

Shame and Trust in Male Friendships as Portrayed in E.M. Forster's *A Passage to India* (1924) and
Herman Hesse's *Narcissus and Goldmund* (1930)

Julie van der Wacht (6410081)

Dr. Cathelein Aaftink

Bachelor Thesis Literary Studies

04-06-2021

Utrecht University

6459 words

MLA8

Abstract

The following thesis examines the friendships between the protagonist of E.M. Forster's *A Passage to India* (1924) and Herman Hesse's *Narcissus and Goldmund* (1930). Positioning itself within masculinity studies, the themes shame and trust are used to explore different facets of the friendship between Dr. Aziz and Dr. Fielding, and Narcissus and Goldmund. Both shame and trust are concerned with expectations and assumptions regarding the other person. Applying both themes in an analysis of male friendships results in an extensive insight into the workings of the friendship. The analysis of both themes reveals a hierarchy within both friendships, although the circumstances from which the experience of a hierarchy occurs and the manner in which the characters deal with the hierarchy differ greatly. Further research would benefit from analyzing male friendships in fiction, specifically with attention to hierarchy, while staying close to the subjectivity of experiences of the characters portrayed.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	3
Introduction	4
Chapter Two: Masculinity, Shame, and Trust	8
Chapter Three: Unfulfilled Expectations: Experiencing Shame	12
A Passage to India	
Narcissus and Goldmund	
Conclusion	
Chapter Four: Believing the Expected: Trust	17
A Passage to India	
Narcissus and Goldmund	
Conclusion	
Conclusion	22
Works Cited	24

Introduction

The field of men's studies has experienced recent growth as both the academic world and societal debate have shown a growing interest in men's experiences and attitudes (Plate 108; "Shame and Masculinity" 33). In *The Making of Masculinities*, Harry Brod explains that, while the objective of both men's and women's studies is to map the experiences that define what it means to identify with a certain gender, the focus of the research in both fields differs. He states:

In inverse fashion to the struggle in women's studies to establish the *objectivity* of women's experiences and thereby validate the legitimacy of women's experiences *as women*, much of men's studies struggles to establish the *subjectivity* of men's experiences and thereby validate the legitimacy of men's experiences *as men*. (6)

Brod thus advocates for an approach to men's stories and experiences that pays attention to the multiplicity of male roles, in order to gain a nuanced insight in what it means to identify as a man. In this thesis, Brod's approach will be followed in the analysis of male friendship in the novels *A Passage to India* and *Narcissus and Goldmund*, hereafter *PI* and *N&G*, respectively .

PI (1924) takes place in India during the 1920's when India was still under colonial rule of Great-Britain. The elderly Mrs. Moore travels to India with her future daughter-in-law Adela Quested. Although the English settlers form a close-knit community and contact with the local population is minimal, the two women long to experience the 'real' India and befriend Dr. Aziz, a muslim man who works at the local hospital as a doctor and has lived in India his whole life. Aziz also becomes friends with Dr. Fielding, a British teacher who has recently come over to work in India. The intimacy between the men goes so far that Aziz even shows Fielding a photograph of his now deceased wife. When Aziz offers to take Mrs. Moore, Miss. Quested and Fielding on a day trip to the Marabar Caves, an unexplainable incident takes place here, after which Aziz is arrested on suspicion of sexual harassment, with Fielding being the only Brit supporting Aziz's claim of

innocence. Although Miss. Quested realizes that Dr. Aziz has not wronged her and he is acquitted, relations have become on edge and Fielding returns to England while Aziz moves to the interior of India to work as a doctor there. Years later, the two men meet again and the friendship is reconciled.

N&G (1930) opens in medieval Germany at the cloister school of the monastery Mariabronn. Narcissus is a gifted young teacher and in the beginning of the novel Goldmund becomes a student there. The two quickly befriend, but Narcissus realizes Goldmund is not destined to be monk. After heated discussion, Goldmund comes to the realization that he is connected to the maternal side of life, something Narcissus realized upon their first meeting, and leaves the monastery to search fulfillment in the world outside. Eventually, he sees a sculpture of the holy mother Mary and, taken by its beauty, desires to become a sculptor himself. Despite this succeeding, Goldmund remains restless and ends up in prison for having an affair with the wife of a city councilor. Sentenced to death, a priest comes to take his last confession. This priest turns out to be Narcissus, who frees him and takes Goldmund back to the Mariabronn monastery where he is now abbot. Goldmund becomes house sculptor and finds some peace in the monastic life, but desires to have one last adventure. This adventure becomes fatal and Goldmund dies with Narcissus at his side.

