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Introduction

In May of 2007, two months before the release of *Deathly Hallows*, I sat in a hotel room at the Phoenix Rising Conference in New Orleans with the members of Pottercast as well as several other loyal members of the Potterverse. As part of a book discussion group to be aired on the Borders website, we covered what we believed would happen in book seven. Of course, the question arose: who was going to die? In stating our various theories, I put forward my belief that one of the Weasley twins would be killed –an opinion that was immediately met with horror. Even when stating that I believed the Weasley twins were literary descendents of the Greek twins Castor and Pollux (close brothers who are tragically separated when one of them dies) and that Fred and George’s strong magical abilities and line of defense products were setting them up to take a fighting role in the war, the idea was still unpopular. I found out how widely unpopular when I read the Mugglenet book *What Will Happen in Harry Potter 7* and saw that the staff of Mugglenet considered the possibility of a Weasley twin death as basically a non-issue. In fact, the Mugglenet crew only gave Fred and George a fifty-to-one chance of dying (186) and stated: “Unless J.K.R. does the unthinkable, only one destiny could possibly await them: jokes, jokes, and more jokes” (183). I felt so certain, however, that something was missed. Thus, I began the investigation that has now become this essay. My intention was to discover textual clues and foreshadowing of a twin death, which I did indeed find in abundance. As we know, two months later, my theory was proven valid, but I needed to continue writing because I had also found a larger message in the series that J.K. Rowling had used twins to tell.
Foreshadowing Fred

It is a fairly common device of authors to speak of duality and to create various pairings in their fictional worlds. Light versus dark and good versus evil are dichotomies that are familiar across broad spectrums of readers. It would, therefore, be safe to expect that a series whose publishers chose eight to twelve-year-olds as the target audience would tap into these most simplistic themes, and *Harry Potter* does just that. J.K. Rowling’s explorations within this framework, however, go much deeper. The Wizarding World does not have casual, intermittent symbols of duality; Rowling’s world is one absolutely riddled with pairings of numerous varieties – twins of all sorts. There are identical twins, evil twins, parasitic twins, missing twins, and even twins that are inanimate objects. What appears when these symbols are deciphered is an intricate thematic foundation. Rowling’s twin imagery provides the infrastructure for the saga’s message about the importance of choice and the wholeness of true friendship.

The framework that Rowling builds is so detailed that it comes across as brilliantly intentional. There is significant evidence that it is indeed so. Asked in March of 2001, “How carefully do you plan your books?” Rowling responded, “So carefully I sometimes feel as though my brain is going to explode” (“Comic Relief”). In interviews, she refers to a wealth of background information on the books. Specifically, she admits that much of her planning has to do with the study of alchemy and folklore. This interview occurred in 1998, after only the second Potter novel had been released:

“To invent this wizard world, I’ve learned a ridiculous amount about alchemy. Perhaps much of it I’ll never use in the books, but I have to
know in detail what magic can and cannot do in order to set the parameters and establish the stories’ internal logic.” So, Rowling underpins her droll and richly textured imagination with meticulous folklore research. In *Chamber of Secrets*, for instance, she refers to the hand of glory drawn from a grisly legend which claims that the chopped-off hand of a hanged man becomes a torch when lit, but only to the one who holds it. “That’s macabre, I know, but a wonderful image, and I wish I’d invented it.”

(Simpson)

Rowling’s planning and research, however, did not simply stop at interesting tales and rules of magic.

Every event of the *Harry Potter* novels leads the reader to Rowling’s ultimate message of wholeness. Rowling has stated that the deaths in particular had great significance to the overarching plot. Back in 2000, when *Goblet of Fire* had just been released, Rowling said that she had decided who was on the chopping block: “I know all of them who are going to die, yeah… It’s not that I sat down with a list and decided to write, ‘You’re going, you’re going, you’re going.’ There are reasons for the deaths in each case, in terms of the story. So that’s why I’m doing it” (“J.K. Rowling Interview”). In particular, Rowling has singled out Fred’s death as one that was specifically planned:

I always knew it was going to be Fred. I suppose standing back from it, I think that most people would have expected it to be George... Because Fred is the ringleader. He’s always been the instigator. He’s slightly
harder than George. George is slightly gentler. Fred is normally the
funnier but also the crueler of the two. So they might have thought that
George would be the more vulnerable one, and, therefore, the one to die…

It wasn’t easier. Either one of them would have been terrible to kill. It
was awful killing Fred. I hated that. (Meann)

In attempting to display the depth of Voldemort’s evil, however, a twin death is essential
to the plot.

The foreshadowing of Fred’s death thus becomes an important literary device. It
gives the audience clues as to what precisely is at stake. Rowling cleverly makes these
foreshadowings through a masterful display of narrative misdirection.

In *Sorcerer’s Stone*¹, when we hear the Hogwarts school song (the only time we hear it in
the series), we learn that there is no one accepted tune to accompany it. Everyone picks
whatever pace and beat he or she prefers. We are not told how other students choose to
sing, but we do get a description of Fred and George’s rendition: “At last, only the
Weasley twins were left singing along to a very slow funeral march” (128). This scene
takes place in the Hogwarts great hall, which becomes the repository for Fred’s body as
well as other victims during the final battle in the seventh book.

*Chamber of Secrets* begins a series of foreshadowing in which Molly Weasley becomes
the portent of doom for her own son. After discovering that Ron and the twins have
stolen their father’s flying car, Mrs. Weasley lets out a tirade:

“…you wait until your father gets home, we never had trouble like

---

¹ As my quotes come from the American version, I will refer to Book 1 by its American title.
this from Bill or Charlie or Percy—“

“Perfect Percy,” muttered Fred.

“YOU COULD DO WITH TAKING A LEAF OUT OF PERCY’S BOOK!” yelled Mrs. Weasley, prodding a finger in Fred’s chest. “You could have died…” (33)

Note that it’s Fred’s chest that Mrs. Weasley prods before “You could have died.” Rowling is literally pointing him out.

We also begin to gain a sense in Chamber of Secrets that Fred’s attitude towards death is slightly more nonchalant than George’s. Before the critical Gryffindor versus Slytherin Quidditch match, Oliver Wood has some very ominous words for Harry.

“Get to that Snitch before Malfoy or die trying, Harry, because we’ve got to win today, we’ve got to.”

“So no pressure, Harry,” said Fred, winking at him. (167)

This could possibly be regarded as merely an example of Fred’s sarcasm if it were not for George’s reaction to this same comment after Harry is being attacked by the rogue Bludger: “This is all your fault,’ George said angrily to Wood. ‘“Get the Snitch or die trying,” what a stupid thing to tell him…”’ (170). Clearly, unlike Fred, George thinks death is no joking matter.

Prisoner of Azkaban sees no change in Fred’s attitude. When Ron believes Crookshanks has eaten Scabbers, Fred tries to comfort Ron with words that eerily echo his own eventual fate: “It was probably better for him to snuff it quickly—one swallow—he probably didn’t feel a thing” (253). We get another pointer from Rowling in the very next line: “‘Fred!’ said Ginny
indignantly.” Fred does indeed “snuff it quickly.”

