main

characters in the novel break with the typical main characters of a traditional thriller. This chapter will attempt to show that this reveals somewhat complex aspects of the novel, since it challenges the genre it was written. I am going to investigate how the novel, through characters' dialogue and reflection, comments on itself and its generic characteristics. The characters comment on their setting and other characters in a certain manner, which can be seen as critique on the novel itself. The characters' thoughts and speech are characterised in such a way that they seem to be aware of their context, which can be extended to an awareness of them as a construction within a text. The protagonist even draws direct parallels to the heroic poem *The Song of Roland*. The poem serves as a very apparent parallel in that one of the major themes of the poem is betrayal, similar to that of *The Confidential Agent*. Through the discussion of these elements I will try to show that although the novel is seemingly like what one would expect from a simpler novel, it still has elements that make the novel more complex.

I will construct the chapter in two main parts: first I will discuss how the three main characters realise or break with their roles within the genre thriller. Secondly, I will discuss the characters' commentary, reflection and perception, which convey the text's awareness of itsown literary existence and generic traits. I see this awareness as a form of self-reflexivity, which I understand self-reflexivity as: "marked by or making reference to its own artificiality or contrivance <self–reflexive fiction>" ("self-reflexive"). I will argue that the characters are to a degree aware of this artificiality, or comments on aspects that can allude to it. There are clear aspects of the novel that allude to the genre of thriller. The theme of betrayal, the hunted and the hunter, war, violence, and a love interest realised by D. and Rose are present. At the same time, the two characters, D. and Rose, in particular, stand in opposition to each other when it comes to their expressed opinions on the genre. I will make use of the term

"melodrama" in my chapter as I mentioned in my introduction. The presence of melodrama is a characteristic of the thriller genre, and Greene's "entertainments".

Characters in the Thriller Genre

Bruce Merry has described Greene as a "first generation" (139) thriller writer, which implies that Greene's characters will probably build on more traditional character types in thrillers. Literary thrillers usually have a hero and a villain, in the case of *The Confidential Agent* realised by D. and L. respectively. In addition to this, the hero often has helpers or assistants, in this novel realised by Rose and to some degree Else. These main characters break with certain expectations connected to their role, which I will argue makes this novel more complex than the label "entertainment" implies.

D. himself comments on his role as the protagonist and thus "hero" of the novel: "I'm nothing mysterious. I am just a businessman" (Greene, *The Confidential Agent*[6] 18). This statement suggests that D. is aware of his role in the novel, which should be mysterious as he is a confidential agent. Thus the statement becomes ironic. He underlines the fact that he is not mysterious, as one would expect a hero of a thriller to be. At the same time he is not presented with a name, nor do we learn anything explicitly about the country that he originates from. In *Ways of Escape* Greene writes of "those black days for author" (28) because of the war and also "there was one firm of solicitors who went out of their way to incite actions for libel, checking the names of characters with the names in the London telephone directory" (28). One could argue that these libel issues, which Greene had already experienced after the publication of *Stamboul Train*, have inspired these anonymous names. At the same time, these characters are foreign agents for an unknown nation, so I question how probable a libel would be in this case.

[6] Throughout the rest of my chapter when I refer to the novel *The Confidential Agent*, I will simply address it as *CA*.

D., as the protagonist of the novel, is supposed to fill the role of the traditional hero in a thriller, or his position in the novel implies this, but he is not brave, does not have courage or masculine strength as I will argue Raven and Czinner both express at some point. D. is an academic, who is on a mission for his government, which is far outside his comfort zone. The initial impression of D.'s physical appearance is not one of a young or strong man, which is expressed when he looks at his own passport photo: "He [D.] saw a stranger's face – that of a man much younger and, apparently, much happier than himself: he was grinning at the camera" (*CA* 11). He has aged considerably physically due to the loss of his wife and the war that he has experienced. D. is not tough, as the manageress points out when she comments on D. to his face: "You are a sentimental man. A bourgeois. A professor. Probably romantic. If you cheat us you'll find – oh, I can think up things" (*CA* 73). In this extract she uses class, and the bourgeois as a way of underlining his lack of courage and ability to defend himself. This is very evident when D. does not defend himself ort retaliate in any way when he is attacked by L.'s chauffeur. More importantly the manageress puts D. in the same social class as L., although we are told at the beginning of the novel that they travel different classes aboard the ship. Merry characterises the hero of a thriller as a spy who is: "a sophisticated individualist; as anti-bureaucrat, a gifted amateur" (9). If I were to try and extend these characteristics to describe D., it would not be proficient, because these elements does not characterise D.'s character. He is constantly dependent on others to help and assist him: Else and to a much larger degree Rose. The fact that he relies on female helpers may be emasculating. He is not an independent individual, and he is not a gifted amateur either in that he does not have an instinctive way of how to act: "They [the police] were after him [D.]. He ran – but there was no exit. He hadn't noticed that the embassy was in a square to which there was only one entrance – he had turned the wrong way and had three sides to cover. There wasn't time" (*CA* 110). He is lost and cannot escape the situation. Usually when confronted

with stressful and dangerous situations, D. moves his mind out of the current situation to other stressful situations he has experienced: "The worst was going to happen now: he was momentarily back in the prison yard as the warder came towards him, swinging the club" (*CA* 23). However, D.'s intentions are good, and he tries to live up to the role as the agent, but fails due to the lacks in his character.