Due to the differences and similarities between the novels, a comparison provides valuable insight into the function of male friendships within the time periods the novels were written in.

Both novels were written and published in Europe shortly after World War I in a period known in literary history as modernism. I apply Sarah Cole's definition of 'modernism' in *Modernism, Male Friendships, and the First World War*, which refers to

a sensibility and a set of forms, themes, and practices attributed most often to highly self-conscious artificers between about 1880 and 1940, who tended to stress the many depletions left in the wake of the Enlightenment's troubled ideals, and to construct for their

era what they viewed as challenging new languages, narrative practices, character types, and forms of spiritual authority. (13-14)

Comparing the friendships in these novels offers a valuable insight into intimate male relations in fiction. Finally, both *PI* and *N&G* feature a friendship formed in context where the two people are not each other's equal. Fielding is Aziz's superior as a white Englishman in India and a native Indian during the British Raj and Narcissus is Goldmund's superior given their positions in the monastery. A notable difference between the novels is the nature of the inequality. The inequality between Fielding and Aziz is that of the colonial system, while the inequality between Narcissus and Goldmund is based on their positions in the monastery and, as becomes apparent later, on spiritual development. The inequality between Fielding and Aziz is part of a broad social system based on innate inequality through race, while the inequality between Narcissus and Goldmund can be resolved through personal growth. The current analysis of these novels gives insight in the differences and similarities of how the characters handle the inequality at the start of their friendship.

The two central themes in the analysis of the novels are shame and trust. Shame revolves around the idea of not living up to someone else's expectations; therefore, shame is relative to another person. Trust, on the other hand, is the projection of assumptions on others that are thought to be true. Thus, shame and trust are both concerned with the image of another person, be it in a different way. It follows that the themes of shame and trust highlight different facets within the friendships, which ultimately show how their relationships work. Analyzing both themes will give extensive insight into the relationship portrayed in them. Therefore, this thesis explores the question: What roles do shame and trust play in the relationship of the male protagonists in *A Passage to India* (1924) and the protagonist in *Narcissus and Goldmund* (1930)?

In order to answer this question, I first analyze the different approaches that explain how masculinity and femininity originated in a person, zooming in on characteristics associated with

masculinity. This is done because gender is influential regarding the experiences and attitudes surrounding a person (Brod and Kaufman 4). Exploring this allows me to extrapolate the different ways in which the characters shape themselves and develop friendships around these notions of masculinity. In this theoretical framework, I also discuss theories on shame and trust in relation to masculinity and friendship, which will be useful in the analyses of the two novels that follows. My analysis of the novels yields the insights that both friendships feature a hierarchy, but whereas in the case of Narcissus and Goldmund this hierarchy can be resolved through self-acceptance and interpersonal communication, the hierarchy between Fielding and Aziz is characteristic of a larger social system and attempts to resolve the hierarchy within the friendship are lacking.

Chapter Two: Masculinity, Shame, and Trust

In “The Bonds of Men: Problems and Possibilities in Close Male Relationships” Drury Sherrod explains the four approaches to understanding why men and women have different attitudes regarding and during interpersonal relationships. First, the psychoanalytic perspective postulates that men and women have different kinds of ego boundaries based on their relationships with their parents during childhood. Mothers favor their daughters because they are of the same gender, while seeing their sons as a “definite other” (223). Consequently, girls develop a stronger sense of empathy, first with their mothers and later with other people around them, while boys grow up eager to express their independence and autonomy (222-25). Secondly, the biological perspective on gender states that differences between men and women originate at a hormonal level. The hormones men produce make them more aggressive in comparison to the hormones women produce, and that this aggression can be observed in various ways, either publicly or privately, as men are more competitive, outspoken and play larger roles in the public sphere (225-27). Thirdly, according to the socialization perspective, boys and girls are treated differently by their parents, school, media, and other social institutions. Consequently, boys and girls grow up in different social environments, which teaches boys they need to be dominant, in control and not show any emotion other than rage (Barker and Galasiński 92-93; hooks 6; 18; 55; Kimmel 136; Sherrod 227-29). In *Masculinities*, R.W. Connell explains that the social environment one grows up in produces a general set of expectations that differ depending on gender. By internalizing those expectations boys and girls are socialized to behave and think in a certain way (Connell 22). Lastly, the economic-historical perspective states that definitions of masculinity and femininity are interwoven with economic and historical developments. The rise of capitalism being a notable development in dividing men and women in attitude and behavior, making men competitive and restless (Kimmel 123; Meijer 130; Sherrod 229-33). Sherrod concludes that the differences in gender roles are established in all four

perspectives rather than four separate spaces, because there is not one perspective that covers the complexity of gender and gender roles in its entirety (234). As evidenced by the importance given to social context in which the novels take place and the role of expectations in the friendship, this thesis will adopt a socialization and economic-historical perspective on masculinity. Masculinity will thus be regarded as a set of characteristics shaped by economic and historic forces a man is taught to portray.