_Goblet of Fire_ serves as the turning point for the series as the full resurrection of Lord Voldemort becomes a reality. It is understandable that in this book and onwards, the foreshadowing becomes increasingly vivid and dark. It is in this book that we learn of Fred and George’s ambition to open their own joke shop, which has a major impact on the plot of all further novels. It’s on Extendable Ears in _Order of the Phoenix_ that Harry learns that he could possibly be possessed by Voldemort, and all sorts of the twins’ products become weapons in the war against Umbridge. It’s with the aid of Fred and George’s Peruvian Instant Darkness Powder that Draco makes his escape in _Half-Blood Prince_. Harry breaks into Umbridge’s office in _Deathly Hallows_ with the help of some Weasley Decoy Detonators. Looking back at the involvement Fred and George really had through their joke shop, it’s no wonder Mrs. Weasley saw that the twins were venturing into dangerous waters:

> “Those two!” she burst out savagely, now pulling pots and pans out of a cupboard, and Harry knew she meant Fred and George. “I don’t know what’s going to happen to them, I really don’t. No ambition, unless you count making as much trouble as they possibly can…

> “It’s not as though they haven’t got brains,” she continued irritably, taking the saucepan over to the stove and lighting it with a further poke of her wand, “but they’re wasting them, and unless they pull themselves together soon, they’ll be in real trouble.” (_Goblet of Fire_ 58-9)
They do indeed get into real trouble shortly afterwards.

When the Dark Mark makes an appearance at the Quidditch World Cup, Molly is naturally concerned about her family. She shocks her kids (but not careful readers) when her family, Harry, and Hermione return from the World Cup.

“You’re all right,” Mrs. Weasley muttered distractedly, releasing Mr. Weasley and staring around at them all with red eyes, “You’re alive… Oh boys…”

And to everybody’s surprise, she seized Fred and George and pulled them both into such a tight hug that their heads banged together.

“Ouch! Mum—you’re strangling us—“

“I shouted at you before you left!” Mrs. Weasley said, starting to sob.

“It’s all I’ve been thinking about! What if You-Know-Who had got you, and the last thing I ever said to you was that you didn’t get enough O.W.L.s? Oh Fred… George…” (146)

As in Chamber of Secrets, Fred once again turns death into a joke, shortly afterwards.

“You wouldn’t be thinking of restarting Weasley’s Wizard Wheezes, by any chance?”

“Now, Mum,” said Fred, looking up at her, a pained look on his face. “If the Hogwarts Express crashed tomorrow, and George and I died, how would you feel to know that the last thing we ever heard from you was an unfounded accusation?”

Everyone laughed, even Mrs. Weasley. (153)
This won’t be the last time danger fails to penetrate Fred’s humor.

Fred’s nonchalant attitude is reiterated after the Triwizard Tournament is announced. He’s quite eager to get his name in the Goblet despite the age limit.

“People have died, though!” said Hermione in a worried voice ...

“Yeah,” said Fred airily, “but that was years ago, wasn’t it?

Anyway, where’s the fun without a bit of risk?” (190)

Bringing up death numerous times, while making the reader laugh over and over about the prospect of Fred dying is a fantastic display of Rowling’s use of narrative misdirection. By the second half of the series, the reader is convinced that the idea of a twin death is purely laughable.

Two passages in *Order of the Phoenix*, however, truly spell out Fred’s fate. Molly’s encounter with a Boggart at Grimmauld Place lends a somber air to the foreshadowing:

Someone was cowering against the dark wall, her wand in her hand, her whole body shaking with sobs. Sprawled on the dusty old carpet in a patch of moonlight, clearly dead, was Ron.

All the air seemed to vanish from Harry’s lungs; he felt as though he were falling through the floor; his brain turned icy cold—Ron dead, no, it couldn’t be—

But wait a moment, it couldn’t be—Ron was downstairs—

“Mrs. Weasley?” Harry croaked.

“R-r-riddikulus!” Mrs. Weasley sobbed, pointing her shaking wand at Ron’s body.
Crack.

Ron’s body turned into Bill’s, spread-eagled on his back, his eyes wide open and empty. Mrs. Weasley sobbed harder than ever.

“R-riddikulus!” she sobbed again.

Crack.

Mr. Weasley’s body replaced Bill’s, his glasses askew, a trickle of blood running down his face.

“No!” Mrs. Weasley moaned. “No… riddikulus! Riddikulus! RIDDIKULUS!”


This passage takes any light-heartedness from our fears of death for these characters and brings us into stark reality. Much like we had previously taken the idea of dying as a joke, we had also considered the Boggart a comic image. This passage clearly shows us that we should take both very seriously. We should also look a little closer at it because Rowling is once again pointing us to who is in danger. Obviously, the spell-word “riddikulus” is taken from the word “ridiculous.” We can then break this scene down to a number of images that are one after the other, regarded as ridiculous. First, we see Ron dead, and we hear “ridiculous.” Next, we see Bill dead. This is also ridiculous. Next up is Mr. Weasley dead, which is once again, ridiculous. The last three images are dead twins, dead Percy, and dead Harry, but no ridiculous follows these images. It is almost like Rowling is making a checklist for us, and is showing her readers which
characters you can cross off the death list. Ron dying? Ridiculous. Bill dying? Ridiculous. Mr. Weasley dying? Ridiculous. The twins, Percy, or Harry? Rowling is stunningly silent. We thus have our potential hit list. The chapter title “The Woes of Mrs. Weasley” tell us clearly that her worries should be our focus, and her stance is depressing yet realistic: “Half the f-f-family’s in the Order, it’ll be a miracle if we all come through this… and P-P-Percy’s not talking to us… What if something d-d-dreadful happens and we had never m-m-made up?” (177). With this passage, we are brought back down to reality. The odds are simply not in favor of the Weasleys. While this above passage could be said to refer to either of the twins, another *Order of the Phoenix* passage points specifically to Fred:

> “Headless Hats!” shouted George, as Fred waved a pointed hat decorated with a fluffy pink feather at the watching students. “Two Galleons each—watch Fred now!”

Fred swept the hat onto his head, beaming. For a second he merely looked rather stupid, then both hat and head vanished.

Several girls screamed, but everyone else was roaring with laughter. (540)

This passage is extremely foreboding once the actual manner of Fred’s death is revealed—a head injury while in mid-laughter. While still a somewhat comic image, in keeping with the dark tone of *Phoenix*, we see that there are some students who don’t immediately find this image funny. Mrs. Weasley as well, does not immediately find Fred and George’s products amusing. When she first walks up to Weasley’s Wizard Wheezes in *Half-Blood Prince* and sees their advertisement for “U-No-Poo”, she whispers, “They’ll be murdered in their beds!” (116). The
Trio treats this as an overreaction.

Yet even after all of this foreshadowing, the argument could still have been made that many of these passages could refer to either one of the twins. It was the beginning of *Deathly Hallows*, however, that sealed Fred’s fate. George’s injury in Harry’s escape marked him for mourning. “As the lamplight fell across George’s head, Ginny gasped and Harry’s stomach lurched: One of George’s ears was missing” (69). Notice that George’s injury is not a cut or a slash that would leave a scar, an addition to his appearance. It’s a subtraction. A part of him is missing.