D. manages to be courageous enough to threaten K., who betrayed him. He uses a fictional text of his own construction, which he calls the "Goldthorb's detective stories", as a weapon against him. D. is not intimidating and is so afraid of confrontation that he has to use a piece of fiction in order to scare K., which is a very indirect of intimidating someone: "D. said, 'Did you ever read Goldthorb's detective stories?'" (*CA* 125), as pointed out by Diemert: "[the] narrative itself is a weapon. D. uses the Goldthorb story to frighten K., and, despite the fact that it is merely D.'s invention, it has the desired effect" (150). D. uses a fiction that he constructs in his own way, in order to create a parallel between the constructed story and the situation he finds himself in. At the point when D. tells about this detective story they are in a lift, thus there is a direct similarity between the two fictional settings: "But I was telling you about Goldthorb's detective story. One man killed another in a lift. Rang the lift down. Walked up the stairs. Rang up the lift up and – before witnesses – discovered the body. Of course, luck was on his side. You have to have a fortunate hand for murder" (*CA* 125). I argue due to the genre of the story that D. is constructing, a detective story, which Jerry Palmer argues is the same as a thriller (106). At the same time, D. points out the nature of the context that he exists in. D. perceives the setting around to be that of a thriller, thus identifies it with a detective story. In this manner D. indirectly comments on the genre of the novel in which he is a character. He also creates awareness of some generic conventions realised in his own constructed life.

D. is supposed to complete his mission in order to save his government and fellow people. However, D. is not characterised as someone who can succeed: "D. felt as a typhoid-carrier must feel when he finds himself among the safe and inoculated: these he couldn't infect. They were secured from the violence and horror he carried with him" (*CA* 159-160). He is described as directly infectious, which implies he actually does more harm than good. An example of his destructiveness to his environment is Else's death. She would not have been murdered if she did not help D. in hiding his credentials. He rather ends up being saved by Rose, his supporting female character. Palmer writes that:

> It is not accidental that the back-up team is not up to it [save the situation]: the hero, by definition, is not only competent, but uniquely competent; if someone else could do as well as he, he would lose all claim to being the hero. In fact, the main function of the back-up team is to be less competent than the hero, thus demonstrating his worth. (27)

I will argue that the point made here about traditional heroes in thrillers describes exactly the opposite of what the character D. is. As I argued above, D. does not have unique skills or competence that a hero would have, but is a middle-aged academic. His "back-up team", as Palmer describes it, is realised by Rose and her father's older business associate, Furt or Forbes, who actually outperform him. She ends up being the vital character that saves D., who cannot save anyone including himself. He did not succeed in his mission to buy coal nor did he save anyone. At the end he has been saved, at least temporarily. When D. heard Rose's voice at the end of the novel at the ship he reacted in this manner: "He didn't turn: he didn't know what to say: his heart missed a beat like a young man's: he was afraid" (*CA* 206). His sentimentality that the manageress identified earlier in the novel is expressed here. The hero has been saved by a heroine, and at the same time he reacts as if he was the victim and Rose his saviour.

The first impression presented of Rose, is through D.'s perspective: "She was very young and blonde and unnecessarily arrogant; she looked like a child who has got nothing she

wants and so is determined to obtain anything, whether she likes it or not" (*CA* 13). She is not characterised as ugly, but her personality does not seem appealing in D.'s mind. When D. and Rose arrive at the hotel, she does not improve this impression:

> she had the absurd mind of her class – which would give a pound note to a beggar and forget the misery of anybody out of sight. She belonged, he thought, with L.'s lot, and he remembered his own, at this moment queuing up for bread or trying to keep warm in unheated rooms. (*CA* 30)

Here D. points out that Rose, Benditch's daughter, is an upper-class girl. The question of class issue is also important theme in this novel as in the previous to novels I have discussed. D. is, however, a scholar, meaning that he has gone to university. At the same time D. seems to imply that he comes from a lower social class, which makes his situation similar to that of Czinner in *Stamboul Train* and the Minister in *A Gun for Sale*. For all of these characters there has been a form of social mobility to a higher social class. Although she is placed by D. to be in an upper-class girl, she explains herself that: "I haven't got a people. My grandfather was a workman, anyway" (*CA* 64). This implies that although she might seem to be upper-class, she tries to place herself in a lower social class, which I read as a way of distancing herself from her father, of whom she does not approve. Rose tries to situate herself outside the upper-class, because she does not identify with them, which might explain her behaviour as a drunken loudmouth. In this aspect, Rose is not the innocent, dim and beautiful character that one might expect from a female helper or assistant. Bruce Merry states that "the more sophisticated thriller the girl is not there for psychological reasons, but because she is a pawn in the plot, and therefore increases the adventure permutations which the author can play around with" (16). Rose indeed plays a very important role in the plot of *The Confidential Agent*, but I will argue that she is more than a pawn in the plot. She is absolutely vital for the survival and escape for D. Seen thus, she performs the role of an assistant or helper, whose functions are essential. However, She becomes a heroine of the story, rather than the hero's

girl. This transcends her role as the female companion, or female "back-up". Although Rose it somewhat outspoken and unrefined, she is still characterised in a very positive manner, since her characteristics makes her unique: "She was lovely; he had never, when he was young, known anyone so lovely - certainly not his wife: she had been quite a plain woman" (*CA* 68). This also breaks with the concept of the "girl in distress" which the hero needs to save. Else fits his description better as a more dependent girl. She functions as a pawn for D., when she secured and hid his credentials. In a way she even functions as a pawn and a hinder for D., since her death made him a murder suspect. After she assisted D., K., the helper of L., murders her, meaning Else needed D. to protect her. Else was not competent, and needed the hero to rescue her, but since D. is too late, he must avenge her instead. D. later fails on both accounts.