The success of the portrayal of this set of characteristics that define masculinity, is determined, according to Michael Kimmel, by other men. He states: “Other men watch us, rank us, grant our acceptance into the realm of manhood. Manhood is demonstrated for other men’s approval” (128). Thus, the essence of relationships between men revolves around the portrayal of masculine identity. In accordance, hooks expresses that an important part of relationships between men is to socialize each other into behaving ‘manly’ (143). Intimacy would not occur in male relationships, as it requires vulnerability and admitting to having emotional depth which cannot be reconciled with emotional numbness that is characteristic of the masculinity. The seeming impossibility of vulnerability in male relationships, among which friendships, make shame and trust in male friendships interesting to analyse in the context of masculinity, as, both shame and masculinity require vulnerability and involve expectations. In *Shame and Her Sisters*, Silvan Tomkins introduces the influential idea that it is necessary to be interested in someone or something in order for shame to occur (134). His notion of interest was developed further by Elspeth Probyn. In *Blush: Faces of Shame*, Probyn takes Tomkins’ idea of interest as a primary condition for experiencing shame and conceptualizes it as the desire for connection. The source of shame then becomes a loss of connection or non-return of the desire to connect (14). This explanation of shame is applicable to interpersonal relationships, but does not fully explain why shame can be experienced in relation to something other than humans. It is therefore worth while to look at a different interpretation of interest. In *Shame: The Exposed Self*, Lewis explains interest as a desire

to adhere to standards, goals and rules. Shame is the result of a dissonance between this set of standards, goals, and rules and one's (past) actions and behavior (75). Feeling ashamed is the feeling of failure, when previously performed behavior is not in line with the perceived expectations. Probyn and Lewis explain Silvan Tomkins' theory that interest is prior to experience shame differently, but their approaches are not mutually exclusive and can in certain cases even occur at the same time. What emerges as the essence of shame, is a desire to obtain something, a connection, goal, or standard, and a failure to obtain it. The vulnerability of shame is the expression of interest and the consequent failure to live up to that interest. When constructing gender, shame can serve a disciplinary function as by shaming people who do not behave in accordance with gender norms, it is ensured that standards of behavior prevail (Meijer 132). In explaining shame in the context of masculinity, Ernst van Alphen points to the requirement of masculinity to be an "independent, initiating subject" ("When Shame and" 11). Shame, being an unsuccessful attempt to connect or achieve a goal or standard, is not only a failure of that attempt, but also a failure to adhere to a masculine characteristic. Shame can, in itself, be a cause for more shame, as it entails a failure of initiative and requires vulnerability. Both these characteristics do not align with the characteristics of masculinity.

Vulnerability also plays a role when it comes to trusting someone. In *Trust in Modern Society* Misztal describes how trust is intertwined with uncertainty. Since one cannot know what someone thinks or how they will act, trusting always involves an "element of risk": Will the person you trust live up to that trust? (18). To minimize the risk that trust is disappointed, the decision to trust in someone is based on the belief that you share a moral framework with that person. A shared moral framework means that you share ways of giving meaning to and understanding the world. This allows for anticipation of what someone thinks or how someone will behave (22-24). Trust is thus the belief that someone will live up to a certain set of expectations that are based on a shared moral framework. Obtaining trust is necessary for a friendship to thrive, so both actors in the

friendship must intimately know each other to learn what motivates the other to establish a sense of a shared intimate relationship (191). The vulnerability that is required for trust, does not seem to be able to reconcile the nature of male friendships aimed at controlling each other for display of masculine personality traits.

Trust can also have an influence on the person who the trust is installed in. Expressing trust in someone makes the other person aware of expectations you have of them and can thereby influence the other person's self-image and behavior. Feeling you have failed someone's trust can cause shame because you have not lived up to someone else's expectations. Here, Lewis' conceptualization of shame as failure to live up to expectations and Probyn's conceptualization of shame as loss of connection come together. Given the uncertainty that comes with trusting, the vulnerability of trust lies in the possibility that the trust might be broken.

