

Divergent Paths of Psychopathy: Unravelling Anton and Ruth through Cinematic Narratives

Ishani Routh¹, Subhashree Rakshit²

¹PG Student, Department of English (First Year), St. Xavier's College (Autonomous), Kolkata, India,
Email: ishanirouth2001@gmail.com

²PG Student, Department of English (First Year), St. Xavier's College (Autonomous), Kolkata, India,
Email: rakshitsubhashree2002@gmail.com

Abstract

The intricate labyrinth of psychopathy has been widely illuminated via its nuanced manifestations in the cinematic universe. The general consensus relegated psychopaths to villains such as gangsters, serial killers, mad scientists and many other types of criminals, at least until 1950. Medical science has defined psychopathy as a neuropsychiatric disorder characterised by deficient emotional responses, lack of empathy and poor behavioural controls leading to persistent antisocial deviance and criminal behaviour. However, cinematic narratives have often consciously distorted and exaggerated this scientific notion of psychopathy to bring about a realistic depiction of psychopaths, thereby forming a new hybrid of “elite psychopaths” possessing eccentric levels of intelligence facilitated by their sophisticated manners and cunning nature. This study probes deep into the minds of psychopathic serial killers as produced in the world of cinema, Anton Chigurh from *No Country for Old Men* and Ruth from *Prevenge* and hatches a comparative analysis between them critically studying the differences found in their character building, psyche motives, actions and finally the responses they received from the audience. The Coen Brothers created the character in their adapted film as a force of nature driven by randomness and desire for victory delving into the lurking darkness of his psyche while Alice Lowe's protagonist Ruth is a happy-go-lucky pregnant woman who all of a sudden, turns into a psychopath when her husband is unjustly killed. This dichotomy existing between their motives and nature will be studied in this paper while challenging the complex gender power relations in the context of the Western world through encapsulating films.

Keywords: psychopathy, Ruth, Anton, gender, killing

Introduction

The intricacies of the mind and its nuances have long attracted the attention of researchers and psychologists who have time and again taken up thorough analyses of the cognitive processes of human beings. Further curiosity is aroused owing to the discovery of the other side of the mind which is considered to be something 'not normal' and is often portrayed in literature and cinema to provide the readers and the audience respectively a cathartic experience. Human minds definitely go beyond the binaries of black and white and mostly consist of grey shades which are suppressed by the conscious self to prevent conflicts. Psychopathy as a common trope depicts actions of characters which are beyond normal understanding and effectively require tracking of events leading to it. However, this always doesn't ensure valid reasons and can largely depend on the distorted mindset of the offenders.

Medical science has defined psychopathy as a disorder characterized in part by shallow emotional responses and impulsivity which increases the likelihood of antisocial behaviour and their manipulative ways hamper the lives of several individuals. They derive a sadistic pleasure from the same and are sometimes clubbed under the category of mad people. The cinematic narratives of these psychopaths however depict their exaggerated and distorted versions, often giving rise to a class of 'elite psychopaths'. The main focus lies on their cold and calculating nature and their ability to commit heinous crimes without any remorse. Popular examples include Hannibal Lecter in *The Silence of the Lambs* or Patrick Bateman in *The American Psycho*. In fact, Hollywood filmmaker Alfred Hitchcock was one such person who dealt specifically with the hidden dimensions of the human mind and many of his films highlight this factor. The antagonists in several psychopathic films add a layer of suspense and tension to the narratives which encapsulate the audience to a large extent.

This research paper explores a comparative analysis between Anton Chigurh (broadly referred to as a monster of all ages) from the film *No Country for Old Men* by the Coen Brothers which is largely an adaptation of Cormac McCarthy's novel of the same name and Ruth from Alice Lowe's film *Prevenge*, while at the same time projecting the cinematic techniques employed to bring about their psychopathic natures as well as the broader gender dynamics of which both the characters are integral parts. While Anton's chaotic nature raises postmodern questions of meaning construction in human minds, Ruth's acts of taking away lives while being the life-giver herself subverts the notion of passive methods adopted by women in literature for killing purposes. A clear depiction of both continuing murders in their own ways yet at the same time reflecting upon

varying reasons and capabilities, manifests subtle differentiation between psychopaths and their inner turmoil.

