THE UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND
AUSTRALIA

The Wolf-King of Rome:

Viewpoint as a tool for classical reception in children's historical fiction

Christopher Spensley

Master of Arts; Bachelor of Arts

A thesis submitted for the degree of Master of Philosophy at

The University of Queensland in 2014

School of English, Media Studies and Art History

Abstract

This paper argues that the narratological technique of viewpoint is a fundamentally important mechanism for engaging young readers with classical antiquity through historical fiction. The creative portion of this paper uses close viewpoint in its third-person narration so that its viewpoint characters are readily identifiable and believable to young readers. The viewpoint characters—three young Roman children of varying social class—are caught up together and must fight against a plot to revive the Wolf-King, a werewolf entity tied to Rome's ancient beginnings. It forms the first 30,000 words of a children's fiction novel that blends historical fiction with fantastical elements.

Children's historical fiction offers its readers the chance to interact with historical events, societies, and cultures (Ringrose 2007 p 212), though this requires the author to have effective command of narratological techniques. Young people's reading habits naturally vary, though identifiable protagonist characters seem to play a significant role in engaging many young people with reading (Hughes-Hessel & Rodge 2007 p 27, et al). The technique of viewpoint allows the writer to focalise the narration tightly upon the subjective thoughts, reactions and experiences of its protagonist character or characters (McCallum 1999 p 30). This can be achieved through both first- and third-person narration, and allows the writer to build readers' empathy and understanding of characters and their perspectives.

<u>Declaration by author</u>

This thesis is composed of my original work, and contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference has been made in the text. I have clearly stated the contribution by others to jointly-authored works that I have included in my thesis.

I have clearly stated the contribution of others to my thesis as a whole, including statistical assistance, survey design, data analysis, significant technical procedures, professional editorial advice, and any other original research work used or reported in my thesis. The content of my thesis is the result of work I have carried out since the commencement of my research higher degree candidature and does not include a substantial part of work that has been submitted to qualify for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution. I have clearly stated which parts of my thesis, if any, have been submitted to qualify for another award.

I acknowledge that an electronic copy of my thesis must be lodged with the University Library and, subject to the General Award Rules of The University of Queensland, immediately made available for research and study in accordance with the *Copyright Act 1968*.

I acknowledge that copyright of all material contained in my thesis resides with the copyright holder(s) of that material. Where appropriate I have obtained copyright permission from the copyright holder to reproduce material in this thesis.

Publications during candidature

Conference abstracts

Spensley, Christopher. "History Through My Eyes: Viewpoint and Classical Antiquity in

Children's Fiction." Classical Association Conference. Novotel Hotel, Reading, UK. 6 April

2013.

Publications included in this thesis

Spensley, Christopher. "History Through My Eyes: Viewpoint and Classical Antiquity in

Children's Fiction." Classical Association Conference. Novotel Hotel, Reading, UK. 6 April

2013.

<u>Contributions by others to the thesis</u>

No contributions by others.

<u>Statement of parts of the thesis submitted to qualify for the award of another degree</u>

None.

Acknowledgements

Keywords

Australian and New Zealand Standard Research Classifications (ANZSRC)

ANZSRC code: 190402 Creative Writing (incl. Playwriting), 90%

ANZSRC code: 210306 Classical Greek and Roman History, 10%

Fields of Research (FoR) Classification

FoR code: 1904, Performing Arts & Creative Writing, 90%

FoR code: 2103, Historical Studies, 10%

Critical exegesis

Introduction

In this thesis, I will be examining techniques for writers of children's historical fiction in constructing historical context. These practices are particularly significant for writers of children's fiction, where historical context serves as a key selling point both for young readers and for their educators. My research will explore how narratological techniques can support writers in constructing authentic historical contexts that engage young readers. In particular, I will focus on how the figure of the viewpoint character is a key tool to service both functions effectively. Moloney notes that boys in particular tend to strongly connect with 'well defined, likeable and identifiable' viewpoint characters in order to want to read a book or series of books (13). I will therefore argue that viewpoint character is a fundamentally important narrative technique to reconstruct history through fiction.

This paper will explore the writer's perspective on an area of research that, until now, has been largely dominated by literary and educational theorists. There has long been a significant movement in children's literary theory that recognises how child readers consume narrative in a vastly different way from the way adults do. The theorist Peter Hunt was an early exponent of recognising these differences in 1985, which has led to an academic discussion that has explored how the literary and educational fields can support one another and, crucially, young people. Historical fiction is a prime example of this trend, as it has taken on a pedagogical task in supporting historical study. On current trend, historical fiction has become at least analogous with textbooks for historical veracity (den Heyer and Fidyk 2007). The perspective of the writer—a core stakeholder— has seldom been the focus of any study in this area, however, which leaves a gap to explore how writers as practitioners fit into this process. Therefore, this study will support previous areas of

study by exploring practical techniques for the writer to effectively recreate historical contexts specifically for younger readers.

As a genre, historical fiction is defined by its intrinsic use of these historical contexts. Furbank defines the genre as being '(more or less) created by Walter Scott and belonging to the nineteenth century or after' (94–95). Certainly, Scott is fundamental to the development of the genre, but Margaronis asserts that with the modernist and postmodernist movements foregrounding the inherent subjectivity of experience, the genre can no longer be classified by Scott's model of an omniscient and authoritative narrator figure (139). She argues that historical fiction has become 'the literature of testimony', but that testimony being a subjective experience of event cannot claim an empirical position of authority insofar as historical accuracy is concerned (139–40). Furbank, on the other hand, creates a view of historical fiction that rejects many of the concepts of postmodernism and subjectivity, claiming that most modern historical fiction novels lack authenticity (96). This lack of authenticity is due to what Henry James called the 'cheap way' of creating historical fiction, namely that the historicity of the historical context is fatally undermined by the inventions of the author (cited in Furbank 94). Furbank's arguments are problematic, not least because they hinge on the concept that history is objective. James's arguments, made prior to the rise of postmodernism, hardly hold value for the current state of the historical fiction genre. Bramwell's argument that concepts of historical accuracy are not set in stone, but are themselves culturally dependent (109–10) ring true: audiences are naturally disposed to accept a 'version' of history that sits most comfortably with their own normative values and beliefs.