Throughout the books, we have seen Fred and George constantly being mistaken for each other. George’s injury finally makes this impossible. “‘Ah well,’ said George, grinning at his tear-soaked mother. ‘You’ll be able to tell us apart now, anyway, Mum’” (75). This is the most definitive and grim foreshadowing: George is finally defined because of the absence of his ear. Because George and Fred were always considered a unit, for the remainder of his life, George will be defined by the absence of his twin. George will never figuratively or literally be whole again.
Wholeness: Natural and Unnatural

The better part of the Wizarding World’s history centers around the debate of who is or is not worthy of acceptance in the magical community – who is or is not a true witch or wizard. In one camp is the Nazi-esque mindset that only those from fully magical families are qualified. “Mudblood” (a term meaning “tainted blood,” and used akin to various racial epithets throughout the world) is used by prejudiced witches and wizards to describe those of magical ability who come from non-magic families while “pure” is used to describe fully accepted magically-blooded persons. Those biased witches and wizards are constantly discussing and harping on their blood status. Draco casually meets Harry while being measured for robes in *Sorcerer’s Stone*, and without even knowing Harry’s name, launches into his blood status beliefs.

“…[your parents] were *our* kind, weren’t they?”

“They were a witch and wizard, if that’s what you mean.”

“I really don’t think they should let the other sort in, do you? They’re just not the same, they’ve never been brought up to know our ways. Some of them have never even heard of Hogwarts until they get the letter, imagine.

I think they should keep it in the old wizarding families.” (78)

It’s rather a heavy conversation for a first meeting, but Draco’s pure-blood superiority is clearly very deeply ingrained. The concept of being pure-blood is one that denotes singularity – blood free of any outside (or “unpure”) influence. Harry’s mindset and that of his companions is that all those capable of magic are equal members in their world. Dumbledore vocalizes this belief best in *Goblet of Fire* when he admonishes Fudge, “You fail to recognize that it matters not what someone is born, but what they grow to be!” (708). This argument continues throughout the
series as to whether birthright or talent is what involves a witch or wizard in magical society, but the core of this great debate is essentially the question: who is or is not whole?

It’s interesting that Harry and all those on his side hardly portray any sense of purity or wholeness. Harry is a half-blood and an orphan. Hermione is muggle-born. Lupin is a werewolf, putting him on the outs of magical society. Tonks is half-blood, and to emphasize her non-singular qualities, is shown with a constantly altering appearance. Sirius is the outcast of his family and an accused criminal. The Weasley’s, though pure-bloods, are marginalized by their poverty. Neville’s magical prowess is less than stellar (despite his pure-blood status), and with his parents mentally absent, is practically an orphan. Dumbledore’s pure-blood family is nearly all dead except for his one goat-loving brother with whom he maintains an icy relationship. How do any of these people become examples of wholeness? This is where Rowling’s use of twin imagery comes into play.

There are a multitude of dualistic images in the series, but they can be simply categorized by the distinction of natural or unnatural. Some characters have natural, in-born dualistic qualities or relationships that represent a natural partnership. Other characters attempt unnatural experiments in duality that force them to supersede their own inherent natures. This is the distinction that guides the reader to determine wholeness amongst the characters. The obvious place to begin is with the natural twinships of the series.

Identical twins occur biologically when a single fertilized egg splits in two and each of these halves develops into a complete embryo, creating two complete people who are genetically the exact same person. Fred and George Weasley fall into this category, and these two tricksters
make it difficult to even consider them as separate entities. During their very first appearance in the series, their first joke is to toy with their mother over which twin is which.

“Fred, you next,” the plump woman said.

“I’m not Fred, I’m George,” said the boy. “Honestly, woman, you call yourself our mother? Can’t you tell I’m George?”

“Sorry, George, dear.”

“Only joking, I am Fred,” said the boy, and off he went. (92)

The twins are still using this gag in *Deathly Hallows* when they pull the same joke on Mad-Eye Moody:

… “Arthur and Fred—“

“I’m George,” said the twin at whom Moody was pointing. “Can’t you even tell us apart when we’re Harry?”

“Sorry, George—“

“I’m only yanking your wand, I’m Fred really—“

“Enough messing around!” snarled Moody. (52)

The twins’ single identity is exacerbated when they speak in unison, which they do eight times throughout the series. Although eight may seem a small number in seven books, the only people who speak in unison more often are Harry, Ron, and Hermione.

Even Fred and George’s extracurricular activity does nothing to earn them a singular identity as they play the same position on their Quidditch team. Their position as Beaters is central to their characterization. Every other Quidditch position is singular (Seeker or Keeper) or in the instance of Chasers, tripled. Beaters are in pairs and serve the basic purpose of bringing chaos to the game by knocking around the two most unpredictable of the four Quidditch balls, the Bludgers. Oliver Wood explains: “The Bludgers rocket around, trying to knock players off
their brooms. That’s why you have two Beaters on each team—the Weasley twins are ours—it’s their job to protect their side from the Bludgers and try and knock them toward the other team” (Sorcerer’s Stone 168). When Harry seems afraid of being gravely injured by the Bludgers, Wood reassures him, “Don’t worry, the Weasleys are more than a match for the Bludgers—I mean, they’re like a pair of human Bludgers themselves” (169). Fred and George fit naturally into this mold. It’s this teamwork and friendship that make it even more heartbreaking when Fred is killed. Fred and George are separate but whole, a natural complete pair.

Yet, Fred and George are not the only pair of identical twins at Hogwarts. Parvati and her sister Padma are also identical twins. However, their relationship is nothing like that of Fred and George. Despite being biologically identical, they are not what could be considered a unit. The Sorting Hat places them in two different houses, Gryffindor and Ravenclaw respectively, whereas Fred and George are both in Gryffindor. Harry and Hermione marvel at this peculiarity:

“Brothers and sisters usually go in the same Houses, don’t they?”

[Harry] said. He was judging by the Weasleys, all seven of whom had been put in Gryffindor.

“Oh no, not necessarily,” said Hermione. “Parvati Patil’s twin’s in Ravenclaw, and they’re identical. You’d think they’d be together, wouldn’t you?” (Goblet of Fire 174)

Parvati and Padma are mentioned briefly as twins in book one, but the reader may well have forgotten that Parvati has an identical twin until the fourth book when they accompany Harry and Ron to the Yule Ball. When Parvati and Padma are finally shown together they don’t speak in unison or behave as a unit like Fred and George.
Why is there such a discrepancy? What is Rowling trying to point out by providing the reader with two sets of identical twins that behave in two completely different ways? A comparison of these sets of twins shows their importance. In the case of Parvati and Padma, their similarity lies in their biology alone. In behavior and friendship, Fred and George and Parvati and Padma are completely opposite. Fred and George act identical while Parvati and Padma behave as separate entities. Thus, it is behavior that the reader is meant to associate with twinship, not biology. Fred and George are a unit. Parvati and Padma are not. It’s actually Lavender that Parvati is shown to have a greater kinship with. It’s Lavender and Parvati as a pair that Harry thinks of when he asks Parvati to the Yule Ball in *Goblet of Fire*. Padma isn’t even Parvati’s first thought when Harry finds out that Lavender is going with Seamus. Parvati suggests Hermione, who is also taken. When Parvati does think of Padma, she seems unsure: “‘Well…’ said Parvati slowly, ‘I suppose my sister might… Padma, you know… in Ravenclaw. I’ll ask her if you like’” (402). In the Fred and George model, Parvati and Lavender are shown twice speaking in unison. They also share a fascination with divination. In this way, Parvati and Lavender are the true pair, not Parvati and Padma. The twins’ names also emphasize this message as Fred and George, the more “identical” twins, have names that begin with two different letters, while Parvati and Padma’s names are more physically similar, both beginning with “Pa”. Rowling’s message is clear: actions determine wholeness—not appearance or genetics.