L. is the antagonist, and the villain of the novel. Palmer writes that the villain "as a character is subordinate to the conspiracy as a function; we do not need to know anything about him. The hero, on the other hand, is in no wart subordinate to a narrative function: he *is* a narrative function, among the most important, and his personal qualities are an integral part of that function" (23). This description of a thriller's antagonist fits L. quite well, since he exists merely in the background, where even his chauffeur is more prominent than him. In this case, the character of D. fits the hero's description in a thriller in that he is explicitly the focus and present throughout the novel, and it is D.'s actions which drive the plot. Palmer also writes that: "When the villain is portrayed in the thriller, he is a total outsider – necessarily, since he is conspiring against the world that the hero is defending. It is perhaps less obvious that the hero himself is equally an outsider, instead of a repulsive one" (24). L. as a character diverges from being an outsider. He is not a social outsider, and fits in better in the business-meeting with Lord Benditch and his partners than D. did. Although L. did not manage to make the coal purchase either, he is not wanted for murder and can still exist in Britain

without repercussion as opposed to D. D., similarly to Raven, Czinner and Myatt, also becomes an outsider. At the end of the novel he is an individual without a nation to go home to since they see him as a traitor, and he cannot stay in Britain being wanted for murder. Without a nationality or a home, he is outside of society since he will be on the run indefinitely. The character of L. is described to be on the top of the upper-class:

> he [L.] had once had some kind of title himself, years ago, before the republic … count, marquis … D. had forgotten exactly what. It was a misfortune that they were on the same boat, and that they have seen each other like that at the barrier between the classes, two confidential agents wanting the same thing. (*CA* 10)

Although the two characters belong to different classes, they have the same goal and are acting out the same role as agents, but out of different intentions. L. wants to help the rich upper-class to overthrow the lower classes and the government, while D. wants the coal deal for the government and rest of the people. The discussion has shown how the characters break with typical character types within the genre of thriller, and I argue makes the novel challenge the genre, which increases the novel's complexity.

Textuality and Melodrama

The initial impression of the main characters in the novel is their names or more specifically initials. The protagonist and antagonist, who both come from the same country are identified with the initials D. and L. respectively. Subsequently the character K., who also comes from their home country, is also introduced with a name which consists of an initial letter. Diemert comments "three of the novel's characters – D., L., and K. – are identified only by initials, a fact that again underscores the textual nature of this world" (145). By this he insinuates that the names of the characters underline the novel's textuality. Diemert also argues that "From the novel's outset, the world is seen […] in terms of writing" (145), to which I agree. On the ship outside Dover, D.'s reminiscence of England were "rather literary" (*CA* 7). D.'s

memories are characterised as literary, which may refer to the fact that they are literary constructions in a narrative. It is evident for the reader that all of D.'s memories and his entire character is literary, but to characterise his memories in this manner implies that the narrator is also aware of D.'s existence as a literary character. The narrator also underlines this for the reader. This can also refer to the fact hat D.'s memories is constructed in his mind much like a story of his life when he remembers them. D. is thus a composer of his own perception and experiences in his past. D. also expressed to Rose that: "I wish – sometimes – I could see *my* ending" (CA 66). The emphasis on "*my*" ending can be read ambiguously. D. can be referring to the end of his constructed life. Another way of reading it can be D. referring to "the end" as the ending of the literary construction in which he is a character. The latter reading strengthens the notion of D,'s awareness of his existence in a narrative.

The initial letters that serve as the name of three characters in the novel, gives the characters anonymity. The reader of the novel never learns if the characters have other names. These names only exist in a textual reality. The letters are presented with a dot behind them, thus it implies that the letter is an abbreviation, but the reader never learns what it represents. The protagonist is the character that the reader learns the most about, thus the reader could speculate as to what the initial represents. Perhaps danger or even destruction, as it is implied in the characterisation of the protagonist: "Danger was a part of him" (*CA* 8). D.'s is constantly characterised by both himself and the narrator as infectious: "He carried the war with him. Wherever D. was, there was war" (*CA* 7). He spreads war and demolition wherever he travels: "He had indeed brought the war with him: the infection was working already" (*CA* 20). Although danger was a part of him, it does not mean that D. in himself is dangerous, which is ironic. He is cowardly and does not act violently, but he is followed by dangerous people, who want to harm him, and thus the characters around him end up in the crossfire.

The theme of war is strongly present throughout the novel, and also becomes infused with D.'s character.

Onboard the ship to Dover D. notices a child: "He [D.] stood and looked at it [the child]. It didn't mean a thing to him – it was like writing so illegible you didn't even try to decipher it" (*CA* 9). There is a distance from D. to his context, it is almost as he was and outsider looking in, or like someone reading a text, which in this case is D. reading his situation. Moreover the word "decipher" implies that D. is an observer of his situation, who like a reader, needs to interpret his surroundings. This is also an example which refers to the protagonist's awareness of the narratives existence. As Bruce Kawin writes: "The mind of the text is seen to be engaged in an act, however imitative, of self-declaration; it appears to be aware that it is a text as well as the process of some narrator's or character's mentation" (228). The mind of the texts as he writes of here is expressed through the narrator and the characters reflections and dialogues.

A character who takes the construction of her own fiction to another level is Else, the maid at D.'s hotel who is obviously in love with him, or at least in love with the idea of being with him. She writes her diary entries as she would construct her own reality: "I [Else] thought he [D.] loved another, but he said No. I do not think he is one of those men who flit from flower to flower. I have written to Clara [the prostitute] to tell her our plan. She will be sad, I think" (*CA* 107). Else writes in her diary that she and D. have a plan, which they did not, as D. confirms to the police. She reads her world as her own melodramatic fiction. Similar to Else, the waitress who claims to be Else's friend, also construct her own story: "He [D.] watched the small brown heartless eyes while she invented things even as she talked" (*CA* 115). She is conducting her own fiction, to which D. thinks: "Else was safely dead; she could be reconstructed now to suit anybody at all" (*CA* 115). In this D. reveals that everyone

could construct their own realities to suit them, as long as you did not include someone who could potentially disprove it.