Subjectivity is, therefore, inherent in how individuals perceive the events of history. This concept underpins the ideas raised by Linda Hutcheon in what she describes as 'historiographical metafiction', a deliberate problematising of historical 'certainty' by challenging accepted notions and privileging individuals who would have been marginalised by the dominant historical record

(69). Stevenson suggests that this critical use of historiography is lacking in most historical fiction for children, which she claims tends to take the historical record at face value more even than actual historians (28). Raymond Williams in 'The Romantic Artist' posits that the events of history are never sequestered from those who are living in those times. In the same way that Williams argues that the works of the Romantic poets cannot be authentically removed from their historical context, nor can the experience of fictional characters in historical fiction be removed from the historical context in which they are depicted. Indeed, Ringrose argues that one of the inherent benefits of historical fiction for children is that it allows readers to interact with characters and events of another time and place (212). He argues that this interaction allows the historical period to be used to foreground debate that has ramifications for the contemporary reader. He cites feminine gender identity as one of these primary examples, where a young female character in a patriarchal historical context can interact with this context in a way that has meaning for young female readers. Bramwell agrees, arguing that historical fiction should 'consciously [address] modern-day issues' (109). Ringrose believes that for the text to be relevant, the characters must occupy authentic positions within the depicted culture (215). The young woman can never buck her historical context too much, or else her authenticity is compromised. Margaronis calls this a 'minefield', but concedes that writers will need to actively make decisions about whether their characters would authentically exist in the real context (138).

Margaronis's minefield hearkens to Georg Lukács's concept of the 'necessary anachronism', which explores the extent to which anachronism is narratalogically useful. What Lukács describes as 'general historicism' and 'the concrete historicism of all the details' (151) are two different levels of historical accuracy: the former being the level where the writer maintains fidelity primarily to the fundamental aspects of historical event, and the latter being where the writer slavishly recreates all aspects of the historical record. Lukács describes the novel as being more capable of including more details of concrete historicism than other narrative media such as drama, as the novel has greater

scope to include detail than performed media that have a more intensive need to condense and shorthand material for the sake of brevity (151). While this is true, the novel is not entirely free of these same imperatives. The novel is 'the sensuous mediator […] by which historical necessity asserts itself at a particular time, in a particular place and within certain class restrictions etc' (Lukács 151), though historical fiction allows the writer the freedom to approach sideways, using allusion, metaphor, and analogy to create connections of meaning between reader and the historical culture being presented.

This essay further examines the nature and function of the narrator, particularly in children's literature. Any academic exploration about how a narrator presents a subjective viewpoint will draw on Booth's assertion that the narrator may be unreliable. McCallum differentiates the 'implied author' from the actual creator of the text. She argues that a close viewpoint creates this 'implied author', with the focal point being the viewpoint character. She defines 'focalisation' as the manner in which characters' viewpoints are demonstrated (23–4). Particularly, she explores how texts use intra-diegetic techniques to tell the narrative from the point of view of the characters. Ringrose suggests that intra-diegetic narration is most useful when creating strong viewpoint characters in children's fiction (216). McCallum relates this same principle at the broader level of adolescent fiction generally, identifying three strategies to focalise readers into a particular character's point of view when writing in third person: verb choices 'denoting the perceptual viewpoint of a character', choices about how the text shifts between direct speech and focalised viewpoint, and use of indirect discourse particular to a character's perspective rather than an omniscient narrator (31). She argues that these are necessary tools to use, particularly when a text alternates between different viewpoint characters and readers need to be grounded in the specific viewpoint being used (29–30).

Cultural Experiences of Viewpoint Characters

A viewpoint character must always have some relationship with the cultural context of the

narrative. Studies into reading behaviour in school-aged children—especially those in the middle school years—point to strong viewpoint characters as a major factor in engaging young readers. Boys in particular tend to strongly connect with well defined, likeable and identifiable viewpoint characters (Moloney 13). Viewpoint character is a fundamentally important narrative technique to reconstruct history through fiction. Clear use of viewpoint enables protagonists to become identification figures, as these characters' experiences are clearly presented and in such a way that readers are invited to empathise with their predicaments. How, then, are viewpoint characters crafted and represented within the context of a given narrative? These characters will ideally be identifiable for the readers by virtue of similarities in age, experience, and interests, though these similarities are naturally made more difficult in fiction set in Classical Rome (and indeed any form of fiction with an exotic setting) because of the inherent cultural differences between the contemporary reader and the characters native to this context. This cultural divide goes some way to explaining a trend through the middle of the twentieth century in which children's historical fiction often included a time travel element, with young viewpoint characters from the readers' own twentieth-century, Western cultural contexts being drawn into events in history. The limitation to this method is that writers lose the ability to explore Roman culture from the inside.

A culture such as Classical Rome, whose cultural context is largely defined by its stratification of society, invites writers to explore both privileged and marginalised experiences of culture. This essay draws on Marxist theories of literary criticism to explore how viewpoint characters form and perceive their own relationship with Classical Roman culture, from different places within the social strata. All characters interact with the cultural discourses of whatever context an author might place them in; viewpoint characters do this more explicitly than others in that the reader is invited to see inside their minds. The more exotic the context for the reader, the more prominent this interaction has to become in order to elucidate the culture. Therefore, this paper proposes codifying viewpoint characters into three core groupings by the nature of how they interact with culture. The

first group may be termed the *privileged insiders*, characters who are familiar with the cultural discourses of the mainstream and/or empowered. The second group, *marginalised insiders*, are broadly familiar with mainstream cultural discourse, but fit more cleanly into discourses of alternative or disempowered underclasses. Finally, characters may be complete *outsiders*, unfamiliar with most cultural discourses at play, usually through lack of exposure.

These delineations are malleable enough that characters can move between them as circumstances change. An outsider may eventually become an insider, though probably a marginalised one, simply by spending time in that context. Privilege and marginalisation don't have a straight-up black-and-white distinction, but the difference between them gives a sense of how an individual and their viewpoint fits into a culture, particularly a culture as heavily class-structured as Rome's. This paper therefore explores the narratological benefits of these viewpoints in the textured presentation of Classical Rome. For the sake of brevity, this essay will focus upon the cultural experiences of insiders—both privileged and marginalised. To do so, I intend to present two case-studies of popular children's fiction novels: *The Eagle of the Ninth* (1954) by Rosemary Sutcliff, and *The Enemies of Jupiter* (2003) by Caroline Lawrence. Each of these novels is written for a young readership, and each maintains a strong use of viewpoint to relate the events of the narrative and build readers' empathy for their respective protagonists.

These texts have been chosen for two equally important reasons: they are both popular texts with their target readerships, and they each apply similar viewpoint techniques to fulfil their narrative aims. *The Eagle of the Ninth* was written for a young adult readership in post-war Britain (Burton 80). Its reputation as a seminal historical fiction novel for young readers has made it a mainstay in bookshops, libraries, and school reading lists for nearly sixty years; indeed, as Burton notes, 'Few novels can have done more to shape perceptions of Roman Britain' (82). It builds close, third-person viewpoint into the core of its narrative; with a single viewpoint character through whom the

action of the novel is focalised. The text juxtaposes two cultural contexts together, Roman and barbarian, with Hadrian's Wall providing a geographical and narrative divide between the two. The viewpoint character, Marcus Aquila, is a young centurion in the Roman army. While in Roman territory, therefore, he is a privileged insider in a Roman cultural context.