Based on this model of twinship, we can determine other pairs who Rowling would group together as natural twins. Harry and Ron form a twin pair as their friendship mirrors that of Fred and George. They speak in unison seventeen times throughout the series. As if to drive home
this point of comparison, there are instances where Ron and Harry’s speech overlaps that of Fred and George, merging the two pairs.

Fred and George came over the threshold, then froze at the sight of Harry, Ron, and Hermione.

“What’re you doing here?” Ron and Fred said at the same time.

“Sending a letter,” said Harry and George in unison.

“What, at this time?” said Hermione and Fred. \(\textit{Goblet of Fire} 567\)

In the Epilogue, Ron and Harry are literally brothers. Harry and Ginny’s marriage is much more the case of Harry becoming a Weasley than of Ginny becoming a Potter. Harry, Ron, and Hermione speak in unison five times, and they can also be considered a set. It might be appropriate to call Harry, Ron, and Hermione the singular set of triplets in the series.

Another pair of non-biological natural twins is Hogwarts’ first pair of tricksters, James and Sirius. Although Slughorn speaks of Sirius and Regulus as a “set” \(\textit{Half-Blood Prince} 70\), it is James who is Sirius’ true sibling. They’re shown speaking in unison in Snape’s memories \(\textit{Deathly Hallows} 672\). When we first hear of James and Sirius’ friendship, Rowling also slips in a comparison to Fred and George:

“Do you remember who [Sirius Black’s] best friend was?”

“Naturally,” said Madam Rosmerta… “Never saw one without the other, did you? The number of times I had them in here—ooh, they used to make me laugh. Quite the double act, Sirius Black and James Potter!”…”
“Precisely,” said Professor McGonagall. “Black and Potter. Ringleaders of their little gang. Both very bright, of course—exceptionally bright, in fact—but I don’t think we’ve ever had such a pair of troublemakers—“

“I dunno,” chuckled Hagrid. “Fred and George Weasley could give ‘em a run fer their money.”

“You’d have thought Black and Potter were brothers!” chimed in Professor Flitwick. “Inseparable!” (Prisoner of Azkaban 204).

The twin pair of Harry and Ron can also be compared to James and Sirius. Harry and Ron’s Patronuses mirror the Animagus forms of James and Sirius. Harry’s Patronus is a stag while Ron’s is a dog. We can clearly imagine that when grown, Harry would make Ron his first child’s godfather.

Analyzing James and Sirius’ full clique, the Marauders, shows what types of twinship are unnatural. This is displayed through James, Sirius, and Peter’s decision to become Animagi. Although being able to turn into an animal seems an attractive and interesting idea, it is clear in the series that embracing this double-nature is really more trouble than it is worth. All but one (McGonagall) of the Animagi that we meet in the series are making their transformations illegally, and Snape’s discovery of their ability to extreme danger. The act of taking the form of a stag, although done nobly to comfort his friend, leads to a nearly fatal incident with Snape that becomes a point of confrontation even after James’ death. Although we know in the end that this was not the ultimate cause of Snape’s hatred, it is this instance that Dumbledore points to when explaining to Harry why James and Snape were enemies.

“…your father did something Snape could never forgive.”

“What?”
“He saved his life.”

“What?”

“Yes…” said Dumbledore dreamily. “Funny, the way people’s minds work, isn’t it? Professor Snape couldn’t bear being in your father’s debt… I do believe he worked so hard to protect you this year because he felt it would make him and your father even. Then he could go back to hating your father’s memory in peace…” (Sorcerer’s Stone 300).

Yes, the real danger came from Lupin because of his werewolf condition. However, Snape’s rivalry with James and James’ accompaniment of Lupin once a month is probably one of the main factors that drew Snape’s curiosity. James and Sirius joining Lupin as Animagi (that is, three people sneaking off instead of just one) clearly drew attention. In Order of the Phoenix, Lucius recognizes Sirius in dog-form on Platform 9 ¾, which leads to Sirius’ confinement and solitude at Grimmauld Place. The entire plot of Prisoner of Azkaban would not have occurred if Sirius hadn’t recognized Peter’s disguise as Scabbers. The revelation of Pettigrew’s identity, although it proves Sirius’ innocence (to a select few), certainly doesn’t help Pettigrew himself. This discovery forces Wormtail out of hiding and leads him back to Voldemort, which hardly ends well for Mr. Pettigrew. Likewise, when Hermione discovers that Rita Skeeter is an unregistered Animagus in Goblet of Fire, she’s able to imprison and blackmail Rita, pulling her out of the tabloid industry and leading her into poverty.

Professor McGonagall, the only legal Animagus that readers meet, does not abuse her double-nature. McGonagall’s ability to turn into a cat is used for little more than observation and entertainment. Her demonstration of her Animagi powers when displayed to her class are actually completely overlooked because the class is too somber over Professor Trelawney’s
prediction of Harry’s death: “‘Really, what has gotten into you all today?’ said Professor McGonagall… ‘Not that it matters, but that’s the first time my transformation’s not got applause from a class’” (109). Rowling portrays becoming an Animagus as an immensely dangerous path on which very few embark, rather than as a solution to any sort of problem. In the second Triwizard task, Krum’s incomplete form of transfiguration is not overly helpful in aiding him to complete the challenge: “The shark-man swam straight to Hermione and began snapping and biting at her ropes; the trouble was that Krum’s new teeth were positioned very awkwardly for biting anything smaller than a dolphin, and Harry was quite sure that if Krum wasn’t careful, he was going to rip Hermione in half” (Goblet of Fire 500-1). Harry has to assist him in releasing Hermione, and Krum comes in third only because Fleur never reaches her hostage. If Fleur had not encountered the grindylows, Krum probably would have taken last place. Earlier in Goblet of Fire, Draco is rescued from a punishment of transfiguration by Professor McGonagall, the lawful Animagus. After Draco tries to curse Harry when his back is turned, Moody turns Draco into a ferret and bounces him off the floor.

“Hello, Professor McGonagall,” said Moody calmly, bouncing the ferret still higher.

“What—what are you doing?” said Professor McGonagall, her eyes following the bouncing ferret’s progress through the air.

“Teaching,” said Moody.

“Teach—Moody, is that a student?” shrieked Professor McGonagall, the books spilling out of her arms.