Descriptions of male friendship in fiction paint a more positive picture regarding the possibility of intimacy. Sarah Cole notes that the theme of life-long loyalty is absent in modernist literature. She explains that notions such as love, friendship and commitment were put under pressure in the post-WWI environment of intense violence and loss. Writers began to favor short moments of connection over friendships lasting a lifetime and therefore, as Cole explains, "we often find tender descriptions of passing exchanges with strangers, moments of generosity, mutuality and commonality" ("Modernism, Male Intimacy" 478). Friendships often end after a short period of time, due to a combination of internal contradiction, that is to say, conflict within the friendship, and external constraint, meaning that the world outside the friendship causes the friendship to collapse in some way (*Modernism, Male Friendship* 6). As a consequence these friendships are often marked by disappointment and failure (*Modernism, Male Friendship* 6).

Chapter Three: Unfulfilled Expectations: Experiencing Shame

Shame can be conceptualized as both a failure to connect with a person of interest as well as a failure to live up to what is expected of you. Regardless of which explanation of interest is applicable, shame results from the feeling that this interest has failed to be reciprocated. In the subsequent chapter, the influence shame can have and the situations shame is experienced will be analyzed in the friendships between Aziz and Fielding, and Narcissus and Goldmund.

A Passage to India

The friendship between Fielding and Aziz is interracially unequal in a context where Aziz, as a native Indian, is inferior in social status to Fielding, who is white and British. The inequality in the colonial society is reflected in the friendship, which becomes apparent in Aziz's experiences of shame. The complexities of interracial friendship is the subject of discussion between Aziz and his friends in the beginning of the second chapter. While Aziz is skeptical of even the possibility to be friends with an Englishman, he and Fielding like each other upon first meeting, which foregrounds the genuineness of their affection (75). Despite this instant mutual feeling of friendship, Aziz's inferior position in comparison with Fielding causes him to feel ashamed about his house. Even before Fielding has given Aziz any reason to expect a visit from him, Aziz observes "[i]f he entered this room the disgrace of it would kill me" (104) and when Fielding comes to visit unexpectedly, Aziz feels "disheveled and bad" (117). Aziz brings the cause of his shame, the state of his house, in relation to his race, as he remarks to Fielding: "Here's the celebrated hospitably of the East. Look at the flies. Look at the chunk coming off the walls. Isn't it jolly? Now I suppose you want to be off, having seen an oriental interior" (117). Being and behaving as, Aziz feels, is associated with the 'orient' is a cause for shame for him in his friendship with Fielding as he feels it would be a cause for Fielding to end the friendship ("Now I suppose you want to be off [...]") (117) The reader does

not get an insight into Fielding's feelings regarding the room, but although he does not refute Aziz's remark that he would find the room repulsive, he sits and talks. It is here that the first real moment of intimacy between the men occurs - as Aziz decides to show Fielding a photograph of his now deceased wife. Aziz's connection between his shame and his race occurs again later in the book when Aziz expresses his suspicion that Fielding is pursuing a relationship with Miss Quested. When Fielding curtly dismisses this, Aziz, "cut to the heart" declares: "the licentious oriental imagination was at work" (247). Again, at the moment Aziz fears he has offended Fielding and (momentarily) lost connection, he attributes the behavior that causes him shame to his racial identity.

On the surface, the reason for Aziz to be ashamed is caused by a loss of connection and the fear that the friendship with Fielding will come to an end as consequence of this. By connection the behavior that brings him shame to his race, Aziz's shame also entails a variation of Lewis' understanding of shame as a failure to live up to a norm. Aziz evidently feels he has lived up to a norm regarding his race and that this is precisely what makes him ashamed. This curious origin of shame can be explained by the social system against which the friendship develops. Within the colonial system, Aziz's race makes him of inferior social states in relation to Fielding. The manner in which Aziz deals with his shame shows his awareness of the unusual occurrence that is his friendship with Fielding and the inferior social position he officially holds. Aziz shows an awareness the complexity and even the impossibility of maintaining a friendship with Fielding under colonial rule, to an extent that Fielding does not. This is shown when during an encounter between him and Fielding at the end of the novel the following conversation ensues

"yes, we shall drive every blasted Englishman into the sea, and then' ... 'and then,' he concluded, half kissing him, 'you and I shall be friends.' 'Why can't we be friends now?' said the other, holding him affectionately. 'It's what I want. It's what you want.'" (289)

The colonial hierarchy is also represented in Fielding's lack of shame. Fielding notices a loss of connection after the misunderstanding where Aziz informs after his relationship with Miss Quested

and seeks to clear the air, but when this is unsuccessful, he feels sadness rather than shame for his own behavior (252). Fielding's lack of shame shows his confidence in his own position in the friendship, which in itself is not harmful. What is harmful for his friendship with Aziz is that Fielding neither acknowledges nor refutes the cause of Aziz shame, ultimately allowing it to contribute to their breach and Aziz's turn against the British community altogether.