A Peek Into the Narratives

Following the precepts of a good cinematic adaptation, the Coen Brothers begin the film with Sheriff Bell's voiceover with a gradual transition from darkness to light in the expository scene. This introduces a conflict between the binaries of light and dark which is manifested via the discarded grand narratives of law and order followed by the Sheriff and the out-of-place antagonist, Anton Chigurh who is a hired killer and is treated more as a symbolic figure. Anton's weird facial expression while strangling the police to death reveals the fact that this face can never be of someone who has reasons for doing something. As the camera zooms in to his face for the first time, we understand that he deliberately creates this demonic face in order to show the audience that unlike stated by the policeman who is a preserver of law and order, the actual control lies with him whose very appearance questions the entire genre of grand narratives. The movie follows a five-act structure and with the protagonist Llewelyn Moss's discovery of the satchel full of money, follows a rising action portrayed by Anton, the cold-blooded hired hitman tracking him down via a transponder. This slightly differs from the novel's projection of the strong intuitions of Anton that help him find Moss but it's crucial from a cinematic point of view which largely emphasises upon bodily expressions of the characters. Moss, the 'good bad' hero, is eventually punished for his course of actions (Little 7). He is both penalized for being seduced by the money and for still being loyal to his moral principles as he rejects the offer of the prostitute by showing his wedding ring. Thus, the gist of this 'zenital' scene is in its determinism (Little 7). Moss hunted the antelope and ironically when he comes across the money, he in turn becomes Anton's prey. The film follows a non-linear narrative with Moss's desperate attempts to escape Chigurh, the investigation led by Sheriff Ed Tom Bell and Chigurh's relentless pursuits. The tension reaches a climax as Moss tries to outsmart Chigurh, with Bell grappling with the increasing violence and moral decay around him. There is a great deal of mystery concerning Moss's death for even after multiple confrontations between him and Anton, there's no clear indication in the film as to who killed him. After his death, Anton is left with the question of what to do next. The final confrontation between Anton and Bell highlights an ideological danger that Bell faces and within the empty room, he finds his own multiple shadows, referring to his fractured persona. Anton's symbolic occupation of room 113 further intensifies their mysterious presence and is a deliberate addition of magic realism by the directors. Whatever Anton represents is not tied to the socio-political milieu but beyond the general run of people.

Even Bell refers to him as a ghost figure who is like an omnipresent character haunting his victims throughout. The climax itself is relatively low-key as the final confrontation is basically between Anton and 'fate' along with the masterful storytelling and the film's cinematography which challenge the traditional notion of the search for an objective universal truth. Bell's final resignation from his job is important for him to let go of his part that existed before and as an author surrogate, he abandons the position between life and readers, thereby leaving the ending of the film to multiple interpretations.

The term 'Prevenge' is a culmination of two words - 'Pregnant' and 'Revenge' and this is elaborated via the protagonist Ruth who goes on a killing spree with the belief that her unborn child insists her to do so. While pregnant, she murders several men and women who did not save her husband from dying and the revenge motif largely stems from her uncertainty as to how she would bring up her child all alone. The film offers a new approach to a horror subgenre that has so readily been the preserve of male directors looking to sensationalize the complex experiences of pregnancy and childbirth (Chambers 209). The film begins with the projection of Ruth staring down at the water indicating her despair and immediately afterwards the scene shifts to her killing a man within a place meant for the preservation of different species. The unsettling prologue sets the tone for impending tension and ensues the series of events that follow. The director introduces an irrational plot however as we find that despite the protagonist murdering one after another, she is never in the news and the police forces are never on the lookout for her. This provides her the authority to carry out her actions without any obstructions. A stage of heightened tension is reached with the gory scene of castration and with Ruth impersonating the actress in *Crime without Passion*. Her eerie and surreal hallucinations almost to the extent of schizophrenia serve as a psychological layer to the plot, blurring the line between reality and Ruth's fragile mental state. This narrative device adds complexity to the storytelling, keeping the audience engaged and questioning the reliability of the protagonist's perspective. Her entire life becomes a lie on learning that her partner was actually planning to abandon her with the child which ultimately brings the film to an end with Ruth accepting the fact that her innocent child was never a source of burden but rather a precious gift to be treasured forever.