“Yep,” said Moody.
“No!” cried Professor McGonagall, running down the stairs and pulling out her wand; a moment later, with a loud snapping noise, Draco Malfoy had reappeared, lying in a heap on the floor with his sleek blond hair all over his now brilliantly pink face. He got to his feet, wincing.

“Moody, we never use transfiguration as a punishment!” (205-6).

At the end of *Goblet of Fire*, we recognize this as a double statement against unnatural duality since this unauthorized form of punishment is carried out by someone using Polyjuice Potion. Transformation by Polyjuice Potion is another example of unnatural duality. By consuming the potion, the drinker becomes the twin of whoever’s hair is added to the mixture. The use of Polyjuice Potion never occurs without dangerous accidents. When the Trio uses Polyjuice Potion in *Chamber of Secrets*, Hermione is accidently turned into a cat because she mistakenly adds cat hair and not human hair into the potion. “‘It was a c-cat hair!’ [Hermione] howled. ‘M-Millicent Bulstrode m-must have a cat! And the p-potion isn’t supposed to be used for animal transformations!’” (225-6). In *Goblet of Fire*, Barty Crouch Jr. uses Polyjuice Potion to become Mad-Eye Moody, which results in Voldemort’s resurrection, Crouch Sr.’s murder, and the loss of Crouch Jr.’s soul. Polyjuice Potion is used again in *Half-Blood Prince* by Crabbe and Goyle to guard the Room of Requirement so that Malfoy can repair the Vanishing Cabinet, which leads to the Deatheaters’ entrance of Hogwarts. In *Deathly Hallows*, Harry’s escape from Privet Drive using Polyjuice cannot be labeled fully successful as it results in George’s mutilation and Mad-Eye Moody’s death. Hermione also uses Polyjuice to become Bellatrix Lestrange as part of the trio’s plan to break into Gringotts – yet another extremely dangerous venture into duality.
Lupin is an interesting study in twinship in that he represents both missing duality and an unnatural twinship. The key lies in his name – Remus Lupin. Remus is famous in mythology as the twin brother of Romulus, founder of Rome. As legend goes, these twins were raised by wolves. Clearly, this is a fitting name since Lupin (also a name referring to wolves) is a werewolf, a condition that plagues him in the Wizarding World, placing him on the margins of society. Because of his first name, there has been speculation in the Harry Potter fandom that Remus had a twin – a theory that Rowling debunked on her website (Rowling, “Professor Lupin”). The question then arises, why give Remus Lupin a name pointing to twinship if he doesn’t have a twin? Further, if Rowling simply wanted to make an allusion to the mythical wolf twins, why not use Romulus instead of Remus? Either name is a reference to the same myth. The answer is because Remus Lupin is not a whole man. He has been plagued by his werewolf condition from a young age, separating him and cutting him off as a full member of society. Rowling has said that he represents the disabled and ill in our community, who are often marginalized and prevented from whole participation in their respective spheres: “Lupin’s a damaged person, literally and metaphorically. I think it’s important for children to know that adults, too, have their problems, that they struggle. His being a werewolf is a metaphor for people’s reactions to illness and disability” (Fraser). Rowling christens him Remus instead of Romulus because he does not believe in his own ability to do great things. He thinks of himself as broken and tries to use this as an excuse to not begin a relationship with Tonks when she professes her feelings for him. Arguing with Molly and Arthur Weasley, Lupin responds, “Tonks deserves somebody young and whole” (Half-Blood Prince 624). Although Lupin does eventually marry Tonks, it is clear that he hasn’t completely gotten over his insecurities. When Tonks becomes pregnant with his child, Lupin runs away, fearing the consequences of founding
a line that begins with his condition. “My kind don’t usually breed! It will be like me, I am convinced of it—how can I forgive myself, when I knowingly risked passing on my own condition to an innocent child?” (Deathly Hallows 213). Harry admonishes Lupin to return to Tonks, whose duality is inborn and natural, unlike Remus’ unnatural werewolf alter-ego, which is the result of an outside infection. It is significant that the next time Harry hears of Lupin after their confrontation, he has since returned to Tonks and accepted his fatherhood, taking his place as the founder of a line. Listening to Potterwatch, Harry learns Remus has chosen the pseudonym “Romulus.”

“And now, over to Romulus for our popular feature ‘Pals of Potter.’”

“Thanks, River,” said another very familiar voice; Ron started to speak, but Hermione forestalled him in a whisper.

“We know it’s Lupin!”

…

“And what would you say to Harry if you knew he was listening, Romulus?”

“I’d tell him we’re all with him in spirit,” said Lupin, then hesitated slightly. “And I’d tell him to follow his instincts, which are good and nearly always right.”

…

“Oh, didn’t I tell you?” said Ron in surprise. “Bill told me Lupin’s living with Tonks again! And apparently she’s getting pretty big too…”

(Deathly Hallows 441)
Having accepted his wife and his unborn child, Lupin considers himself a greater man, and as a member of a family unit, Lupin is now whole.

Neville, like Lupin, is also a would-be twin. While Harry is the Boy Who Lived, Neville serves as the Boy Who Could Have Been. Neville is very much a foil to Harry. Harry’s parents die, but Harry is able to see and connect with images of them via the Mirror of Erised, Priori Incantatem, and the Resurrection Stone. Neville can see, hug, and speak to his parents, but there is no true communication because of their mental incapacitation. When pondering Neville’s situation, Harry considers it even sadder than his own: “As Harry took off his glasses and climbed into his four-poster, he imagined how it must feel to have parents still living but unable to recognize you. He often got sympathy from strangers for being an orphan, but as he listened to Neville’s snores, he thought that Neville deserved it more than he did” (Goblet of Fire 607).

Harry and Neville both live with their overbearing next of kin, and while Harry’s aunt and uncle attempt to squash the magic out of him, Neville’s grandmother is concerned he may not be magic enough. Neville explains:

“My Great Uncle Algie kept trying to catch me off my guard and force some magic out of me—he pushed me off the Blackpool pier once, I nearly drowned—but nothing happened until I was eight. Great Uncle Algie came round for dinner, and he was hanging me out of an upstairs window by the ankles when my Great Auntie Enid offered him a meringue and he accidentally let go. But I bounced—all the way down the garden and into the road. They were all really pleased, Gran was crying, she was so happy” (Sorcerer’s Stone 125).

In fact, it could be said that Neville was bullied into magic.
Neville’s isolation is furthered by his ignorance of the prophecy and what could have been his fate instead of Harry’s. Harry’s full knowledge of the prophecy’s contents solidifies Neville as the severed twin, and Harry is left solo to contemplate their lives in reflection.

Neville’s childhood had been blighted by Voldemort just as much as Harry’s had, but Neville had no idea how close he had come to having Harry’s destiny. The prophecy could have referred to either of them, yet, for his own inscrutable reasons, Voldemort had chosen to believe that Harry was the one meant.

Had Voldemort chosen Neville, it would be Neville sitting opposite Harry bearing the lightning-shaped scar and the weight of the prophecy… Or would it? Would Neville’s mother have died to save him, as Lily had died for Harry? Surely she would… But what if she had been unable to stand between her son and Voldemort? Would there have been no “Chosen One” at all? An empty seat where Neville now sat and a scarless Harry who would have been kissed good-bye by his own mother, not Ron’s?