Narcissus and Goldmund

Much like in *PI*, in *N&G* only one of the two friends experiences shame: Goldmund is ashamed on multiple occasions at the beginning of the friendship, while Narcissus does not experience shame. However, instead of Aziz's shame in *PI*, Goldmund's shame does not stem from societal hierarchy, but from a lack of self-acceptance. The first instant Goldmund feels ashamed in relation to Narcissus is when he loses control and starts crying in front of him after Narcissus informs about his wellbeing (24). At this point, Goldmund plans on living a monastic life and, by extension, aims to be like Narcissus, who is very stoic (15; 21). Narcissus however does not think the outburst to be shameful and, more than anything, sees it as a confirmation of his suspicion about Goldmund's nature. Narcissus namely observes that, against Goldmund's desire, he and Goldmund are very differently natured and that Narcissus is connected to the paternal side of life and Goldmund to the maternal side of life. This entails that Goldmund is destined to be an artist and a lover, while Narcissus is destined to be a thinker and a scholar (43; 61; 159; 167; 311). Goldmund tries to repress his connection to the maternal, but with the help of Narcissus comes to accept his connection to the maternal and decides to leave the monastery to realize his true self (77). Only after years of travel and exploration does Goldmund fully understand what it means to be connected to the maternal.

Goldmund's feelings of shame stem from the belief that he wants to be like Narcissus and, at the same time, be Narcissus' friend. As shame is brought on by instances where he does not behave

as he expects Narcissus to have behaved in his situation, it seems that the source of Goldmund's shame is a fear that the friendship will come to an end. Narcissus functions here as projection of a deeper occurrence within Goldmund that makes him ashamed of his connection to the maternal and, by extension, his connection to the feminine. This is underscored by the disappearance of shame for his emotions when Goldmund realizes he is connected to the maternal, and the absence of shame when Goldmund returns to the monastery much later in the novel when he has realized his true self. Narcissus' role in overcoming the shame is remarkable as it is in contrast to theories on male friendships described earlier, where the main function of male friendship is to socialize each other into behaving masculine. However, Narcissus helps Goldmund accept his connection to the feminine and continuously reassures him they can be friends (32; 41-43; 63).

Conclusion

In both friendships, shame occurs when either Aziz or Goldmund feels the friendship runs the risk of not developing further. However, for both Aziz and Goldmund the fear to lose the friendship with, respectively, Fielding and Narcissus is characteristic of a deeper reason for shame. At the moments Aziz feels his friendship with Fielding is suffering, he expresses shame for his race, thereby showing awareness of his lower social position. Goldmund's struggle with his connection to the maternal leads him to be ashamed when he responds to that side of himself, namely by experiencing and expressing emotions. In contrast to Aziz's shame in *PI*, Goldmund is able to overcome his shame partly because Narcissus ensures Goldmund they can still be friends and equals despite their differences, and partly given the nature of Goldmund's shame. Whereas Aziz's shame reflects societal inequality and to be able to lift this shame the colonial system needs to change, Goldmund's shame namely stems from a personal judgement of value where he prefers the paternal over the maternal. Narcissus' large role in helping Goldmund to overcome his shame is in contrast with previous descriptions of male friendships that describe the relations as centered around

successful portrayal of masculine characteristics. Fielding on the other hand, does not refute the manner in which Aziz relates his shame to his race and thereby seems to agree with Aziz's comments and, by extension, the racial hierarchy imposed by colonialism. Fielding's treatment thereby is in line with Cole's description of friendships in modernist literature, as it contributes to Aziz's disappointment in Fielding and a disappointment in the British community altogether.

Chapter Four: Believing the Expected: Trust

As explained earlier, trusting someone means expressing a belief that the other person will meet certain set expectations you have of them. The basis of this belief is a conviction that the other person experiences a sense of obligation to meet these expectations, which is based on the idea of sharing a similar worldview. In this chapter I analyse instances where trust is expressed in the friendships between Aziz and Fielding, and Narcissus and Goldmund and the influence these expressions of trust have.