Unmasking Gender Dynamics

The Coen Brothers feature Anton as the male character who drives the entire plot based on his whims and believes himself to have control over fate largely on the basis of a simple coin. For him, God simply is a notion manifested in the form of the coin which decides whether a person gets to live or die. *No Country for Old Men* undermines the

typical gender hierarchy present in most classical Westerners through complex uses of voice-over narration and sound (Beadling 2). New York Times Book Review claimed that “Women grieve, men fight in this hard-boiled Texas noir crime novel.” Anton's unpredictability and lack of empathy create tensions and subvert expectations related to how male characters typically engage with female characters in films. Rather than adhering to a straightforward portrayal of masculinity, Chigurh becomes a symbol of existential threat, detached from conventional gender narratives. Further, his choice of weapons dehumanises his personality and blurs the line between human agency and automation. Moss' behaviour with his wife, on the other hand, narrates a tale of indifference which even Anton states to be the reason for her death. Carla wanted to believe that God controls her fate but Anton confidently states that her fate had always been decided. “Carla's last act before being killed is to say that she understands Chigurh's point. One can dismiss Chigurh's actions as those of a homicidal maniac but that does not deny the possibility that in her last moments, Carla has accepted her destiny as the only possible one allowed her. She had believed that Moss was fated to be her husband so it is logical that she should believe that Chigurh is her only possible end...In her last moments, Carla's blindness falls away as she awakens into death” (Parrish 73-74).

This sharply contrasts Ruth's character who is an expecting mother and challenges stereotypes associated with female characters in horror films. Lowe subverts the pregnancy horror by showing neither the conception nor the birth of the “baby”, which are so often the sites of performative gore and female pain and powerlessness (Chambers 209). She is not a passive victim but an active agent of her own narrative, reclaiming control over her life in a genre where women often suffer as silent victims. Her condition can be alluded to as that of a tiger who once getting the taste of blood cannot let it go and continues preying in search of flesh and blood. Alice Lowe in fact has projected motherhood in a different light altogether as her tiniest feelings are tied to the child and she considers it her duty to take revenge on those who deprived the baby of its father. The film also explores Ruth's journey as a visceral response to societal pressures and expectations placed upon women during pregnancy. She willingly lets herself be assaulted by a drunk man simply because of fulfilling her personal agenda, severing his penis in the process. Her interactions with other pregnant women and her thorough care of her unborn child reveal her hallucinations to be a deeper connection with the baby, thereby navigating the balance between horror and satire.

Randomness Versus Victim to Circumstances

The character of Anton as presented by the Coen Brothers in the film, *No Country for Old Men*, seems to stem from nowhere, with no origin or purpose except the fact that he is a hired killer though in both the book and the film we are not very sure he works for whom. His life revolves around the simple game of tossing the coin, deciding the fates of his victims while having no purpose or reason behind killing them. He is rather a slave to the coin game, where he consciously surrenders his whole agency to that one single circular metallic object to order his course of actions further determining and fulfilling the promises he made, sometimes to his victims, sometimes to his enemies, sometimes to himself or maybe sometimes to no one. As Sheriff Bell delves into the investigation of Anton and hunts around to find him, what he finds is only the death. He found victim of Anton lying around dead, having committed no wrong to him. He seems to lose his system of ideology, and his perception of finding meaning in what he witnesses around himself when he tries to get close to Anton, who is but the epitome of meaningless. Anton appears in the film and disappears out of the film, out of nowhere, he remains a mystery rather ends up being more mysterious by the end of the film.

We don't know anything about this character other than his motivation (retrieve a satchel of money), but he is still infinitely fascinating because of his mysterious persona and unstoppable: he cannot be reasoned with or bribed (in fact, money seems to mean nothing to him). In addition, most of his character is left open to interpretation by Joel and Ethan Coen, which has led to several debates on what his true goals are. (King Tyrion Solo 2015)