Diemert writes that D. in the novel's constructed world finds himself amongst many fictions, and they are possible to read in different ways (146). With this he implies that D. can choose to interpret his constructed world in different manners. Like a novel, D. must interpret his reality. This is exemplified by the narrator describing D.'s situation through D.'s thoughts:

> He [D.] suddenly realized how absurd it all was. He was a confidential agent employed in an important coal deal on which the fate of a country might depend; she was a young woman, the daughter of a peer whose coal he wanted, and the beloved, apparently, of Mr Forbes who also controlled several mines and kept a mistress in Shepherd's Market; a child had been murdered by the manageress or Mr K. – acting presumably, on behalf of the rebels, although they were employed by his own people. (*CA* 133)

In this extract D. reflects on his own absurd situation, and at the same time his reflection can be extended to include a reflection on the novel and how absurd the story is. It is very coincidental that D. becomes familiar with the daughter of the man who he was to make business arrangements with. He goes on commenting on the improbable events that have taken place. This may point out the melodramatic side of the novel. The events that have taken place are absurd and extreme in D.'s eyes. He assesses his own situation as something unrealistic, which can be extended to comment on the novel being unrealistic, because of these melodramatic events.

In a discussion between D. and K. after K. has been captured, he says that D. will not get away and that he would not dare. To which D. responds: "That's the kind of argument they use in the stories. It doesn't apply for any more in these days. There's a war on: it's not likely that any of us will 'get away', as you call it, for long" (*CA* 138). In this example D. describes K.'s argumentation as the same as in "the stories", which to some extent can be seen as acknowledging their own argument as that of a part in a fictional story, and in this case a

novel. The dialogues between D. and K. reveal the attitudes that can be read not only as dialogues, but also as they commenting on the novel. In their initial meeting, D. tells K. about the story of what has happened to him up until the point of their meeting point to which K. responds: "It's an extraordinary story" (*CA* 45). Although story is quite accurate term to use on someone to tell a series of events that has happened to someone's person, I argue that the use of such terms between D. and K. can be drawn further to actually signify their awareness of the novel's fictitious nature. K. also uses the term extraordinary, which literally means outside of the ordinary. It is so incredible that they are almost fictitious. D. also makes these observations when he is on the boat at the end of the novel: "It was all very fictitious" (*CA* 190). Observations that D. makes also refers to his surroundings as being constructed:

> The little parlour was crammed with china ornaments and photographs in tortuous silver frames. A round mahogany table a velvet-covered sofa, hard chairs with twisted backs and velvet seats, newspapers spread on the floor to save the carpet – it was like a scene set for something which had never happened, which would never happen now. (*CA* 163)

This is a very cinematic description through D.'s observations of his surroundings, followed by a reflection of that the room seemed to be like a scene that was constructed for an event or action. D.'s surroundings are constructed, much like it is for the reader observations. D. comments on his surroundings with a perception which takes into consideration the construction or even "fakeness" of the scene he finds himself in. Another example of D. observing his seemingly constructed and fake surroundings is when he enters Benditch's house: "This was the moment, but he could hardly believe it – in the fake house, among the fake ancestors and the dead mistress; he couldn't even see Lord Fetting. This wasn't the sort of place where you expected a war to be decided" (*CA* 88). For the reader the situation is fake since it is deciphering a literary story, however, D. also perceives his surroundings as constructed or composed.

At a point early in the story Rose refers to D. as "The mystery man" (*CA* 26). D. is a man of mystery since he is a confidential agent on a secret mission for his government in order to secure a deal on coal. For the reader he is also mysterious since he does not have a proper name like I mentioned earlier in my chapter. D. also compares himself to the literary character Roland from the heroic poem *The Song of Roland*: "It felt odd, lonely, terrifying to be the only one in danger […] Roland had companions at Roncevalles – Oliver and Turpin: the whole chivalry of Europe was riding up to help him" (*CA* 56). This is an example where D. uses a literary text as a comparison to his own situation, in this case it is a text which exists outside the world of *The Confidential Agent* as opposed to the "Goldthorb's stories". D. draws these literary parallels between this narrative fiction and his own character. Another example of D. comments on other characters' literary qualities, is when he reflects on the manservant at Lord Benditch's house: "He [D.] had always felt a faint distaste for manservants: they were so conservative, so established, such parasites, but this man made him want to laugh. He [the manservant] was such a caricature" (*CA* 87). The text's self-commentary through the reflections and dialogues of D. and being aware of certain literary aspects of other characters adds to the novel's complexity.

Another aspect that further underlines the awareness of a fictional story created by D. is the comments he makes on the murderer in the "Goldthorb story": "Of course luck was on his side" (*CA* 125). With this D. implies that unlikely coincidences occur in order to help the hero. In this he is commenting on his own absurd amount of luck. D. met Rose when he got off the ship at Dover, who happened to be the daughter of Lord Benditch, the man D. was to do business with. Although, D. still failed making this deal, his relationship with Rose is what saves him in the end. Another example of luck is when D. comes back to the Entrenationo school, and neither Dr. Bellows, who runs the school, or Miss Carpenter, his secretary, have read the paper since they only read weekly papers, and therefore they have not noticed that D.

is wanted for murder. When D. called to Benditch's house, D. was similar to the character in "Goldthorb's story": "Luck favoured him [D.]; it was a woman – not the manservant – who might have remembered his voice" (*CA* 131). Allott and Farris write: "Ultimately, the most important difference between Greene's entertainments and the ordinary thriller—besides that quality of the style—lies in the fact that, though so much of the action and the violence depend on a series of ironical coincidences, the element of irony is a natural growth from the underlying serious view of life" (126-127). The characters present characteristics of the genre, and although they seem somewhat critical of them, the text still realises them. Allott and Farris have identified that the novel makes use of this coincidental luck for the protagonist. I agree with Allott and Farris that this becomes ironic because D. expresses how protagonists in such stories have an exaggerated amount of luck, which he experiences himself.