The Enemies of Jupiter, the seventh title in Lawrence's highly successful, long-running *Roman Mysteries* series, is targeted at middle readers. Indeed, Lawrence's series is recognised as being the most significant player in middle-reader historical fiction in the twenty-first century, certainly of texts set in classical antiquity (Maurice 2013). Similarly to *The Eagle of the Ninth*, it employs close, third-person viewpoint to relate the events of the story. Unlike *Eagle*, however, Lawrence divides the viewpoint of the four primary characters of her series: the child detectives Flavia Gemina, Jonathan ben Mordecai, Lupus, and Nubia. Her most commonly used viewpoint character in *Enemies* is Jonathan, as it is Jonathan's story that drives the central plot of the narrative. While he is long since naturalised into Roman society, he belongs to marginalised ethnic (Hebrew) and religious (Christian) groups. This makes Jonathan an ideal example for the marginalised insider category of viewpoint character.

The contrasting way that Sutcliff and Lawrence apply the Roman cultural context to the worlds of their stories exists primarily due to the vastly different lives of Marcus and Jonathan. In order to fully analyse each text, it is necessary to offer a brief plot outline of each. In *The Eagle of the Ninth*, young Centurion Marcus arrives into Roman Britain, the same province in which his father's legion mysteriously vanished several years earlier. Despite being injured early into his first campaign, Marcus and his locally born slave-turned-friend Esca journey through the province and beyond in order to solve the mystery of the vanished Legion and recover its missing eagle standard. *The Enemies of Jupiter* finds Jonathan and his fellow detectives summoned to a fever-ravaged Rome in response to a strange prophecy. Jonathan helps investigate the prophecy, uncovering the Ark of the

Covenant in the process, but is primarily concerned about reuniting his estranged parents. Jonathan's attempts lead to a major fire in Rome, building to a cliffhanger conclusion in which Jonathan and his parents each presume each other to be dead. The different aspects of the Roman world that are explored in each novel—the far frontiers in *The Eagle of the Ninth* compared to the metropolitan Rome in *The Enemies of Jupiter*—contrast with the type of viewpoint character who experiences each world. Marcus, the privileged insider, is placed at the frontiers; the marginalised Jonathan is placed in the heart of the capital.

The choice of viewpoint character reflects the personal and cultural experiences of the two authors and their target readers, but viewpoint is nevertheless a core tool for both Sutcliff and Lawrence in reaching these readerships. Sutcliff mirrors her personal experience and the broader cultural experience of post-war Britain in Marcus's own journey, reflecting upon questions of patriotism, loyalty to empire, and British nationhood. Lawrence's viewpoint characters, in contrast, all come from outside mainstream Roman culture. This marginalisation actively engages with contemporary trends in Western children's literature that foreground characters' clashes with mainstream culture as a way to engage with young readers at a similar developmental stage. Viewpoint offers a direct insight into how privileged or marginalised cultural status actively affects these characters as individuals, offering the reader a deeper engagement with the direct, subjective, and personal impacts of a relationship to culture.

The Eagle of the Ninth's reputation for authenticity, as demonstrated by its regular appearance in the history classroom (Burton 83), is intrinsically tied to the close viewpoint of Marcus; as such, it stands as a valuable example of the privileged insider viewpoint. Sutcliff places Marcus's Roman-ness at the centre to the scope and thematic intent of the text. Marcus being on his first mission into the wilds of Roman Britain brings his personal experiences of Roman culture into play, shaping his perceptions of the world around him. This provides a valuable prism through which Sutcliff is able

to explicate Roman culture for her readers.

Similarly, Lawrence uses *The Enemies of Jupiter* to present her own interpretation of Roman culture, albeit from a different perspective. She narrates primarily from the Jonathan's viewpoint, as Jonathan is the character most affected by the events of the novel. Nevertheless, each of the *Roman Mysteries* protagonists maintains a viewpoint presence, and each of them is—in one way or another—marginalised by their social, gender, ethnic, or disability status. Equally, they are each marginalised by their youth, with Jonathan's impending coming-of-age and the subsequent prospect of gaining citizenship being a significant motivating factor.

While these remain central to an understanding of both Sutcliff's and Lawrence's works, this paper focuses primarily on the narratological techniques of each author in achieving these outcomes. This paper will therefore explore firstly the narrative techniques that Sutcliff and Lawrence employ to achieve the depth of viewpoint, and secondly the effect this has on explicating Roman values, attitudes, and beliefs through Marcus's and Jonathan's personal experiences of culture. Through this, each becomes ambassador for the socio-cultural discourse of Imperial Roman civilisation, and in so doing supports readers' understanding and appreciation for this specific period of history.

Narrative techniques to achieve deep viewpoint

Both *The Eagle of the Ninth* and *The Enemies of Jupiter* are grounded by their depth of viewpoint. The narrative techniques that Sutcliff and Lawrence employ allow for the specific and subjective reactions of Marcus and Jonathan to drive their respective stories. This centralises both characters' stakes in the events of the narratives and allows for greater opportunity for readers to empathise with their situations. Both Marcus and Jonathan have ambassadorial roles to perform, being an intrinsic link between readers and the cultural context of life in the Roman world. This link is only possible if readers are encouraged to understand and empathise with the thoughts, reactions, and decisions of either character. Close viewpoint, as employed by both authors, provides readers with

direct access to these subjective experiences, allowing for readers to more strongly understand their driving motivations, building empathy for Marcus and Jonathan themselves and for their cultural contexts.

In *The Eagle of the Ninth*, Sutcliff achieves this by orienting readers into Marcus's viewpoint at the start of each scene, using that viewpoint to explore the material impact of the world on Marcus's body and mind in each scene, and making allusions and comparisons that actively reflect the social and cultural experiences inherent to his viewpoint. Each of these strengthens readers' understanding of Marcus as a character and as cultural ambassador.