*(Half-Blood Prince* 139-40).

Neville and Harry’s connection is solidified in *Deathly Hallows* when Harry imparts the knowledge of the final horcrux onto Neville: “Dumbledore had died knowing that three people still knew about the Horcruxes; now Neville would take Harry’s place: There would still be three in the secret” (696). Neville serves as Harry’s double in this respect.

Dumbledore is also a severed twin. His twinship with Grindewald is an example of that very common device known as “the evil twin.” Similar to the Sirius/Regulus relationship, Albus Dumbledore physically resembles his brother Aberforth. Harry even mistakes Aberforth’s eye
for Albus’ in the sliver of Sirius’ broken mirror. Albus’ true partner, however, was Grindewald, who Rowling referred to as Dumbledore’s “dark twin” (Anelli). Both brilliant and both looking to right wrongs against wizard kind, Dumbledore and Grindewald are equally ready to act for “the greater good.” The tragedy of Arianna’s death pulls Dumbledore back from the extremes of Grindewald’s quest for power, at which point Dumbledore severs their friendship. He never ceases to recognize in himself the likenesses to Grindewald, however, and keeps himself away from too much power in the event that this darker side of himself would once again surface. “I had proven, as a very young man, that power was my weakness and my temptation. It is a curious thing, Harry, but perhaps those who are best suited to power are those who have never sought it” (Deathly Hallows 718). The severed connection is further represented by the winning of the Elder Wand from Grindewald by Dumbledore. During their friendship, they were connected by their quest for the Deathly Hallows. The Elder Wand severs its allegiance to Grindewald during their duel, cutting off Grindewald from power and leaving Dumbledore to emerge as the victorious but much humbled twin.
Wands and their Twins

Wands throughout the series serve as inanimate twins of the wizards and witches that wield them. Though objects, Rowling portrays them as quasi-sentient with the ability to choose whose power they allow themselves to channel:

“I see wands as being quasi-sentient, you know? I think they awaken to a kind of—They’re not exactly animate but they’re close to it. As close to it as you can get in an object because they carry so much magic. So that’s really the key point about a wand… So one would expect a certain amount of loyalty from one’s wand. So even if you were disarmed while carrying it, even if you lost a fight while carrying it, it has developed an affinity with you that it will not give up easily. If, however, a wand is won, properly won in an adult duel, then a wand may switch allegiance, and it will certainly work better even if it hasn’t fully switched allegiance for the person who won it.” (Anelli)

For wizard-kind this is a natural connection, and the attempt to use a wand other than one’s allied wand is shown to produce less than desired results and a feeling of unnaturalness. Harry experiences this feeling with a wand Ron wins after Harry’s own wand is broken in his escape from Voldemort. “Harry looked down at the blackthorn wand. Every minor spell he had cast with it so far that day had seemed less powerful than those he had produced with his phoenix wand. The new one felt intrusively unfamiliar, like having somebody else’s hand sewn to the end of his arm” (Deathly Hallows 392). This unnaturalness is the source of this attempted
twinship’s failure.

The loss of a wand in the Wizarding World is portrayed as a type of bereavement. The reader is meant to feel pity and sympathy for a wandless witch or wizard. It also represents a severing of the witch or wizard from normal magical society. As readers, we’re outraged when Muggle-born witches and wizards are portrayed as thieves of “real” witches and wizards’ wands in *Deathly Hallows*.

“A wand was taken from you upon your arrival at the Ministry today, Mrs. Cattermole,” Umbridge was saying. “Eight-and-three-quarter inches, cherry, unicorn-hair core. Do you recognize that description?”

Mrs. Cattermole nodded, mopping her eyes on her sleeve.

“Could you please tell us from which witch or wizard you took that wand?”

“T-took?” sobbed Mrs. Cattermole. “I didn’t t-take it from anybody. I b-bought it when I was eleven years old. It—it—it—chose me.”

Umbridge laughed a soft girlish laugh that made Harry want to attack her…

“No,” said Umbridge, “no, I don’t think so, Mrs. Cattermole. Wands only choose witches or wizards. You are not a witch” (260-1).

We know the prejudice of Muggle-borns has reached a crescendo when their natural magical right to wand twinship is in question.

Rowling cultivates sympathetic feelings towards Hagrid by likewise showing him as
wandless. Hagrid’s status of being half-giant, which we learn of in book four, is merely a confirmation that he is not a fully accepted member of his community. Our pity for Hagrid begins in book one when it’s shown that Hagrid’s wand was snapped when he was expelled:

“Rubeus! Rubeus Hagrid! How nice to see you again… Oak, sixteen inches, rather bendy, wasn’t it?”

“It was, sir, yes,” said Hagrid.

“Good wand, that one. But I suppose they snapped it in half when you got expelled?” said Mr. Ollivander, suddenly stern.

“Er—yes, they did, yes,” said Hagrid, shuffling his feet. “I’ve still got the pieces, though,” he added brightly.

“But you don’t use them?” said Mr. Ollivander sharply.

“Oh, no, sir,” said Hagrid quickly. Harry noticed he gripped his pink umbrella very tightly as he spoke (Sorcerer’s Stone 83).

The comic treatment of Hagrid’s wand being hidden inside a pink umbrella mirrors his treatment by the majority of society. Hagrid’s ineptitude is generally the object of laughter.

Like Hagrid, Ron is a character to be pitied and who also, early in the series, is shown breaking his wand. Harry and Ron have just crashed into the Whomping Willow, but the state of the car isn’t Ron’s first concern:

…to his right, Ron let out a low, despairing groan.

“Are you okay?” Harry said urgently.

“My wand,” said Ron, in a shaky voice. “Look at my wand—“

It had snapped, almost in two; the tip was dangling limply, held on by a few splinters. (Chamber of Secrets 74)
The Weasley’s financial status often elicits great sympathy from Harry and feelings of inadequacy from Ron. In *Chamber of Secrets*, Ron’s wand is damaged but not fully broken, making it useable but not reliable, much like Ron’s behavior throughout the series. His fits of jealously and self-pity make him the most volatile member of their group. He abandons Harry’s friendship in both *Goblet of Fire* and *Deathly Hallows* and turns on Hermione in both *Prisoner of Azkaban* and *Half-Blood Prince*. In *Sorcerer’s Stone*, it was Ron’s reluctance to befriend Hermione that upset her enough to spend an afternoon crying in the bathroom. Yet, in the end, Ron’s loyalty wins out, and he finds new stamina and optimism, as symbolized by his replaced wand and the new wands he provides the Trio after returning in *Deathly Hallows*. Of course, it is Harry’s wand that is the most curious in the series. Its connection with Voldemort’s wand is an obvious mirroring of Harry’s own connection with Voldemort through Harry’s scar horcrux, and the mystery of their twin cores is a central mystery in the series. It’s a mystery that Rowling clearly wants us to ponder. She uses the term “twin core” eight times in *Deathly Hallows*. The telepathic connection, like the cores, that Harry and Voldemort share is one that neither of them anticipated and which Voldemort is eager to overcome. In both cases (telepathic and wand), it is Harry who is aware of the connection before Voldemort. Harry is made aware of both connections in the first novel, but Voldemort is not aware of the core connection until book four and not aware of the mind connection until book five.