In addition to the unconventional characters and the awareness of a fictitious text, Rose comments on the generic conventions present in their lives, and the novel. Amongst other critics, Kunkel points out that melodrama is an important generic trait within Greene's "entertainments", and also in the thriller, as mentioned in the introduction. Although Greene used melodrama in writing this novel, there is also a consciousness of melodrama in the novel, especially through Rose. Thus Greene is aware of the generic conventions of his own writing, and offers the reader a more critical view of the story. Rose says to D.: "'Don't be melodramatic,' [...] 'I can't stand melodrama'" (*CA* 18). When Rose comments on melodrama in this manner, she critiques D.'s character and how he is acting, thus assessing melodrama in a negative way. Kunkel writes further on melodrama:

> The exigencies of plot dictated by a heavy reliance on melodrama do not permit very much character development. Hence in the entertainment, Greene is forced to focus his attention on a few characters and allow the rest to stand as a backset for the melodrama he is staging. If some of the characters in an entertainment have to be archetypal and seen more in silhouette than in the round, there are nonetheless compensations. (58)

I agree that melodrama, is present in this novel, but I question whether the novel relies too heavily on it. Greene presents through Rose a more critical eye towards melodrama, thus creating awareness of it in the novel. The reader becomes aware of this in tandem with the characters' increased comments and reflections. This critical attitude towards melodrama makes the novel not rely on it heavily, but rather question it and its function. The characterisation of Rose breaks with the romantic melodramatic convention of sentiment, in her brutish drunken ways. Even in the manner she explains her and Else's interest in D.: "This is what always happens. I know. I told you. I'm not romantic. This is what's called father-fixation. You hate your own father - for a thousand reasons, and then you fall for the man the same age" (*CA* 67). I will not use the term romantic interest, because as Rose herself points out, her interest in D. is a result of an unfortunate relationship with her father, and not with D.'s characteristic. I argue that the characters' awareness of the conventions in their fictional world, here in example with Rose, makes the novel more complex. At the same time this would not have worked if Greene had omitted melodrama. The dramatic actions and reactions that D. displays through the novel demand room, however Rose opposes this with her reflections on the quality and usefulness of the melodrama. Through her the novel does not allow the melodrama to uncontrollably take too much room.

Rose's scepticism against melodrama is also expressed when D. does not want to dine at the hotel because there are too many people, to which Rose says: "Why not a lot of people? Are you going to begin something after all?" (*CA* 20). In this situation D.'s paranoia of being hunted and not trusting everyone is commented on by Rose, and she does not react with sympathy. She does not believe him and she thinks him irrational, and because of his melodramatic expression she does not take him seriously. It is as if Rose thinks that melodrama in itself makes the situation. This may be a result of melodrama's exaggerated nature as I mentioned in my introduction. Rose's opinion towards melodrama can be drawn

further to her actually commenting on the genre of thriller, and the fact that melodramaic elements make it less credible. Thus she is not only commenting on the character D.'s credibility, but also the credibility of the novel. The less melodrama there is in fiction the more realistic it seems. When D. was attacked by L.'s chauffeur at the hotel, Rose finds this hard to believe: "Why do you tell stories like that? […] Making yourself out mysterious. I'd rather have The Three Bears" (*CA* 24). The manner that Rose uses the term "stories" here implies that she means fictional stories, like a thriller story. She expressed that she would rather hear a fairy tale than this explanation:

> "He [D.] said, 'I didn't really expect to find you here. Not after your friends tried to shoot me.'
> 'Listen,' she [Rose] said, 'there are things I won't and can't believe. I came here to apologize. About last night. I don't believe you meant to steal that car, but I was drunk, furious. ... I never thought they meant to smash you as they did. It was that fool Currie. But if you start being melodramatic again. ... Is it a new kind of confidence trick? Is it meant to appeal to the romantic female heart? Because you'd better know, it doesn't work.' (*CA* 58)

Here again Rose comments negatively on melodrama and how it does not make his story believable and also connects melodrama to be something that is thought to appeal to women over men. Rose also expresses that she did not believe D. when he mentioned the shooting, again she underlines with her commentary that being melodramatic undermines a character's credibility. Rose also makes a connection between melodrama and sentiment by referring to the female heart. Rose states that she is not a typical feminine woman. In this she also transcends the female companion that she is to be to D. as I have discussed earlier. It is interesting that one of the characters in the novel says that the melodrama will not work, which slows the melodramatic effect down, since the events lose some of their dramatic effect when it is constantly mentioned and pointed out, which makes the reader aware of its existence. Thus the reader is not too distracted from the melodrama, and the more important aspects come into focus.

Rose has been critical towards D. a number of times, however she still wants to assist him, as a sort "back-up" as I have discussed. As Bergonzi also comments on Rose: "Soon after they met, Rose tells D. that she cannot stand melodrama. But Greene regarded melodrama as one of the constituent elements of his art, and despite herself she is caught up in it as she decides to help him in his mission" (72). Rose allows herself to become part of the story, although she opposed melodrama. She is eventually seduced by the narrative to take part. Rose tells D. about her father and his associates: "If you hope anything at all from them, for God's sake don't breathe melodrama - or sentiment. Show them a cheque-book, a contract, let it be a cast-iron one" (*CA* 63). She does this in order to make him minimise his melodramatic stories and gestures in order to become more believable. She tells him that he cannot successfully go through with his mission when he is acting in this manner. However, D. can not constrain the melodrama after he discovered that his credentials were stolen:

> One after another D. searched the pockets: he searched the lining: of course there was nothing. It was no more than a theatrical gesture – to convince them that he had once had the credentials. He felt himself that his acting was poor, that he wasn't really giving the impression that he expected to find them. (*CA* 91)

The theatrical gesture that D. performs just emphasise his melodramatic nature, and as Rose commented on earlier D.'s credibility diminishes gradually in the eyes of the other characters. They would be inclined to think that he never had any credentials to begin with.