Sutcliff has a specific technique to orient each scene around Marcus's subjective viewpoint. She begins with an objective overview of the geographical or situational layout of the scene location before fixing into Marcus's viewpoint by narrating his reflection on a specific piece of stimulus. This usually occurs within the opening two to three paragraphs of a scene and, once it does, the scenes remain locked to his perspective. This is the prose equivalent of a film establishing the setting in a wide shot before zooming in to a close-up angle of the lead character. *The Eagle of the Ninth* opens to an abstract description of the road to Isca Dumnoniorum, then broadly details the types of travellers who use the road, then the specific sight of a cohort of soldiers (Sutcliff 5). This draws the reader closer and closer to Marcus, travelling at the head of the cohort. Sutcliff first names Marcus in the sixth paragraph, at which point the reader becomes privy to his reminiscences of childhood life, including his emotional response to these memories. He recalls the depths of antipathy between his guardian and himself by '[smiling] to himself a little wryly, as he remembered how almost pathetically thankful that plump official had been [to get rid of Marcus]' (6). Marcus's emotional response immediately offers the reader a direct perspective of his life and experiences that no other character is provided.

This means that, at sentence level, Sutcliff can use Marcus's subjective experience to convey concrete observations of the material detail of the scene. Sutcliff uses Marcus's responses to these stimuli to weave historical exposition through the text, believably drawn from the perspective of an individual born, raised, and immersed the socio-cultural context of being Roman. Marcus's viewpoint of many settings within Isca Dumnoniorum and Calleva sees him comparing the Roman British setting with his familiar experiences in Rome: the township of Isca has 'Little that was Roman […] here yet', with Marcus imagining that 'One day there would be straight streets, he supposed, and temples and bath-houses and a Roman way of life' (9). Even while describing the sameness of Roman forts across the empire, Marcus's mind actively picks out the differences. The Praetorian Guards' fort in Rome is a 'stone-built camp', while a hypothetical fort on the Upper Nile would be baked mud (14). The Isca fort has 'individualities' that Marcus directly perceives and through these he comes to feel at home (14). In his viewpoint, therefore, the rolled-turf ramparts are remarkable and as such warrant mention in his narration. Sutcliff uses similar techniques through other settings, including Uncle Aquila's home (41–3) and the Calleva gladiatorial arena (47). She therefore builds from the authenticity of Marcus's Roman cultural experience in order to ground readers in the minutia of life within that culture.

Sutcliff's use of imagery, particularly analogies, also has a base root in Marcus's viewpoint. For instance, when Marcus is first coming to know Uncle Aquila, the narration notes that '[…] Authority seemed to hang on [Uncle Aquila] in easy and accustomed folds, like his toga' (Sutcliff 43). This offers a sophisticated and multilayered analogy. On the most basic level, it's a simile that takes the comparative element from Marcus's everyday experience—the toga. More than this, it aids the unfamiliar reader by framing the analogy with a piece of concrete description; the 'easy and accustomed folds' not only adds to Uncle Aquila's Authority, but explicates detail of how the toga is worn. Finally, Sutcliff's choice to capitalise the 'A' in 'Authority' adds another layer of meaning, implying a transliteration of *auctoritas*. This adds yet another layer of Roman context that

reinforces Marcus's Roman-ness. These elements reinforce the narration as being from a Roman viewpoint, while still providing meaning for a contemporary reader.

In applying these narrative techniques, Sutcliff positions the narration of *The Eagle of the Ninth* deeply within Marcus's viewpoint. From this position she is able to immerse readers within Roman civilisation, providing a specific cultural experience that gives context to the names, dates, and events of history. Marcus's experiences, therefore, have a deeper application than merely the events of the novel, but to readers' overall interaction with Roman history.

Similarly, Lawrence employs her own techniques for achieving viewpoint to offer her own viewpoint characters as cultural ambassadors for Roman civilisation. In particular, *The Enemies of Jupiter* places Jonathan deep within Rome itself, a city Jonathan has visited but does not know well. As with Sutcliff, Lawrence orientates readers into Jonathan's viewpoint at the start of his viewpoint scenes; narrates the material impacts of the world on Jonathan's thoughts, feelings, and sensory responses; and explores the social and cultural experiences of Roman civilisation from Jonathan's specific marginalised insider viewpoint. His viewpoint is less inclined to blindly accept the world around him than, for instance, Marcus in *The Eagle of the Ninth*, as the marginalised insider offers a greater position to reflect on his context more critically. This builds readers' interest in and connection with Jonathan as a character, and allows him to perform a more complex role of cultural ambassador than the privileged insider would have done.

Lawrence orients each of Jonathan's scenes around his viewpoint in the opposite manner from Sutcliff's slow zoom. Instead, Lawrence focalises the action immediately on Jonathan as the viewpoint figure by structuring the opening paragraph of his scenes around his thoughts, feelings, or sensory reactions. The scene that follows will, invariably, play out entirely within Jonathan's close viewpoint. In most of these instances, she structures the opening sentence of the paragraph to make

Jonathan's name the subject. For instance, one scene opens as 'Jonathan passed along the columned walkway, not looking at the patients, not looking at the doctors, not even thinking about Flavia's quest' (83). The sentence places the Jonathan, as viewpoint character, at the heart of the action of the scene right from the very first sentence. It offers something of a material description of the setting, but this is merely incidental to Jonathan's distracted, obsessive thoughts about how to bring his parents together. This draws the reader immediately into Jonathan's emotional response to the events of the story, offering an understandable and relatable conundrum with which middle-school readers can empathise. The benefit of immediately grounding the reader in a specific viewpoint at the outset of a scene is that, unlike *The Eagle of the Ninth*, Jonathan is one of four viewpoint characters that Lawrence actively uses in the text. A simple, clear delineation between various characters' viewpoints becomes fundamental to the clear narration of any given scene, and goes a long way to supporting readers' in easily empathising with Jonathan and, to a lesser extent, his fellow viewpoint characters, ensuring that Jonathan successfully performs role as a cultural ambassador, albeit as a resistant exponent of that culture.

Jonathan's subjective viewpoint allows for Lawrence to weave his concrete observations about the material detail of the scene into the events. A significant advantage of Jonathan's marginalised status is that he has enough distance from the cultural mainstream that he does not accept every detail uncritically, while still existing within the culture and having a relationship with it. Lawrence uses these responses to draw historically authentic details into the text. Jonathan's exploration of an apothecary's workroom in the Temple of Faustus yields what he is able to recognise as 'all the medical paraphernalia any doctor could ever want: bronze scales, weights, spoons, scoops, probes, needles, tweezers, saws and cupping vessels' (85). He, the son of a doctor, has enough familiarity with medical instruments to be able to pick one up and recognise its quality (85). This aspect of Jonathan's viewpoint solidifies him as a believable representative from the Roman cultural context; he may be from a marginalised social group but he still displays enough awareness of the society in

which he lives to believably exist within it.