A Passage to India

Cole has argued that Fielding “occupies the role of potential mimic” by being relatively independent from institutions and his ability to move between different cultures (*Modernism, Male Friendship* 86). This makes a friendship with Aziz, a native-Indian and muslim, possible as their friendship can form around the “Muslim convention and family practice” that Aziz is used to and urges on (*Modernism, Male Friendship* 87). While Aziz initiates intimacy when he shows Fielding a photograph of his wife, thereby encouraging the development of the friendship, I would argue that Fielding also shapes the friendship by assuming knowledge over Aziz. Fielding arrives at the Marabar caves after the incident that results in Aziz’s arrest, and he therefore was not present at the moment of the supposed assault. Despite this gap of knowledge, Fielding’s initial reaction when he hears the reason for Aziz’s arrest is disbelief (158) and Fielding remains convinced of Aziz’s innocence throughout his arrest and the trial that ensues. This position bears witness to a tremendous trust in Aziz, but at the same time feels misplaced since Fielding claims knowledge over Aziz with a conviction that he, because of his late arrival at the caves, does not have. Fielding’s certainty could be explained by the social context in which the friendship takes place. His support of Aziz is the support of friend, but nonetheless of a friend who carries within him the colonial

paradigm that he, as a white man, is allowed to make assumptions regarding the behavior of non-white people. At the same time, Fielding puts himself in a vulnerable position towards his fellow Brits in India. For his support of a native man against a British woman, Fielding is cast out of the British community. In response, Fielding does not try to strengthen his ties with the indigenous Indians in an effort to become part of their community, but decides to return to England (249). This decision shows that he can be friends with Indians, but feels that he first and foremost is a British citizen. Fielding's trust thus bears witness to the complex intersection of affection for Aziz and a willingness to forsake the British community, and an illustration of colonial hierarchy in his far-reaching claim of knowledge over Aziz.

An example of Aziz's trust, and how his initiative to develop the friendship is based on Muslim customs, is evident in Aziz's decision to show Fielding a photograph of his wife. This decision is motivated most likely by a desire to show Fielding he appreciates him and wants to develop their relationship - that is the showing of the photograph is followed by Aziz's explanation that he has only shown his wife to people he regards as brothers: "All men are my brothers, and as soon as one behaves as such he may see my wife" (118). Aziz's explanation, combined with the understanding that Aziz's shame for his house is caused by the fear for a break of his connection with Fielding, support the notion that Aziz's trust is motivated by a desire to be friends.

Trust in the friendship of Fielding and Aziz is marked by its intercultural nature. Aziz shows trust and affection for Fielding in accordance with Islamic culture, thereby making himself vulnerable because, as discussed in chapter three, behavior that he regards non-British is also a great source of shame in his friendship with Fielding. Aziz's trust is thus a vulnerable moment for him, thereby showing the depth of his desire to deepen his friendship with Fielding. In Fielding's trust of Aziz, the intercultural nature of their friendship is also apparent, be it more implicit. While Fielding's trust in Aziz's innocence comes from a place of genuine affection for Aziz, the certainty of Fielding's trust is characteristic of the larger framework of the colonial system where he, as a

white man, can make assumptions about behavior and inner-workings of non-white people. The trust Fielding has in Aziz is indicative of the affection Fielding has for Aziz, but also bears witness of the hierarchy that is implicit in how the two cultures relate to each other.

Narcissus and Goldmund

A similar dynamic of trust where one person believes they have knowledge over the other person in the friendship and, on the basis of this knowledge, makes assumptions about the other person, is evident in the friendship of Narcissus and Goldmund. Narcissus is convinced that he understands Goldmund's nature and, as becomes clear in the following citation, this knowledge regarding Goldmund's nature is bound up with expectations of how Goldmund will behave:

And Narcissus did not believe that Goldmund was destined for the ascetic life. More clearly than anyone else, he knew how to read human beings, and here, loving as he did, he read with intensified clarity. He saw Goldmund's nature which, despite their polarities, he intimately understood, since it was the other, lost half of his own. (28)

In recognizing Goldmund as his counterpart, Narcissus trusts Goldmund will not live a scholarly life in the monastery (see also: 32; 34; 39; 43; 60). Goldmund himself has very different ideas regarding his future and, as discussed in the previous chapter, rejects Narcissus' view that he is not fit to live in a monastery (32; 40-41). However, after one conversation in which Narcissus reminds Goldmund of his childhood, Goldmund experiences a revelation that leads him to agree with Narcissus that he should leave to monastery (43). What follows is what Charles Winquist calls a "life-long recovery of the fullness of the personality" that ends in a "reunion with the natural self" (101), because although Goldmund now believes he is not fit to live in the monastery he does not know what it entails to be his true self (62). Narcissus' expression of trust thus indirectly does have an influence on Goldmund's actions and even his self-image by awaken something in Goldmund that will cause a revelation.