D. is characterised as a melodramatic character to some degree, he also comments on the situation himself. When D. tries to explain to the detectives investigating Else's death that he was not intimate with Else, and that his credentials were stolen in Lord Benditch's house, D. thinks about his own explanation: "It was, of course, an incredible story" (*CA* 105). In this context the word story can be drawn further than only meaning a series of events, similar to that I discussed earlier. The comment can be read as if D. himself uses this word to underline the fictitious construction he is a part of, and that it is beyond credible because of the

melodrama. Again it can be seen as if a character in the novel comments on the decreased credibility the text has with all of these melodramatic events, which makes the story sound fictitious. The sceptical reactions from the police and Forbes signal that such stories are perhaps hard to believe, thus pointing to the lack of credibility of the thrillers, and thus Greene's "entertainments". D.'s thoughts of his own situations draw direct parallels with his own situation and melodrama: "Surely they were not going to throw a mistress at his head - people didn't really fall for that sort of thing except in melodrama. In melodrama a secret agent was never tired or uninterested or in love with a dead woman" (*CA* 53). D.'s comment on himself is quite ironic since he explains how a secret agent should be, which is far from his own character. He compares himself to a protagonist in a thriller. D.'s thoughts are an attempt to single out characteristics of a melodrama which does not fit with this novel. These are all aspects of D. which in his opinion does not fit within the frames of the given genre of the thriller.

D. does not only comment on the constructed world in which he exists, but he also comments on who these melodramas most likely are written for: "But perhaps L. read melodramas – he represented, after all, the aristocracy – the marquises and generals and bishops – who lived in a curious formal world of their own […] They might take their ideas of the other world – of professional men an working people – partly from melodrama" (*CA* 53). In this excerpt D. implies that these narratives are written for people without actual issues in their lives, namely the aristocracy. The upper classes in a way seek trouble and thrilling aspects in fiction, since their own lives are to a degree shielded from the lack of fundamental needs. D.'s reflection directly comments on the distance between the worlds of the different social classes. He also expresses that the upper classes, here represented by L., are so distant from the "other world", meaning the world of the lower social classes, that they get their information on these people partly from these texts. As stated by Rose, these narratives are

exaggerated and not credible, thus L. is bound to be misinformed. L. treats people based on stereotypes or types of characters represented in the literary world.

The ending of the novel is melodramatic, which is ironic since the source of the sentiment is Rose. Although she has said repetitively to D. through the course of the novel that he should not act in this manner. Allott and Farris comment on the ending: "Here Greene resorts to every trick of melodramatic effect, including the last-moment appearance, in the middle of the night and on the high seas, of the 'heroine' herself" (145). Rose has opposed herself to such effects up until this point in the novel, thus it seems as though she gives in to the melodrama in the end. I question whether the ending is as sentimental and melodramatic as Allott and Farris identify. When Rose tells D. that she will run away with him, she says: "I like a man alive – not dead or in prison. I couldn't love you for a month if you were dead. I'm not that sort. I can't be faithful to people I don't see. Like you are" (*CA* 146). Here Rose does not express romantic feelings, which stand in opposition to the connection that Rose makes earlier between sentiments and romance to melodrama. The lack of emotional statements also breaks with the mood which Allott and Farris describe: "You'll be dead very soon: you needn't tell me that, but *now* …" (*CA* 206). Instead of going further with the sentiment in her melodramatic entrance, and make a suggestion that they will live together happy, Rose underlines the finiteness of their reunion. Although she states that "*now*" meaning the near future, and they will have a pleasant time together, she paints a bleak picture of their future.

In my opinion, *The Confidential Agent* is the only one of the three I discuss in my thesis that has a somewhat "happy ending" as Kunkel puts as one of the criterion for an "entertainment". However, the novel does not end with complete happiness, since D. failed his mission and will now be on the run from his own country as a traitor and from Britain as a suspected murderer. At the same time, L. did not succeed either, as told to D. by Forbes when Forbes retrieved D. from the police and saved him: "You haven't got the coal for yourself, but

L. hasn't got it either. We had a meeting early this morning. The risk is too great […] Already there's been a leading article about political gangsters and the civil war being fought out on English soil" (*CA* 193). The businessmen do not want to take the risk now that the public eye is on the situation, I question whether they had gone through with it for a profit it they could avoid a public scandal. D. did not die as Raven and Czinner did, but actually lives with a girl he eventually expressed an interest in. On the ship where the hero and heroine meet, there is a presence of a dark passenger in the form of imminent destruction for D. in the near future, as expressed by Rose. By stating the finiteness of the moment, she also comments on the ephemeral nature of their happiness, and at the ending of the novel.

In this chapter I have discussed how the main characters in the novel *The Confidential Agent* break with the typical main character features of the thriller genre. I consider this kind of deviation a challenge to the thriller genre, by breaking with the traditional generic conventions. I have also shown that the characters' dialogues and reflections express a form of self-reflexivity in the novel. I have shown that through the characters the novel expresses awareness of its existence as a text. The characters also express attitudes towards generic conventions connected to the thriller genre, namely melodrama. The dramatic events and unlikely coincidences in the novel help create the melodrama. However, as I have argued, the novel does not create melodrama uncritically. Most notably D. is characterised with melodramatic gestures, which is commented on and critiqued by Rose. Thus she makes the reader more aware of the place melodrama has in the narrative. This also invites the reader to be aware and more critical towards the generic trait. As I have shown in my analysis of the novel, the discourse and the characterisation of the characters, creates then a form of melodrama, which in my opinion, supported by Brooks, is surprisingly complex.