He is an unsettling villain who represents death itself. Carved out of randomness and ambiguity he is a non-believer who goes on killing people, deciding their fates on his own as if he is some kind of archangel sent on earth to perform god's bidding. Though there is not much Christian Theological inspiration in his character's portrayal, he seems to be a Satanic figure who has no belief or faith in the supernatural or divine power, he has no religion or faith, and what he has is a void ideology where his own decisions and plans pop in. He is not only deciding other people's fate but also trying to construct a Pandemonium of his own, a hellish world on this earthly realm spreading his randomness within the humanity and diseasing people like Sheriff Bell to finally question the faith which people have been following, the ideology they have been believing in, the principles they have been practising ever since. *No Country* returns to this theme of random chance determining our lives again and again, but a few of the ways it does so particularly stand out. (Collar 2016) The film begins off with Anton

killing a police officer who was supposed to hand him over to a higher official. Then as he sets off on his odyssey to nowhere, he stops a man randomly and shoots him with a cattle gun in quite an unceremonious manner and soon the scene switches to Moss shooting at a herd of deer—in an intricate message of his scene sequence is that the nature of death itself is random and it can come and take anyone at any time just like that. Chigurh seems to be representing this nature of death himself, he is a fictional personified character of death. The most quotable line from the film, “What business is it of yours where I’m from, friendo?”, by Chigurh when he badgers an old clerk at an isolated gas station who seemed to be a friendly curious man asking about his whereabouts. At this time, he tosses the coin deciding the fate of this innocent man who was petrified and confused about what Anton was doing and when the man won life in this coin toss game, Anton says the coin was waiting to be his since, twenty-two years and this coin has saved his life therefore he should keep this coin separately as his token of luck. The very ambiguity and unnerving scene, epitomises the randomness of the character that will rule throughout the plot. Even when Carla Jean calls him unreasonable and questions his randomness he is not budged from his spot, he is sturdy and grounded there to be soon faced with an accident that will injure his arm brutally and he vanishes to nowhere, leaving behind more puzzling meaninglessness to be never discovered and investigated later as Bell is too broken in his traditional belief to weapon that in his struggle to solve down him.

There are no easy lessons to learn from *No Country for Old Men*. Chigurh does technically manage to escape the law despite his many misdeeds, leaving behind only a long trail of bodies. This ending can be seen as a meditation on the randomness and senselessness of death, and the people the Grim Reaper so often brings into his fold without warning or the possibility of escape. (Neeraj Chand 2023)

On the other hand, Ruth, in *Prevenge* is driven by the revenge motive to kill all those who shattered her happy family dream. Initially, she was a happy-go-lucky lady expecting her child to be born soon, dreaming of resolving all conflicts with her husband and spending a beautiful life with her family. But all of a sudden, her husband dies and she learns it happened due to a group of trekkers who sacrificed him to save their own lives. Burning in the rage of her unrestorable loss and forcibly inflicted pain she falls into the madness of hearing her unborn child who directs her to kill all those who wronged her. She becomes a slave to that voice that seems to be coming from her womb and kills one after another until she finishes off the second last perpetrator.

Traumatized by the death of her partner, Ruth (Lowe) starts hearing voices from the womb telling her to kill. From a reptilian pet shop proprietor (Dan Renton Skinner) to a supercilious businesswoman (a typically sharp Kate Dickie), Ruth preys upon a diverse group of people tangentially connected by an Agatha Christie-style accident of fate. Occasionally, Ruth's eye-for-an-eye resolve starts to weaken, only to be reignited by the demanding taunts of "Baby", whom she is assured "knows best". "I'm scared of her," admits the increasingly conflicted mother-to-be, tellingly describing her pregnancy as "like a hostile takeover". (Kermode 2017)

However, before killing her last target and the main one she learns the truth of her late husband's plan of leaving her and soon goes into labour. When she gives birth to her child, she realises that voice and orders were her hallucination and nothing else hence for a moment she stoops down from her objective. But the climax occurs when in the last scene of the film she is shown to be returning to her killer self and the scene blinds out making us assume that she is defeated by her madness and hunger for killing. She sprang imitating the ghostly woman from *Crime Without Passion* and at that moment the scene fades out into darkness making it apparent the fate with which her last and main target will meet also it indicates the closure of the narrative, the narrative of her serial killing. Her motive was to kill all those who were responsible for her husband's sudden demise and she ends up killing all of them even after realising that there was no such voice of her daughter commanding her to kill her father's killers, it was all her own psychological complication, her own hallucinations which she made up in her mind in order to get the space to create her own reality living in the reality of the world. And within her reality which she made in this worldly reality, she avenged all of them, thus, the last assumed and obvious killing indicates she is very much conscious of what she is doing and she is not at all repentant for that. It is not her madness at the end of the day that makes her kill all these people, it is she, it is Ruth, her own self who makes her kill all these people so brutally and mercilessly. Quoting Jessica Smith from her review of this film on the official website page of Tiff,

Ruth's psychic pain, combined with her prenatal state, makes for clever social fodder, allowing Lowe to caustically critique misogyny, pregnancy ("like a hostile takeover"), and the invisibility of motherhood. Scripted and filmed within a matter of weeks when Lowe was seven months pregnant, this "killing for two" fantasy revenge horror wears its jaded heart on its blood-soaked sleeve, suffering and sparing no fools.