In the same scene, though, Jonathan's marginalised status is also highlighted. As Mordecai is a Hebrew and a Christian, several aspects of Roman medical practice would be discursively inappropriate for Jonathan to closely recognise. He notes that votive statuettes are also stored and sold by the apothecary (85–6), this detail standing out apart from Jonathan's immediate inventory of the medical implements as these are details that separate his father's medical practice from a mainstream Roman physician's. He notes that the stock includes 'even lead curse tablets' (86), the use of *even* in this context building a separation between Jonathan's cultural expectations and that of mainstream Roman society. This separation is shared with the reader, allowing the surprise of finding curse tablets among the medical paraphernalia of the day to stand out as novel and unexpected in a way that they would not have done from the viewpoint of a character more deeply embedded in the mainstream of that culture. She therefore builds from the authenticity of Jonathan's cultural experiences both as a Roman and as an outsider in order to ground readers in the minutia of life within that culture.

Lawrence uses the narrative tools of viewpoint to position the narration of *The Enemies of Jupiter* deeply within Jonathan's viewpoint. In presenting much of the novel from Jonathan's marginalised viewpoint, Lawrence aids her readers' interaction with Roman history by presenting an alternative perspective of Roman culture from the privileged insider. Jonathan may understand and share in many aspects of general Roman society, but his ethnic and religious background combine to distance him from many of the more aspects of culture that readers may find confronting or unusual. This allows for a greater scope to explore these elements, therefore providing a more vivid depiction of the alien-ness of a substantively different cultural discourse from readers' own. Both Sutcliff and Lawrence apply their narrative techniques to presenting strong, relatable viewpoint characters who exist believably in the context of the Roman world. Narrative tools like

orientation, description, and imagery provide the figures of Marcus and Jonathan with more complete, authentic contexts to inhabit. These contexts simulate a genuine historical culture, and so have a responsibility to uphold Lukács's 'general historicism' (151). Because of their different subjective experiences, Marcus and Jonathan have very different relationships with nationality and cultural identity, as so each one's viewpoint presents a different facet of an historically authentic cultural experience.

Representing cultural experience through viewpoint

The main benefit of having a viewpoint character deeply embedded within a cultural context is in how they can inhabit the values, attitudes, and beliefs of that culture. Cultural experience is by nature subjective, and so eschewing Walter Scott's concept of the omniscient, professorial narrator figure has allowed for both Sutcliff and Lawrence to peer deeper into how individuals engage with living in a Roman society (Margaronis 139). Each author approaches this in different ways, with their two different protagonists' relationship with culture forming the centre of these approaches. Marcus's privileged position in *The Eagle of the Ninth* offers a viewpoint into the values, attitudes, and beliefs that underpin mainstream Roman culture. In contrast, Jonathan's marginalised viewpoint in *The Enemies of Jupiter* offers an opportunity to explore these same values, attitudes, and beliefs with a more overtly critical eye. Examining both viewpoints together allows for a more comprehensive understanding of the cultural impact of living in a Roman world.

In *The Eagle of the Ninth*, the reader first meets Marcus as Pilus Prior Centurion and commander of his cohort (Sutcliff 5), a privileged position within this discourse. More significant than the fact of his merely maintaining a part of the discourse, though, are the cultural assumptions and values that are inherent to it. Marcus does more than merely hold these values, but such a close viewpoint allows for the reader to share in his moments of reflection upon these. The reader is invited to see inside Marcus's mind to understand his specific attitudes about key aspects of the culture, including the value of tradition and the institution of slavery. The attitudes that he holds are offered as a

reflection of Roman society, with Marcus as its ambassador.

Sutcliff imbues Marcus's memories of his 'plump and purse-proud' guardian with a snide invective that can only have originated in Marcus's viewpoint (6).While Marcus is given a clear viewpoint and thus a relatable attitude, the official's only presence in the narrative is through Marcus's heavily biased memories of him. This use of viewpoint offers perspective on tensions within the Equestrian class, while simultaneously explicating overarching Roman values. Marcus reflects about how, in contrast to the official, his family had 'kept to the old way of life' of soldiering and farming, rather than the more leisurely life of trade and finance (6). Inherent to this viewpoint is a fundamentally Roman cultural value of pride in tradition, the Mos Maiorum, which goes so deep into Marcus's persona as to inform his sense of identity. Marcus's first meeting with Esca ties his identity as a Roman directly to his rank (and therefore persona) in military life, despite having not been an actively serving Centurion for months (54). The importance he places in his title demonstrates how directly his military persona informs his concept of self. Marcus's specific subjective viewpoint offers an entry point for the reader to understand this value, which builds awareness of and empathy for the cultural attitudes at play in broader social and cultural contexts of Roman society at the time. Therefore, Sutcliff's use of viewpoint in *The Eagle of the Ninth* provides readers a direct method to understand the experience of being Roman.

Where Marcus's values toward tradition and military life place him squarely within the mainstream of the Roman cultural context, he does actively resist the mainstream in his attitudes toward the institution of slavery. This is a massive concession by Sutcliff toward her readers' cultural sensibilities, and so she carefully builds narrative justification for this into Marcus's viewpoint of himself and his relationship with Esca. He actively recognises and is reflexively aware of how he is 'slipping more and more often from the master to the friend in his dealings with Esca' (55), to the extent that he becomes 'baffled, hurt, and angry' when Esca's manner toward him becomes overtly

servile (Sutcliff 59). Marcus recognises the incongruity of this relationship, admitting to himself that he 'found it hard to see quite what he had in common with a barbarian slave' (53). Sutcliff uses viewpoint here to give this strongly self-reflexive moment enough texture to acknowledge Marcus's social conditioning as a Roman in defining Esca as 'a barbarian slave', while still allowing him to appear more 'enlightened' (from a contemporary Western reader's viewpoint) than his contemporaries.

The character of Tribune Placidus is offered as a counterpoint to Marcus in his attitude towards slavery. This dichotomy is underscored by Sutcliff's use of viewpoint, which goes to great lengths to generate Marcus's 'quick dislike' (86) for him. Marcus sees Placidus as cold, patronising and snide (86), and of course the reader is of course privy to 'all the contempt that the professional soldier could feel for the aristocrat playing at soldiers for a year' (87). Not only does this actively use viewpoint to explicate a particular class tension within Roman society, but it also aids Sutcliff in building an unsympathetic character in whom she can depict authentic but uncomfortable values, attitudes, and beliefs. This means that the reader's relationship with the viewpoint character is not threatened by the breadth of the cultural gap, and in fact, Marcus's indignation on behalf of Esca (96) sets him directly apart from the mainstream view of slavery. Giving Marcus an attitude to the cultural values, attitudes, and beliefs of Roman society, even an oppositional one, helps explicate these cultural details. Marcus's attitudes may be a concession to the sensibilities of contemporary Western culture, but this allows Sutcliff to use him as a connecting bridge between the two conflicting traditions.