Conclusion

The aim of this thesis has been to explore the qualities and complexity of three of Graham Greene's so-called "entertainments". By using this generic distinction between novel and "entertainment" as a backdrop for my reading, I have examined the three chosen novel and focused on the ways in which the characters are presented and characterised, as well as on their development and function within the narrative. I have done this in order to see how the novels, through the characters, challenge readers' expectations prompted by the generic label "entertainment"

The first chapter discussed how an unexpectedly complex protagonist challenges the generic notion of "entertainment", by discussing how the protagonist adds significant aspects to *A Gun for Sale*. Through an in-depth reading of the protagonist, I illuminated how the characterisation of Raven changes significantly over the course of the narrative. Raven's development is initiated by his female counterpart, Anne. Her character functions as a trigger to the protagonist's changes. Due to her compassionate behaviour towards Raven, he becomes prone to act more humanely than at the start of the novel. This development contradicts the expectations connected to the classification of this novel as an "entertainment", as done by Greene himself as well as several of his critics. By focusing on aspects of the novel that clearly challenge or contradict these categorisations, I have highlighted facets of the novel that make it more complex. The "entertainment" label, as defined by Greene, underlines the lack of development in the characters as a generic trait, something which Raven's clear change and development contradicts. The complex and multifaceted characterisation of Raven in *A Gun for Sale* thus moves the novel as a whole beyond the category of "mere 'entertainment'".

The second chapter in discussed these complexities from a different angle. Looking at *Stamboul Train*, I explored the two main characters, showing how they play on and deviate

from stereotypes associated with their characters. The narrator characterises Myatt by emphasising his Jewish characteristics, something which turns the readers' attention to his supposedly Jewish traits. While Myatt to some extent embodies and identifies with the traits of the Jewish stereotype, he also challenges and breaks with them. One the one hand he is characterised as a wealthy Jewish business-man in a fur coat, with a cold rational outlook and a willingness to exploit Coral. Over the course of the novel, however, he becomes more caring for her than the Jewish stereotype would lead the reader to expect. Myatt is at first preoccupied with value and how much cost, yet later reveals a capability to show empathy, thus underlining the emotional side to the initially cold Jewish character. In this manner, Myatt challenges and surpasses the stereotype his characterisation is at first based on.

The second protagonist in *Stamboul Train*, Czinner, identifies with the ideology of socialism. Although he sympathises and to some degree identifies with the working class rather than the bourgeois, his actions reveal his close affiliation to the values of a bourgeois life-style. Thus Czinner breaks with the character he makes himself out to be. By illuminating how these characters break with their respective stereotypical characteristics, I have shown that this novel that reveals complexity in relation to characterisation.

The image of the Jew as outsider attempting to assimilate and become unrecognisable is another topic of the novel. The two Jewish characters, Stein and Eckmann, were discussed in terms of removing aspects of their Jewish identity. While Stein operated on his "Jewish" nose, Eckmann converted to Christianity. The discrimination and scrutiny experienced by Myatt invites sympathy for the Jewish characters, and at the same time can serve as an explanation for Stein and Eckmann's attempts at assimilation. Going beyond the stereotypes, the reader's perception of the novel's characters is challenged. The readers are invited to see different Jewish characters characterised in diverse ways, something which paints a more nuanced picture of the Jewish situation and thus challenges the notion of stereotype.

In *The Confidential Agent* I have focused on two elements which, in my reading, are unexpected and do not conform to the label "entertainment". The novel is written within the thriller genre, but the chapter argues that the novel challenges this genre's conventions. The main characters in the novel all break with the typical main characters in a traditional thriller. By placing D., L., and Rose in the most important roles in this thriller, the reader is led to expect that certain character traits will be present in the characters. This expectation is not met, however, and the unexpected character constellations add an additional dimension to the narrative. Moreover, I have argued that the novel shows a mode of self-reflexivity as a text and also of the generic conventions that are present in it. This self-reflexivity is realised through the characters' reflections, attitudes and dialogue. I have shown that the manner in which the characters reflect on their own reality reveals hints of awareness of their own textual nature. There is also commentary and even assessment of generic traits connected to the thriller genre, more specifically to melodrama. It is as though Rose constantly evaluates the presence of melodrama, mostly in a negative manner, which makes the reader of the narrative very aware of the melodrama's presence. The characters function in a way that not only makes them more complex as characters, but also makes the narrative discourse comment on its own construction. I have argued that this makes the novel seemingly more complex than critics have deemed it to be.

Another element all the novels also have in common is the prominence of influential female characters. As I have argued, all of them influence for their male counterparts in important ways. Both Anne and Rose have significant impact on their respective male protagonists, while Coral, although she functions as a character that brings out Myatt's sentiment and compassion, is not as compelling as the other two.

The three novels in my thesis all depict similar themes, which clearly were of importance to Greene in the 1930s. The most prominent recurring theme in the novels is the

notion of the isolated character and the outsider. As I have argued throughout my thesis, all the protagonists of the novels are presented as being on the outside of society. This characteristic is helpful in problematising the characters' situation, and also gives the characters different room for the aspects, which I have argued is been beneficial for the novels.

A further element that supports my discussion on the social commentary present in the novels is the characterisation of the capitalism. The capitalists we meet in Greene's novels are greedy and cold. In *A Gun for Sale*, especially, the greed of the old industrial owner, Sir Marcus, is shown to have potentially catastrophic consequences. The socialist Czinner may serve as a polar opposite of the capitalists, due to his self-proclaimed identity as a Socialist. However, his dire opposition to the bourgeois is overshadowed by the fact that he cannot stand to fraternise with third class passengers on the train. Even in a critique of capitalism, then, Greene does not allow stereotypical and moralistic representations of the left and right to dominate the novels, even though his sympathy is clearly with the outsider.