Eventually, Narcissus and Goldmund have become true equals as Goldmund has gained insight into his own nature to the same extent Narcissus already had at the beginning of the novel (289). The conversations the men have when Goldmund returns to the monastery at the end of the novel show Goldmund's spiritual growth as he is not only an artist, as Narcissus predicted he would be, but is also able to explain his philosophy on art and how art relates to being able to realize his true self (268; 274).

In contrast to the trust between Aziz and Fielding, here the claim of knowledge should not be understood in light of social position, but in light of spiritual development. Narcissus is further along in this development and this is reflected in the insight that he and Goldmund are each other's counterparts. After Goldmund has developed himself and is able to see what his true nature is and how to convey it, Narcissus and Goldmund are able to be equal.

Conclusion

The same mechanism of trust is visible in *PI* and *N&G*, whereby Fielding and Narcissus express great certainty regarding their trust in, respectively, Aziz and Goldmund. This certainty comes from the experience of a hierarchy in the friendship. Fielding is of a higher social position in relation to Aziz from which he believes he can estimate how Aziz acts. Compared to Goldmund, Narcissus is more spiritually evolved at the beginning of the friendship, which is reflected in the latter's insight into both their natures. Throughout the narrative Goldmund develops and gains insight into what it entails to be connected to his true nature. This development's development leads him to an understanding of what it entails to be connected to the maternal. At the end of the novel, Goldmund, like Narcissus at the beginning of the book, has insight into his true nature. The men are now equals which is evidenced by the discussion on the meaning of art where both men show great insight into each other's natures. The uncertainty that Misztal sees as inseparable from trust is missing, and with

that the vulnerability comes with trusting someone. The trust of Fielding and Narcissus therefor does not break with the set of characteristics of masculinity described in chapter two.

Conclusion

The question central in this thesis was as follows: What roles do shame and trust play in the relationship of the male protagonists in *A Passage to India* (1924) and the protagonist in *Narcissus and Goldmund* (1930)? To answer this question I have analyzed the occurrences of shame and trust in the friendships between Aziz and Fielding, and Narcissus and Goldmund and ultimately conclude that shame and trust bear witness to the experience of inequality within the friendship.

In analysing shame, I have observed that the fear of loss of the friendship is a significant actuator for shame. Only one person in the friendships experiences shame, namely Aziz and Goldmund, and it is emphasized in both novels that the characters' shame is the result of them having failed their own internalized expectations, which is underscored by the fear that their friend will no longer want to be friends for not having performed the way they should have. However, this fear of losing the friendship is characteristic of a deeper cause for shame. Aziz repeatedly relates the behavior of which is ashamed to his race, thereby showing awareness of his lower position within the social system. In *N&G*, Goldmund feels ashamed when his behavior is not in alignment with the characteristics described as 'masculine' by theorists in the field of gender, such as Sherrod, hooks, and Kimmel. Narcissus functions here as a model for what Goldmund wants to be. Eventually, however, Goldmund can make peace with his feminine characteristics and no longer feels ashamed.

In analysing trust, I have observed that the most notable instances of trust, namely Fielding's trust in Aziz's innocence and Narcissus' trust in his insight into Goldmund's nature, bear witness to a hierarchy between friends. Fielding's higher social position in relation to Aziz leads him to regard his assumption as truth, while Narcissus' further spiritual development in relation to Goldmund provides him with an insight into Goldmund from which he can estimate how Goldmund should act to realize his true nature. The uncertainty that, according to Misztal, is characteristic of trust is lacking in these descriptions, making it a very 'masculine form of trust.