Sutcliff's claims to authenticity depend as much on her ability to convey the depths of the cultural experience as it does on her own understanding and research into it. Regardless of whether Marcus as an individual upholds or challenges particular details of the Roman cultural context, the fact that he self-actualises enough to have these specific responses demonstrates the value of a strongly

realised viewpoint. Marcus's reflections from within discourse offer something substantive to contribute to readers' own understanding of Roman culture.

In contrast, Jonathan presents an alternative perspective of the values, attitudes, and beliefs of Roman culture. Indeed, in many ways, Jonathan and his equally marginalised group of friends share their readers' lack of experience with these values, attitudes, and beliefs. Being originally from Jerusalem and having settled in Ostia, the everyday experience of life in Rome is initially an exciting novelty for Jonathan (26), but one in which he becomes increasingly aware of his own inability to completely fit into the discourse. Jonathan's viewpoint therefore parallels that of the reader, helping them to understand aspects of Roman culture, including religion, crime, and slavery. The attitudes that he holds are offered as a critical evaluation of Roman society from the perspective of a boy who does not entirely fit inside the confines of a typical Roman lifestyle.

Jonathan's experiences during his time in Rome mark him out as separate from the mainstream Roman cultural experience. This is most prominent in the area of religious and mythological beliefs. Jonathan is openly scathing of traditional elements of Roman mythology, particularly regarding the myth of Prometheus. He rejects the Roman interpretation of the legend of Prometheus being justly punished for his hubris, even suggesting that Jupiter himself might be 'the bad one' in the myth, scandalising Flavia with this opinion (48). In contrast, Jonathan treats the discovery of the Ark of the Covenant in the chambers of the Emperor's mistress Berenice with reverential awe (110). He refuses to allow Flavia or Nubia to touch the ark, relating the legends of the ark to his non-Hebrew friends with fervent belief in their historicity (111). The presence of the ark itself in a story with no other supernatural elements is surprising, though despite Jonathan's claims, the ark is not shown to have supernatural properties. The privileging of the Judeo-Christian mythology over the mainstream Roman beliefs may act to marginalise Jonathan from the society in which he lives, but it provides a relatable link to contemporary Western readers, many of whom share Jonathan's beliefs. Therefore,

Jonathan's marginalised insider status offers readers a link to the classical world, and he becomes an ambassador for society to which he only partly belongs.

Jonathan's experience as being foreign-born and a refugee from war-torn Jerusalem has a direct impact on his views on the institution of slavery. When he, Flavia, Nubia, and Lupus first arrive at the court of the Emperor Titus in Rome, their guide Ascletario provides commentary to Jonathan about the layout of the city, including 'the enormous amphitheatre [the Colosseum, though it did not bear that name during the depicted era] on their right, telling them how tall it was, how many exits it had, how many people it could seat' (104). This great symbol of Roman civilisation, an object of pride and wonder for Ascletario, elicits no such wonder from Jonathan. He sees it as a symbol of Rome's—and more specifically, Titus's—oppression of his own people and of his homeland. Jonathan immediately supposes that the slaves working in the Colosseum are captives from the recent warfare in Jerusalem. This leads Jonathan to contemplate the recent uprising in Judaea, how Titus's comparative mercy had still condemned 'hundreds […] to die in gladiatorial games and the triumphal parade – that was to be expected' (104). This demonstrates how Lawrence effectively integrates relevant historical exposition into the text of her novel. Giving a viewpoint character a specific relationship with and opinion about the historical event allows for that character to contemplate the event, its causes, and its aftermath in such a way that the exposition remains justified within the context of the narration.

Lawrence's claims to authenticity depend as much on her ability to convey the depths of the cultural experience as it does on her own understanding and research into it. Jonathan as an individual sometimes upholds and sometimes challenges the individual elements that form the Roman cultural context, in particularly as they relate to religion, crime, and slavery. Jonathan's reflections from within the discourse offer something substantive to contribute to readers' own understanding of Roman culture, but his reactions against those aspects of the discourse that strike out against the other, marginalising aspects of his identity provides Lawrence with scope to engage with what

contemporary readers tend to find most jarring about Roman civilisation. At the points where Jonathan's Christian identity stands in contrast to his Roman identity, Lawrence gives Jonathan a series of values and beliefs that make him a far more relatable character to the contemporary reader, while still recognising the alien and confronting details of life in Classical Rome.

The chance to experience life in extinct cultures offers perhaps the most significant draw for readers of historical fiction. In particular, Roman society provides a popular and intriguing prospect for young readers exposed to classical antiquity through curricular and pop-cultural channels. Both authors make claims to authenticity of context in order for their works to be taken as historical fiction, and it is in the viewpoint characters' expression and actualisation of these details of context that most effectively demonstrates both Sutcliff's and Lawrence's ability to engage with the historical context of classical Rome. This offers younger readers something beyond what is available in the facts and dates of an ancient history textbook; the chance to understand and empathise with representatives from this culture offers a deeper respect for that cultural context in its entirety. In this way, viewpoint characters such as Marcus and Jonathan stand as ambassadors for the real, historical culture, and this provides young readers with a strong perspective on the cultural reasons for how and why the events of Roman history occurred.

Reflexive Analysis of *The Wolf-King of Rome*

I had several specific areas of exploration for the creative arm of my project. Primarily, my ambition for *The Wolf-King of Rome* was to use viewpoint to achieve a similar goal to the Sutcliff and Lawrence examples, albeit one with a focus on an earlier period of Roman history. While many existing historical fiction texts focus on the Imperial period, including both *The Eagle of the Ninth* and *The Enemies of Jupiter*, there seemed a gap in historical fiction titles set during the decline and fall of the Roman Republic. The majority of middle-reader and young-adult titles for this period are creative non-fiction titles such as *Horrible Histories*. I also intended that *The Wolf-King of Rome*

explore this period by utilising elements of the fantastic that would support the historical and cultural details of the period. In order for each of these ambitions to be successful, I would need to create strong viewpoint characters of a similar age to my target readers in order for those readers to most effectively experience the story. One of the earliest decisions I made was that the viewpoint characters of the story would each represent a different stratus of Roman society. This would be vital for the text to reflect upon the societal dysfunction and class conflict of the late Republic.