A nurturer and killer combined image can be derived from her character. Being a mother, she is supposed to be bringing life to this world but what she does is that she

takes the lives, of multiple people, in a well-framed plan, chained and patterned order, so finely and so professionally that it never seems she is killing or is introduced to the world of crime for the first time. It seems as if she has been in this profession of a human butcher since ages and never for a single second, we see her quiver or hesitate from committing all these murders. In an interview, Alice Lowe herself stated: “I could have chosen to give Ruth a ‘funny’ motivation for revenge, but I was done with seeing pregnant women as ‘light’ and their concerns and demands as somehow irrational. It was a bit of a risky gamble, but I wanted to see how far you’d go with this character....I actually read about women who had lost their partners while pregnant, and what was striking was the bitter cocktail of emotions. Some said they resented the baby for being alive, and many said they would swap the baby for the partner to be living instead. Some said that they felt coerced by healthcare professionals and relatives to “put aside their grief for the sake of the baby”, as if their grief was selfish.” (Baughan 2017). What Lowe tried to portray in her dark comedy, is that the frustration of a pregnant woman, who is pained by her partner’s death and nobody seems to see her pain throughout the film. All the targeted killers never show genuine care or sympathy for her advanced delicate state of pregnancy, either they do not want to hire her for her condition or they simply ignore her. It is the main target, her last victim who seems to sympathize with her condition, but he is the one who appears most selfish to her. For his pregnant wife, he chooses to live by deciding to kill another man for whom there is a pregnant wife waiting at home, waiting to live her dream life, a happy family life, with her husband, to see her husband caring for her and playing with her soon to come child. His preference of his happy life over her dream life makes him monstrously selfish in her eyes, so in the form of revenge, she pushes him off from the same cliff where her husband was killed, playing a déjà vu kind of theory, to finally put a full stop to her killing spree.

Cinematic Techniques and Props Building up the Psychopathic Characters

The Coen Brothers cleverly designed Anton to give the impression of a person not belonging to the normal world. They gave him a bizarre hairstyle styled by the Oscar prize winner hairstylist Paul LeBlanc who was asked to create a “strange and unsettling” hairstyle inspired by the mop tops of English Warriors in crusades as well as the mod cuts of the 1960s. For Chigurh, the Coens wanted to cast someone “who could have come from Mars”, and with Bardem, that is exactly what they got. He brought a steely alienness to the character, which McCarthy’s original creation, adding a hefty dose of realism that’s enough to perturb even nihilists.

Given the wholly emotionless spirit of Chigurh, this has made him one of the most revered – and feared – cinematic villains, with the coin toss scene in the Texaco petrol station going down as a masterclass in building nail-biting atmosphere. Here, chance plays the role of the decider as we watch the unsuspecting owner flip the coin at Chigurh's behest, not knowing that his life hangs in the balance. (Starkey 2022) Javier Bardem was intentionally chosen because he drove a car as an amateur and spoke bad English and that contributed in making up his character really well. In the film too we find him eerie and unnerving, different from everyone else, with a weird accent and alienatic personality. Anton's makeup gives him a pale, ghostly complexion while his meticulous hairstyle covers the majority of his head's shape, aside from his wide, bony jaw—almost as if his hair is a hood. (Uncategorized 2014). The film introduces him with the remote wild grasslands lurking outside the fence, which symbolises the demarcation between lawful and unlawful and introduces him only when he is strangling the officer slitting his throat with his handcuff chain and the moment the camera zooms into his face revealing an animalistic tensed face, inhuman wild and spine chilling, an expression that is born naturally out of one's primaeval dark desires and that is how we get to know what Anton is and that is what prepares us to gulp down his randomness to be narrated throughout the rest of the film. If we take a look at what he wears throughout the film, we find the jacket is not going well with his tall figure and stunts his height a bit. The clothes he wears seem to be unmatching and disjointed having no combination essence with each other that depicts his disjoint and eerie character, who has no connection, devoid of any logic and pattern of the universal thought, faith and ideology--- he belongs to nowhere, and definitely does not belong to this world. His overall look is quite peculiar and especially his hairstyle has often been the talk of the town for film lovers and cinematographic critics. Bardem once reflected on being cast in *No Country for Old Men* in the magazine *Vanity Fair* :