What emerges from taking shame and trust together, is the experience of a hierarchy in the friendship. The friendship between Aziz and Fielding is marked by the hierarchy within the colonial system against which their friendship develops, of which, as is reflected in Aziz's shame and Fielding's confidence, both men are aware. The hierarchy between Narcissus and Goldmund is based on spiritual development as Goldmund discovers what his true nature entails throughout the book and eventually develops to the same point as Narcissus, causing the hierarchy between the friends that is apparent at the beginning of the novel, to be lifted. Narcissus is influential in Goldmund's self-acceptance partly by awakening awareness of the maternal connection and partly by refuting Goldmund's fear that behaving in accordance with the maternal will cause their friendship to end. The role Narcissus plays in Goldmund's self-acceptance is contrary to Kimmel's theory on male relationships, whereby male friendships serve to socialize each other into masculinity. Narcissus, however, helps Goldmund express his true, maternal, nature. The hierarchy between Aziz and Fielding is inherent in the colonial system and can only be dissolved when the colonial system ceases to exist

By reflecting on the nuances in which friendships differ from each other, I have put into practice Brod's plea for men's studies in which the plurality of men's experiences are central. Further research is needed to give insight into the workings of male friendship, but the findings of this thesis suggest that a hierarchy of some kind can form part of a friendship between men. I would propose analysing more novels featuring male friendships to explore the occurrence and impact of a social hierarchy on male friendships, as in *PI*, or the role of personal development in the friendships, as in *N&G*.

Works Cited

- Alphen, Ernst van. "When Shame and Masculinity Collude and Collide". *Shame! And Masculinity*, edited by Ernst van Alphen Amsterdam, Valiz, 2020, pp. 9–14.
- - - . "Shame and Masculinity in Visual Culture". *Shame! and Masculinity*, edited by Ernst van Alphen, Amsterdam, Valiz, 2021, pp. 33–63.
- Barker, Chris and Dariusz Galasiński. *The Name of the Father*. Canada, SAGE Publications, 2001.
- Brod, Harry. "Introduction: Themes and Theses of Men's Studies". *The Making of Masculinities (Routledge Revivals): The New Men's Studies*, United Kingdom, Routledge, 2015, pp. 1–17.
- Brod, Harry and Michael Kaufman. "Introduction". *Theorizing Masculinities*, edited by Michael Kaufman and Harry Brod, Canada, SAGE Publications, 1994, pp. 119–41.
- Cole, Sarah. *Modernism, Male Friendship, and the First World War*. United Kingdom, Cambridge UP, 2003.
- - - . "Modernism, Male Intimacy, and the Great War". *ELH*, vol. 68, nr. 2, 2001, pp. 469–500. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/30031977.
- Forster, E. *A Passage to India*. United Kingdom, England, 2008.
- Hammond, Dorothy and Alta Jablow. "Gilgamesh and the Sundance Kid: The Myth of Male Friendship". *The Making of Masculinities (Routledge Revivals): The New Men's Studies*, edited by Harry Brod, United Kingdom, Routledge, 2015, pp. 241–58.
- Hesse, Hermann. *Narcissus and Goldmund*. United Kingdom, Penguin Random House, 2017.
- hooks, bell. *The Will To Change*. United States, Simon & Schuster, 2005.
- Kimmel, Michael S. "Masculinity as Homophobia: Fear, Shame, and Silence in the Construction of Gender Identity". *Theorizing Masculinities*, edited by Michael Kaufman and Harry Brod, Canada, SAGE Publications, 1994, pp. 119–41.
- Lewis, Michael. *Shame: The Exposed Self*. New York, Free Press, 1992.

- Meijer, Maaïke. "Father Shame? In Search of Post-Patriarchal Authority". *Shame! And Masculinity*, edited by Ernst van Alphen, Amsterdam, Valiz, 2020, pp. 123–39.
- Misztal, Barbara. *Trust in Modern Societies*. Nederland, Amsterdam UP, 1996.
- Plate, Liedeke. "The Arena of Masculinity: Willem Stoner and Masculinity Studies". *Doing Gender in Media, Art and Culture*, edited by Rosemarie Buikema e.a., United-Kingdom, Routledge, 2017, pp. 106–22.
- Probyn, Elspeth. *Blush*. Nederland, Amsterdam UP 2005.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky and Irving Alexander. *Shame and Its Sisters*. The Netherlands, Amsterdam UP, 1995.
- Sherrod, Drurry. "The Bonds of Men: Problems and Possibilities in Close Male Relationships". *The Making of Masculinities (Routledge Revivals): The New Men's Studies*, edited by Harry Brod, United Kingdom, Routledge, 2015, pp. 213–39.
- Winqvist, Charles E. "The Act of Storytelling and the Self's Homecoming". *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, vol. 42, nr. 1, 1974, pp. 101–13. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/1461530