From this, I designed each of the three protagonists to each reflect a different type of viewpoint: one privileged insider, one marginalised insider, and one outsider. The two most central viewpoint characters, the patrician-ranked Lucius and the street urchin Celox, would each represent insider viewpoints, the privileged and marginalised viewpoints respectively. The third, less central viewpoint character—recently arrived slave-witch Indica—would offer an outsider viewpoint. Close viewpoint would be the most effective narrative technique for focalising effectively into the thoughts, feelings, and experiences of each of these characters, and so I employed the third person to most effectively cross between different close viewpoints throughout the story. This allowed my project to give each viewpoint character enough scope within the narrative that each one would contribute to the overall goal of the project.

I identified several specific challenges that I would need to address in order for this goal to be realised. Firstly, I would need to set in place a practice for quickly and easily identifying which character was to be the viewpoint character for a given scene. After that, I would need to adopt a framework for each viewpoint character—Lucius, Celox, and Indica—so that each would approach the events of the narrative from a specific set of lived experiences for their particular character. These frameworks would incorporate a set of social, cultural, and political awarenesses that were appropriate to their position in society. Through this, I could adopt a position from which I was able to effectively explore the values, attitudes, and beliefs inherent to each character and their station in

Roman society.

Identifying which is the viewpoint character in a scene was a pragmatic but necessary duty, without which the fundamental aim of the project would fall apart. Beyond simply naming the viewpoint character early in the scene—always ensuring that the viewpoint character was the first named in any given scene—this was a matter of ensuring that the beginning of any scene focalised clearly onto a thought, emotion, or action clearly attributed to the viewpoint character. For example, the reader's first introduction to Lucius is tied to a specific, clear thought: 'Lucius just wanted to be alone' (9). The sentence is structured to have Lucius's thought stand as clearly as possible, choosing not to relate this through a direct thought attribution so as to keep Lucius's name as the first word of the chapter. This is followed up with descriptions of both the visual details of how Lucius sees the scene and also how he perceives his own physicality, including his stiff back and churning stomach (9). The combination of early naming, thought, emotional reaction, and sensory reaction were vital in establishing a viewpoint perspective that readers can react to and engage with, and as such was highly important in achieving the goals of my project.

I aimed to ensure that each viewpoint character maintains their own unique perspective on the different aspects of Roman social life, including the nature of relationships and the expectations on the role of the individual. A significant element of this is in the sex of each of the characters. Each of their viewpoints therefore reveals a different aspect of the Roman social milieu. Lucius, for instance, is a privileged member of Roman society—an aristocratic male—and has been raised to implicitly accept and respect traditional Roman attitudes about the individual's roles and responsibilities within society. He has a strong sense of *familias*, with his Patrician name and responsibilities being at the forefront of his sense of self. His father's parting words to 'be the man of the household while I'm away' (10) became important to foreground very early in the narrative so that this sense of familial responsibility would drive Lucius's motivation. This ties into the

gender dynamics of the strongly patriarchal Roman society, in which the *paterfamilias* was the chief lawmaker and law-enforcer within each household.

In stark contrast, Celox and Indica each occupy marginalised positions in Roman society. Celox is young, homeless, and of the criminal underclass. As such, I have designed him to actively reject many of the social morays of the Roman context. He considers oaths to be 'empty words, nothing more' (39), and scoffs dismissively at Lucius's attempts at adopting an authoritative tone befitting his rank (44). Nevertheless, he does enjoy the implicit social benefits of being male within Roman society, which allows him a level of privilege within his cultural context. Finally, Indica's outsider status keeps her separated from the rest of society; even though she is a slave, she does not operate on that social level; the other slaves reject her (41). Furthermore, she is the sole girl of the three central protagonists. I consciously made this choice so as to alienate Indica as far as possible from the Roman cultural context, and even from the character dynamics between the three protagonists early in the novel. This decision allowed me to use Indica to explore aspects of Roman society from a disconnected, objective viewpoint. This is far more pronounced because of her sex, her slavery and her foreignness. She shares many of the readers' unfamiliarity with the society around her and, as such, makes for a useful viewpoint character. The combination of the three viewpoints was designed to offer a more complete re-creation of Roman society.

Similarly, the characters all have different awarenesses of cultural minutiae, including details such as architecture, dress, customs, and religion. I was aware from the beginning of the project that the way my viewpoint characters interact with these minutiae would have a significant impact upon the authenticity of the Roman context I was constructing. For instance, Lucius's authenticity as a patrician depends on his familiarity with typical elements of a Roman house; after all, he has grown up in one and actualises this as a normal and unremarkable fact of his life. The vestibule of his family home is lined with the wax funerary masks of his ancestors, as was culturally normative for a

Roman patrician's residence. To narrate this, I decided that Lucius must have a specific reason for being aware of the masks, and the event of his father's funeral provided a believable reason for him to do so (10–11). Similarly, Celox's attempted thievery at the bathhouse offers a believable context for the narration to describe the punishment for stealing (13), the layout of a typical bathhouse (14–16), details of typical Roman dress such as the toga (15), and more. Celox's intense engagement with the details of this scene, being highly aware of his surroundings because he is in the act of committing a crime, offers a justifiable reason for him to notice—and therefore narrate—the minutiae of these details.

Finally, each character had a different level of awareness of, and opinion about, the political discourses at play in the context of the late Roman republic, and as such this formed a crucial aspect of the framework through which I related the events of the story and, through this, the events of history that underpin them. That Lucius is familiar with the most politically active Senators in Rome is justified by his social rank; he provided me with a viewpoint character who could identify significant characters (54), as well as relating elements of backstory. Celox's viewpoint, in contrast, does not believably take much interest in the politics of the Republic; while he recalls attending an execution at the Tarpeian Rock, he does recall the crime for which the condemned was executed, and only vaguely recalls that the man's name might have been Lucinus or Lucilius (194). Even though Celox's viewpoint does not recall these details as he considers them unimportant, they are still significant factors in explicating details of Roman crime and punishment. Therefore, the believability of historical exposition that I deploy within the context of the story is entirely dependent on how believably it comes from that viewpoint character's recollection.

Through each of the viewpoint characters' reflections on and relationship with the society, culture, and political events, I was able to focus my project onto representing the values, attitudes, and beliefs of individuals within the Roman Republic in such a way that was engaging, relatable, and

meaningful for *The Wolf-King of Rome*'s target readers. My viewpoint characters act as intermediary between classical and contemporary culture. I understood that the characters would need to bridge the significant cultural chasm between Roman and contemporary societies without significantly breaching the integrity of how they exist as Romans within a Roman world. This was made even more important by the supernatural elements of the narrative; my goal being to underpin the supernatural with a believable and relatable cultural context.