I went to New Mexico and I sat down in a makeup trailer, and they came with a photograph of a brothel in the border with Mexico in the '50s or the '60s with a guy photographed with this haircut and two prostitutes. And I thought, "What does this mean?" And they said, "Well, we want you to look like that." I said, "Okay." And then the hairdresser, Paul, who passed away recently, amazing hairdresser, in a second, with my own hair, he made [imitates snipping], and I saw it and I said, "Yes, I have to make this movie." I mean, this is such a Coen brothers look. And, because it was funny, it was ridiculous, it was fun. And then that in comparison with what the character is, would make a very good Coen brothers character to play.

Thus, we find how meticulously this character has been built with little and most detailed props to paint the psychopathic essence which this character is to paint and plot throughout the film, and this careful and detailed attention to making Anton Chigurh still makes him remain as a study of wonder and analysis in the field of film studies.

While Alice Lowe who plays the role of Ruth, and being the director herself, she freely takes the agency of designing her own character in the way she wants. She presents herself as a helpless pregnant woman at the very onset of the film, however, showing herself from a lower angle signifies the negative role that she will play throughout the film. On one side, lies her simple helpless woman and on the other side we see the masked woman in the Halloween party donning a red gown waiting patiently for the apt opportunity to spill the red blood of her final and main target. Like Frances McDormand's indomitable Marge Gunderson in *Fargo*, Ruth's increased size merely makes her more imposing, adding heft and power to her remorseless mission. She's an avenging angel, inspired by the cackling *Furies* of Ben Hecht and Charles MacArthur's 1934 oddity *Crime Without Passion*, which she watches in her lonely hotel room. As for her baby, she's a not-too-distant relative of the "children of rage" from Cronenberg's *The Brood*, prompting Ruth's exclamation that "I'm not grieving, I'm gestating!" Elsewhere, a low-angle shot of her writhing in an underpass clearly evokes an infamous sequence from Andrzej Żuławski's magnificently unhinged *Possession*, with the ghosts of Gaspar Noé's *Irréversible* lurking in the shadows. (Kermode 2017). She derives her expression and her avatar of the psychopathic killer from the film *Crime Without Passion* and throughout imitates that ghostly woman smiling a monstrous smile lifting her hands in the air ready to pounce upon her targets. Ruth creates her own reality by imitating a fictional character from a film, and this habit is very common among us, as we often tend to follow any fictional character of our liking and taking inspiration from that character, we often tend to implement that in our real life; thus she too in order to enter the world of serial killing and to adopt the religion of psychopathy for her revenge narrative, she imitates from another famous cinematic character. Lowe does not focus much in building up the character of Ruth except the fact that she is pregnant. Pregnant at the time of planning and shooting her directorial debut, *Prevenge* (2016), Lowe used her frustrations about stereotypes of pregnancy as inspiration for her horror-comedy film: "[Prevenge] was more born of frustration and bafflement, and feeling like an outsider to the shiny tourist version of pregnancy. "What I really wanted to channel was that it's an incredibly individual experience, whether that means you're a happy earth mother or a hellbent tool of vengeance. I feel like the earth mother cliché has been fully explored, and we could all benefit from seeing something else" (Smith 2018). The whole

film revolves around the fact that the killer is a life-bringer persona, whose breasts are leaking, who goes into labour and getting up from that she again kills, she is a seemingly vulnerable woman but from her is born another figure of revenger who is ruthless, merciless and unstoppable. On the cover page of the film, a pregnant woman donning a red dress, her face painted to depict a ghostly woman, makes up her character is the ultimate lash out of a woman who is turned to a monster by her circumstances and forced upon vulnerable condition.