The twin core problem and Harry and Voldemort’s reactions to the connection mirror the attitudes of Harry and Voldemort to their mental connection as well. In the beginning of *Goblet of Fire*, Harry’s wand is used as a beacon to announce the Dark Lord’s rising strength just as later in the novel, Harry’s blood is used as an ingredient to accomplish his resurrection. Harry accepts his wand’s connection to Voldemort as a forgivable aspect of its inherent nature:
“[Harry] was very fond of his wand, and as far as he was concerned its relation to Voldemort’s wand was something it couldn’t help—rather as he couldn’t help being related to Aunt Petunia” (Goblet of Fire 310). Harry uses that connection and its effect to his advantage to escape Voldemort in Goblet of Fire and to ultimately defeat Voldemort in Deathly Hallows. Even though the Holly-Phoenix wand is not used in Harry and Voldemort’s final duel, the two wands used both share an allegiance to Harry and thus can be said to be equivalents of the Holly-Phoenix wand. The Elder and Hawthorn wands essentially have the same connection as the Yew and Holly wands. They are both representations of a single allegiance.

Voldemort’s whole attempt to gain the Elder Wand in the first place is driven by his desire to circumvent the Phoenix core connection. This desire is the reason the wandmaker Ollivander was kidnapped. “‘The Dark Lord,’ said Ollivander in hushed and frightened tones, ‘had always been happy with the wand I made him—yew and phoenix feather, thirteen-and-a-half inches—until he discovered the connection of the twin cores. Now he seeks another, more powerful wand, as the only way to conquer yours’” (Deathly Hallows 496). Ultimately, Voldemort’s desire to side-step the twin core problem is what leads to Harry’s advantage in their final duel, much like attempting to undo the prophecy results in its fulfillment and Harry’s scar horcrux, which provides their mental connection. Dumbledore tells Harry in Half-Blood Prince, “Voldemort himself created his worst enemy, just as tyrants everywhere do… By attempting to kill you, Voldemort himself singled out the remarkable person who sits here in front of me, and gave him the tools for the job! It is Voldemort’s fault that you were able to see into his thoughts, his ambitions, that you even understand the snakelike language in which he gives orders…” (510). Voldemort’s use of this connection in Order of the Phoenix which resulted in Sirius’ death was really the only instance of Voldemort using the link. After this instance, Voldemort
uses Occlumency to block Harry and doesn’t attempt to plant mental images in Harry’s head again, which is quite strange given the success that Voldemort had in using it. Harry, however, easily uses the link to locate Voldemort in Deathly Hallows, which leads him to Snape’s death, and ultimately the answer to Voldemort’s defeat. Although the idea of this taint disgusts Harry, he’s still willing to use it if it will assist in undermining Voldemort, much like Harry accepts his wand despite its twin core.

Yet, Harry’s wand is not only a connection to Voldemort. The phoenix feather in the wand comes from Dumbledore’s phoenix, Fawkes, so it also just as greatly represents a connection to Dumbledore. Fawkes is shown in Chamber of Secrets to be a representation of loyalty to Dumbledore, which Harry shows greatly until Voldemort’s return. In Goblet of Fire, Harry’s wand is stolen, which is a dire foreshadowing of how Harry’s faith in his headmaster will soon be tested. In Deathly Hallows, the breaking of Harry’s wand mirrors his test of faith in Dumbledore. Harry’s discovery of Dumbledore’s earlier temptations of power makes him question his trust in his mentor’s larger plan. He is even drawn to considering whether Dumbledore had any plan at all. It is at this lowest point that Harry’s wand is shown broken, and Harry’s situation looks similarly irreparable.

And [Harry’s] fury at Dumbledore broke over him now like lava, scorching him inside, wiping out every other feeling. Out of sheer desperation they had talked themselves into believing that Godric’s Hallow held answers, convinced themselves that they were supposed to go back, that it was all part of some secret path laid out for them by Dumbledore; but there was no map, no plan. Dumbledore had left them to grope in the darkness, to wrestle with unknown and undreamed-of terrors, alone and
unaided: Nothing was explained, nothing was given freely, they had no sword, and now, Harry had no wand (351).

The incident at Malfoy Manor and Dobby’s death are what force Harry to reconsider, and Harry chooses to trust Dumbledore again:

Harry understood and yet did not understand. His instinct was telling him one thing, his brain quite another. The Dumbledore in Harry’s head smiled, surveying Harry over the tips of his fingers, pressed together as if in prayer.

*You gave Ron the Deluminator. You understood him... You gave him a way back...*  
*And you understood Wormtail too... You knew there was a bit of regret there, somewhere...*  
*And if you knew them... What did you know about me,*

*Dumbledore?*  
*Am I meant to know, but not to seek? Did you know how hard I’d find that? Is that why you made it this difficult? So I’d have time to work that out?* (483).

The escape from Malfoy Manor is when Harry wins the loyalty of Draco’s wand. “Malfoy” is French for “bad faith” (Colbert 116). Harry regains his loyalty because of this incident. His faith is returned and restored.

Through this encounter with Draco, Harry dually wins the allegiance of the Elder Wand:

“You still don’t get it, Riddle, do you? Possessing the wand isn’t enough!

Holding it, using it, doesn’t make it really yours. Didn’t you listen to
Ollivander? The wand chooses the wizard… The Elder Wand recognized a new master before Dumbledore died, someone who never even laid a hand on it. The new master removed the wand from Dumbledore against his will, never realizing exactly what he had done, or that the world’s most dangerous wand had given him its allegiance…

“The true master of the Elder Wand was Draco Malfoy.”

Blank shock showed in Voldemort’s face for a moment, but then it was gone.

“But what does it matter?” he said softly. “Even if you are right, Potter, it makes no difference to you and me. You no longer have the phoenix wand: We duel on skill alone…and after I have killed you, I can attend to Draco Malfoy…”

“But you’re too late,” said Harry. “You’ve missed your chance. I got there first. I overpowered Draco weeks ago. I took this wand from him.”

Harry twitched the hawthorn wand, and he felt the eyes of everyone in the Hall upon it.