What indeed is present in all of Greene's work that I have discussed is the characterisation of the bleak world that all of the characters exist within. In all three novels the presence of oncoming war or civil war creates a strong impression of Greene's fallen world. In the decade preceding the worst war in history, the anxiety and uncertainty of the period is eloquently expressed.

The aspects of the characters I have discussed and illuminated in my thesis show that all three novels are more complex than the label "entertainment" makes the reader expect, thus approaching the genre of the novel. This concluding point is linked to, and inspired by, the understanding of the genre novel represented by, amongst others, Mikhail Bahktin.

Although there is a difference in complexity, I have found that all the novels studied here possess elements that make them multi-faceted and engrossing. Thus the distinction in

Greene's authorship between novel and entertainment is not particularly helpful, and it is unfortunate if it to this day makes readers and critics read and treat Greene's works differently. A good novel can surely entertain her reader, and I conclude that all three narratives by Graham Greene discussed in this thesis are entertaining novels.

Works Cited

Abrams, M. H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 9th ed. Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2009. Print.

Adamson, Judith. *Graham Greene: The Dangerous Edge*. Macmillan, 1990. Print.

Allain, Marie-Françoise. *The Other Man: Conversations with Graham Greene*. London: The Bodley Head. 1983. Print.

Atkins, John. *Graham Greene*. London: John Calder, 1957. Print.

Allott, Kenneth and Miriam Farris. *The Art of Graham Greene*. New York: Russell & Russell inc., 1963. Print

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981. Print.

Bergonzi, Bernard. *A Study in Greene: Graham Greene and the Art of the Novel*. Oxford: University Press, 2006. Print.

Bloom, Harold (editor). *Classic Crime and Suspense Writers.* 1995. Print.

Braybrooke, Neville. "Graham Greene: A Pioneer Novelist." College English, Vol 12, No. 1 (Oct. 1950): 1-9. *JSTOR*. Web 18. Sept 2013.

Brooks, Peter. *The Melodramatic Imagination: Balzac, Henry James, Melodrama, and the mode of Excess*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985. Print.

De Vitis, A.A. *Graham Greene*. New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1964. Print.

Diemert, Brian. *Graham Greene's Thrillers and the 1930s*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996. Print.

Forshaw, Barry (Editor). *British Crime Writing: An Encyclopedia Volume I: A-H.*

Friedman, Alan Warren. *Fictional Death & The Modernist Enterprise*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1995. Print.

Greene, Graham. *A Gun for Sale*. 1936. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1963. Print.

---. *A Sort of Life*. 1971. London: Vintage Books, 1999. Print

---. *The Confidential Agent*. 1939. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1965. Print.

---. *Stamboul Train*. London: Vintage Books, 2004. Print.

---. *Ways of Escape*. London: The Bodley Head. 1980. Print

Hoskins, Robert. *Graham Greene: An Approach to the novels*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1999. Print.

"ideology." *Encyclopaedia Britannica. Encyclopaedia Britannica Online Academic Edition.* Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 2014. Web. 23. Mar. 2014. <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/281943/ideology>.

Kunkel, Francis L. *The Labyrinthine Ways of Graham Greene*. Mamaroneck: Paul P. Appel, *Publisher*, 1973. Print.

Lothe, Jakob, Christian Refsum and Unni Solberg. *Litterturvitenskapelig Leksikon*. Oslo: Kunnskapsforlaget, 1999. Print.

Melada, Ivan. "Graham Greene and the Munitions Makers: The Historical Context of *A Gun for Sale*." *Studies in the novel*, Vol 13, No. 3 (1981): 303-321. *JSTOR*. Web 18. Sept. 2013.

Merry, Bruce. *Anatomy of the Spy Thriller*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1977. Print.

Mosse, George L. *The Image of Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinity*. Oxford University Press, 1996. Print.

Palmer, Jerry. *Thrillers: Genesis and Structure of a Popular Genre*. London: Edward Arnold Ltd, 1978. Print.

Phelan, James. *Reading People, Reading Plots: Character, Progression, and the Interpretation of Narrative*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1989. Print.

Pryce-Jones, David. *Graham Greene*. Glasgow: Oliver and Boyd, 1963. Print.

"raven." *Encyclopaedia Britannica. Encyclopaedia Britannica Online Academic Edition.*

Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 2013. Web. 12 Nov. 2013. <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/492234/raven>.

Richetti, John (editor). *The Columbia History of the British Novel*. (1994). Article "Isherwood, Huxley and the Thirties" by Michael Rosenthal.

"self-reflexive" Def. 1. *Merriam Webster Online*, Merriam Webster, n.d. Web. 13. May. 2014. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/self-reflexive>.

Sharrock, Roger. *Saints, Sinners and Comedians: The Novels of Graham Greene*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984. Print.

Shelden, Michael. *Graham Greene: The Enemy Within*. New York: Random House, 1995. Print.

Sherry, Norman. The Life of Graham Greene 1904-1939. Vol I.

Smith, Grahame. *The Achievement of Graham Greene*. Brighton: The Harvester Press Limited, 1986. Print.

"socialism." *Britannica. Encyclopaedia Britannica Online Academic Edition.* Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 2014. Web. 23. Mar. 2014. <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/551569/socialism>.

Thomson, Brian Lindsay. *Graham Greene and the Politics of Popular Fiction and Film*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. 2009. Print.

Wolfe, Peter. *Graham Greene: the Entertainer*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1972. Print.