Conclusion

If we place the films side by side, just focusing on the concept of psychopathy portrayed in both the films, we are bound to find a lot of differences between their depiction, handling structure and plotting, however there is one single thing that remains constant in both of them and that is psychopathy indeed. In both the films, *No Country for Old Men* and *Prevenge*, the main protagonists playing the role of psychopaths, Anton Chigurh and Ruth, at the end of the day, despite the differences in their gender, motives, actions and portrayal, the thing that is undoubtedly same between them is the uncontrollable urge or rather the unquenchable thirst to kill, be there be reason, be there be no reason. They are after all different from the normal world, detached from the reality living in their disillusion taking the law in their hands, employing their whole existence to become the Death of people's lives whom they think should die thereby denying the rule of universe, the rule of humankind and stripping humanity from their souls.

Works Cited

- Abrams, Simon. "Prevenge Movie Review & Film Summary (2017): Roger Ebert." *Movie Review & Film Summary (2017) | Roger Ebert*, www.rogerebert.com/reviews/prevenge-2017. Accessed 10 February 2024.
- Addyronnie, and Addyronnie. "No Country for Old Men (2007)." *Deciphering the Bigger Picture: A Film Blog*, 3 Dec. 2014, addyronnie.wordpress.com/2014/12/03/no-country-for-old-men-2007/. Accessed 08 February 2024.
- Beadling, Laura. "Girls and Old Men Talking: Gender, Power, and Sound in the Coen Brothers' *No Country for Old Men* and *True Grit*", *The Cine-Files Featured Scholarship*, <http://www.thecine-files.com/girls-and-old-men-talking/>, Accessed 15th February 2024.

- Chambers, Amy C. "17. The (Re)birth of Pregnancy Horror in Alice Lowe's *Prevenge*". *Women Make Horror: Filmmaking, Feminism, Genre*, edited by Alison Peirse, Ithaca, NY: Rutgers University Press, 2020, pp.209-221, <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.36019/9781978805156-017/html?lang=en>. Accessed 15th February 2024.
- Kermode, Mark. "Prevenge Review ." *The Guardian*, Guardian News, and Media, amp.theguardian.com/film/2017/feb/12/prevenge-review-alice-lowe-sightseers. Accessed 15 February 2024.
- Little, Suzanne. "No Country for Old Men (part 1)". *Anatomy of a film* (n.d.):1-15.
- Myers, Scott. "Script to Screen: 'No Country for Old Men.'" *Medium*, Go Into The Story, 17 Nov. 2021, gointothestory.blcklst.com/script-to-screen-no-country-for-old-men-163bc6656999. Accessed 01 February 2024.
- Murphy, Drew. "'What's the Most You Ever Lost on a Coin Toss?' - Anton Chigurh." *Medium*, Medium, 21 May 2019, medium.com/@DrewGMurphy/whats-the-most-you-ever-lost-on-a-coin-toss-anton-chigurh-563b9be1ebe5. Accessed 31 January 2024.
- Parrish, Timothy. "History and the Problem of Evils in McCarthy's Western Novels" *The Cambridge Companion to Cormac McCarthy*, ed. Steven Frye (Cambridge U 2013)73-74, https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/cambridge-companion-to-cormac-mccarthy/history-and-the-problem-of-evil-in-mccarthys-western-novels/C5B93BA8F1B2D4BCEE604D1D8D1CFC52_. Accessed 15th February 2024
- Perise, Alison. "Prevenge [Revealing Women in Series]." *Star and Shadow*, starandshadow.org.uk/programme/event/prevenge-revealing-women-series,3667/. Accessed 2 February 2024.
- Prakash, Aagam. "Cinematography in No Country for Old Men (2007)." *Intro to Film* 2023, 11 Sept. 2023, scholarblogs.emory.edu/introtofilm2023/2023/09/11/cinematography-in-no-country-for-old-men/. Accessed 05 February 2024.
- Smith, Jessica. "Prevenge." *TIFF*, 14 Sept. 2022, www.tiff.net/events/prevenge. Accessed 09 February 2024.
- "Goings on about Town." *The New Yorker*, www.newyorker.com/goings-on-about-town/movies/prevenge. Accessed 1 February 2024.
- Bfi. "From Kubrick to Kate Bush: Alice Lowe on Her Influences for Killer Mum Horror *Prevenge*." *BFI*, BFI, 2 Feb. 2017, www.bfi.org.uk/interviews/kubrick-kate-bush-alice-lowe-influences-prevenge. Accessed 01 February 2024.