“So it all comes down to this, doesn’t it?” whispered Harry. “Does the wand in your hand know its last master was Disarmed? Because if it does…I am the true master of the Elder Wand.” (Deathly Hallows 742-3)

Of course, Harry is correct, and the Elder Wand refuses to use the Killing Curse on its master, which results in Voldemort’s death. The Elder Wand then enables Harry to fully repair his original phoenix wand. Harry’s first, natural wizard-wand twinship is whole once more.
What is Voldemort’s great fallacy on all of these occasions? Why does he make all these mistakes that lead so pointedly to his downfall? Answering these questions ties in Rowling’s framework of wholeness to the story’s overarching theme. It is the natural tendency to speak of Harry and Voldemort in the realm of evil twins, but discussing them along this line leads to a greater discussion of their differences instead of putting the focus where Rowling wishes it – on their likenesses. If Harry and Voldemort can be described through likenesses, the focus narrows to their choices alone. Seeing their similarities but noting their behavior is what Rowling has encouraged throughout her twin motif. This provided structure practiced on minor characters provides readers the tool kit with which to analyze the main characters.
The Final Division

Through applying numerology, there is a great revelation into the extent of the connection between Harry and Voldemort. Hermione lists Arithmancy (prediction by numbers) as one of her favorite subjects, and Hermione and Dumbledore are identified as the two direct voices of Rowling in the series (Eric). Numerology seeks to analyze personalities through discovering a person’s ruling number. A person’s ruling number can be determined by adding up the numerical quantities of the letters in that person’s name and then reducing that quantity to a single digit. We know that Rowling took particular care in choosing the letters in Voldemort’s name because *Chamber of Secrets* shows that “Tom Marvolo Riddle” is an anagram for “I am Lord Voldemort” (313). In numerology, the number 2 represents balance, but it also represents conflict and duality: “Two represents interaction, two-way communication, cooperation, and balance… But two also introduces the idea of conflict, opposing forces, and the contrasting sides of things: night and day, good and evil” (Kronzck 7). Because Harry and Voldemort both can be said to be, as Dumbledore’s instruments predict, “in essence divided” (Harry with Voldemort as his parasitic twin and Voldemort with his mutilated soul), it seems logical that both of their numbers would be 2, and this is indeed the case. When the ruling numbers of Harry Potter and Lord Voldemort are calculated, their numbers are both 2. (Harry’s middle name is omitted because it is so rarely used, and Lord Voldemort is Tom Riddle’s chosen identity.)

H A R R Y  P O T T E R

\[8+1+9+9+7+6+2+2+5+9 = 65 \quad 6+5 = 11 \quad 1+1 = 2\]

L O R D  V O L D E M O R T

\[3+6+9+4+4+6+3+4+5+4+6+9+2 = 65 \quad 6+5 = 11 \quad 1+1 = 2\]
What is startling about the calculation is that not only do Harry Potter and Lord Voldemort have the same ruling number, but when their ruling numbers are calculated, both names equal the exact same quantity even before it is reduced to a single digit. Harry and Voldemort are designed to be identical.

As previously stated, Harry’s Fawkes-feather wand represents a connection with Dumbledore. Given Harry and Voldemort’s identical status, this connection must apply to Voldemort’s wand as well. Yet, how can Voldemort’s wand represent a loyalty to Dumbledore when Voldemort has never shown any inclination to accept Dumbledore’s ideals or tutelage? The answer goes back to Dumbledore’s acknowledgement of the existence and importance of choice. Voldemort had the same opportunity as Harry to choose Dumbledore’s guidance, and Voldemort consistently chose to go it alone. Choice depends on an acceptance of natural duality, the existence of multiple options, but Voldemort over and over again refuses to acknowledge his natural duality. Thus, Voldemort’s decision to believe the prophecy truly represents a disbelief in choice.

Harry, unlike Voldemort, hears the whole prophecy. Contemplating it in its entirety, Harry accepts its dual nature. This is Voldemort’s gravest mistake. Dumbledore recognized Voldemort’s weakness the first time he encountered Voldemort in the orphanage, and Dumbledore felt this weakness should be shared with Harry as part of his education in fighting Voldemort:

“…I hope you noticed Riddle’s reaction when I mentioned that another shared his first name, ‘Tom’?”

Harry nodded.
“There he showed his contempt for anything that tied him to other people, anything that made him ordinary. Even then, he wished to be different, separate, notorious. He shed his name, as you know, within a few short years of that conversation and created the mask of ‘Lord Voldemort’ behind which he has been hidden for so long.

“I trust that you also noticed that Tom Riddle was already highly self-sufficient, secretive, and, apparently, friendless? He did not want help or companionship on his trip to Diagon Alley. He preferred to operate alone. The adult Voldemort is the same. You will hear many of his Death Eaters claiming that they are in his confidence, that they alone are close to him, even understand him. They are deluded. Lord Voldemort has never had a friend, nor do I believe that he has ever wanted one” (Half-Blood Prince 277).

Voldemort’s great weakness is his quest for power through the embracing of unnatural singularity. This is where Harry has the upper hand, as Dumbledore informs him:

“…[Voldemort] was in such a hurry to mutilate his own soul, he never paused to understand the incomparable power of a soul that is un tarnished and whole” (Half-Blood Prince 511). This is why Fred Weasley was clearly marked as a victim, because the twins represent the exact things that Voldemort is out to destroy, that which is naturally dualistic yet whole.

Voldemort denies his own inherent duality, his half-blood status. He is disgusted with his
own name, one that represents duality ("Thomas" means "twin"), yet Tom is his true identity—his wholeness. When subjected to the analysis of numerology, the name Tom Riddle has a quantity of 1.

\[
\text{TOM RIDDLE} \\
2+6+4+9+4+4+3+5 = 46 \quad 4+6 = 10 \quad 1+0 = 1
\]

Dumbledore insists on referring to Voldemort as Tom, indicating his hope that Voldemort would return to that which is natural and whole. Harry, in his final confrontation with Voldemort, also addresses him as “Tom” (\textit{Deathly Hallows} 738), and in this exchange, is extending to Voldemort a final offer of wholeness.

“Before you try to kill me, I’d advise you to think about what you’ve done… Think, and try for some remorse, Riddle…”

“What is this?”

Of all the things that Harry had said to him, beyond any revelation or taunt, nothing had shocked Voldemort like this…

“It’s your one last chance,” said Harry, “it’s all you’ve got left… I’ve seen what you’ll be otherwise… Be a man…try… Try for some remorse” (\textit{Deathly Hallows} 741).

Of course, Voldemort refuses to take it. He chose long before not to accept his identity as Tom Riddle and instead embrace the dark past of his family represented by his middle name, Marvolo, the name of his cruelly abusive grandfather. It is interesting that when quantified in numerology, his full name, Tom Marvolo Riddle (Tom’s natural identity with the addition of “evil”), comes out to a quantity of 7, the number in which Voldemort placed his hope of immortality.
Only in the realm of horcruxes did Voldemort accept duality, but the duality that he strove for in this case was unnatural and thus an abomination. Voldemort was correct in thinking 7 a strong number. 7 is the largest single prime digit. It’s indivisible by anything except itself and 1, and this is what Voldemort desired – indivisibility. However, Voldemort didn’t get a 7-part soul. Unintentionally, he created an 8-part soul. 8 on its side is the sign for infinity, which would initially seem to make it even more of an appropriate number for Voldemort to split himself into, but this is not the case. 8, unlike 7, is vulnerable and divisible. How is an 8 destroyed? Use a 2 to divide it. Harry Potter (a 2) is Voldemort’s ultimate divider.

Harry represents the strength and power of love, but most importantly, he represents what is natural and whole. He accepts his dual nature—his choices, and through that acceptance is able to maintain his wholeness while extracting the unnatural. Harry recognizes that family and friendship (natural dualities) are additions and not subtractions from one’s own natural wholeness. He acknowledges the existence of choice and with this great power, Harry chooses faith. This is the core meaning of Rowling’s images of twinship. Many are always greater than one. A true, natural unified whole will always triumph over that which is unnatural and in essence, divided.
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