The supernatural elements of the story would interact with this context in two ways. Firstly, it interacted with the mythology and belief systems underpinning the Roman awareness of their own context. Secondly, it provided a prism through which I comment and reflect upon elements of the specific periods of history and the historical individuals I depict. It is not by accident that Lucius Cornelius Sulla becomes an inhuman monster when he obtains an unprecedented source of power. The way that my characters recognise this requires a careful use of viewpoint, so as to not over-literalise the metaphor. Lucius recognises the Wolf-King as personifying the negative impacts of monarchical and tyrannical rule, as does his ancestor Brutus in the prologue. The elements of the supernatural, therefore, depend on viewpoint characters to give them authenticity, scope, and significance in order that they accurately and engagingly interact with the historical context. My project built from strong viewpoint characters. The protagonist figures of Lucius and Celox, who embody the different ends of the Roman social stratus, were the first element I developed in the narrative, and from them the story became what it is. Close viewpoint became the underpinning narrative technique for the intended goals of my project. I believe that by focalising effectively into the thoughts, feelings, and experiences of each of these characters, I could build an authentic re-creation of classical Rome that balanced the need for historical authenticity and Lukács's 'necessary anachronism' with an appealing, engaging narrative hook to appeal to young readers. Each of the three viewpoint characters contributes to the authentic historicism of my alternative-fantasy Rome, and builds an overall project that I believe offers middle-school readers with an appealing view of

history as seen through the eyes of engaging and believable viewpoint characters.

Conclusion

Viewpoint characters hold a vital importance for connecting young readers with the events—and therefore contexts—of historical fiction texts. Given what Moloney elucidates about the empathic relationship of young readers to viewpoint characters in forming the reader's desire to read on and engage with the text (13), historical fiction texts must therefore use their viewpoint characters to represent a specific period in a way that is both reflective of its era and comprehensible to its readers. This is, of course, not always an easy marriage, and authors must sometimes apply Lukács's 'necessary anachronism' (151) in order that the text is understandable and relevant to readers. With any reader, but especially with young readers, the lure of a different time and place is significant to the appeal of historical fiction, meaning that authors intending their work to critically engage with that context must recognise their responsibility to treat it with appropriate respect. While this paper has focussed upon historical fiction, many genres of fiction present cultural contexts that differ from that which the reader is familiar. The way that viewpoint characters reflect—and reflect upon—these unfamiliar cultures is critical for allowing readers to fully engage with that context in such a way that does not undermine the integrity of that culture. Breaking out of the reality of the context impairs the effect of depicting the culture in the first place. Authors who actively reflect upon giving their characters a true and realistic relationship with their culture will discover clear paths for depicting it and exploring its intricacies. Categorising characters as privileged insiders, marginalised insiders, or outsiders offers a basic framework around which this level of reflection may be framed. In historical cultures such as Classical Rome, these delineations become increasingly valuable as they offer means through which the stratification of a class-aware society can be critically evaluated.

Authors of historical fiction, particularly those that critically engage with context, offer young readers a perspective of classical antiquity that is absent (and discursively inappropriate) in a

textbook bound to parroting names and dates and gobbets of primary-source material. An interpretive representation of the context builds a framework for young people to understand the culture in which events happened, in which the major personalities lived and by which they were shaped. Viewpoint is one of the most effective narratological techniques for aiding this process, as it foregrounds the direct experience of culture. The subjective thoughts, reactions and experiences of a character like *The Eagle of the Ninth*'s Marcus Flavius Aquila or *The Enemies of Jupiter*'s Jonathan ben Mordecai are the most direct link between readers and classical cultural discourse. Simulated though they are, viewpoint characters in children's historical fiction are indeed the ambassadors for extinct cultures and civilisations, ensuring they remain real and vital and relatable even millennia after the fact.

Works Cited

Dupuis, Mary M. "Introduction", *Young Adult Literature in the Classroom*. Eds. Joan B. Elliot &
  Mary M. Dupuis. Newark: International Reading Organisation. 2002.

Furbank, P.N. "On the historical novel", *Raritan*, 23.3 (2004): 94–114. *Literature Online*. Web. 13
  August 2011.

Hunt, Peter. "Necessary Misreadings: Directions in Narrative Theory for Children"s Literature",
  Studies in the Literary Imagination, 18.2 (1985): 107–121.

Hutcheon, Linda. "The Pastime of Past Time: Fiction, History, Historiographic Metafiction",
  Postmodern Genres. Ed. Marjorie Perloff. London: University of Oklahoma Press. 1989. 54–
  74

Illig-Avilés, Barbara A. "Great Moments in History: Engaging Young Adults through Historical
  Fiction", *Young Adult Literature in the Classroom*. Eds. Joan B. Elliot & Mary M. Dupuis.
  Newark: International Reading Organisation. 2002.

Lawrence, Caroline. *The Assassins of Rome*. London: Orion Children"s Books. 2003I.

Lawrence, Caroline. *The Enemies of Jupiter*. London: Orion Children"s Books. 2003II.

Lawrence, Caroline. *The Twelve Tasks of Flavia Gemina*. London: Orion Children"s Books. 2004I.

Lukács, Georg. *The Historical Novel*. Trans. Hannah and Stanley Mitchell. London: Merlin Press.
  1974.

Maurice, Lisa. "The Roman Mysteries in Context: Writing Ancient Rome for Children Before and
  After Caroline Lawrence." Classical Association Conference. University of Reading (Palmer
  Building), Reading, UK. 6 April 2013.

McCallum, Robin. *Ideologies of Identity in Adolescent Fiction: The Dialogic Construction of
  Subjectivity*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc. 1999.

Moloney, James. *Boys and Books: updated edition*. Sydney: ABC Books. 2002.

Proud, Linda. "Truth is No Stranger to Fiction", *History Today*, 54/11 (2004) 30–31. Web. 13

    March 2013.

Rice, Linda J. *What was it Like?: teaching history and culture through young adult fiction*. New

    York: Columbia University Teachers" College Press. 2006.

Ringrose, Christopher. "A Journey Backwards: History through style in children"s fiction",

    Children"s Literature in Education, 38/3 (2007) 207-218. Web. 25 August 2009.

Stevenson, Deborah. "Historical Friction: Shifting Ideas of Objective Reality in History and

    Fiction." *The Presence of the Past in Children"s Literature*. Ed. Ann Lawson Lucas.

    Westpoint, Conneticut: Praeger. 2003. 22–30.

Sutcliff, Rosemary. "The Eagle of the Ninth", *The Eagle of the Ninth Chronicles*. Oxford: Oxford

    University Press. 2010. (First published as *The Eagle of the Ninth*. Oxford: Oxford University

    Press. 1954)

Williams, Raymond. *Culture and Society: 1780–1950*. 2nd ed. New York: Columbia University

    Press. 1983.