The Beast Within: Gothic Vampirism in the Nineteenth Century

Shirley Shen-Chih Yeh, Department of English

McGill University, Montreal

July 2015

A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the

degree of Master of Arts

Table of Contents

Abstract

This MA thesis studies the significance of the nineteenth-century British literary tradition of Gothic vampirism. The first half of the thesis surveys the modern image of Gothic vampires developed by Lord Byron in *The Giaour* (1813) and "Fragment of a Novel" (1819), by John William Polidori in his novella *The Vampyre* (1819), and by Abraham "Bram" Stoker in *Dracula* (1897). At the beginning of the nineteenth century Byron and Polidori reinvented the Gothic vampire as a callous, cunning, but always charismatic predator, and at the end of the century Stoker reinforced the same image by portraying his vampire-protagonist Count Dracula as an intellectually brilliant, well-educated, and refined master parasite. Together these three authors reimagined the abominable undead entity in folklore as a monster that donned the mask of a gentleman—a remarkable creature occupying an enduring role in modern literature. The second half of the thesis traces the allusions to Gothic vampirism in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818) and Robert Louis Stevenson's *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886). I analyze how Mary Shelley and Stevenson model their human and monster protagonists on the alluring images of Gothic vampires to shock, to seduce, to psychologize, and above all to investigate the dangerous proximity of man to beast, of a drawing-room dandy to a monster. These vampiric tales of the makings of a monster are thus about what defines a human. Through the juxtaposition of monsters and their humanized counterparts these stories of Gothic vampires destabilize the distinction between humanity and animality and challenge our conventional understanding of the relationship between man and beast.

Résumé

La présente thèse de maîtrise est une réflexion sur l'importance de la littérature anglaise dans le développement et l'évolution du vampirisme gothique. La première moitié de la thèse passe en revue l'image moderne des vampires développée par Lord Byron dans *The Giaour* (1813) puis dans «Fragment of a Novel» (1819), par John William Polidori dans *The Vampyre* (1819) et enfin par Abraham «Bram» Stoker dans *Dracula* (1897). Au début du 19e siècle, Byron et Polidori ont réinventé le vampire gothique pour en faire un prédateur à la fois insensible et rusé mais toujours charismatique. À la fin du siècle, Stoker est venu ajouter à ce portrait en représentant son personnage principal, le comte Dracula, comme un maître parasite intellectuellement brillant, éduqué et raffiné. Ensemble, ces trois auteurs ont réinventé l'abominable entité de mort-vivant du folklore pour en faire un monstre portant un masque de gentleman—une créature formidable qui occupe une place durable dans la littérature moderne. La deuxième partie de cette thèse trace les allusions au vampirisme gothique dans le roman de Mary Shelley, *Frankenstein* (1818), et dans la courte nouvelle de Robert Louis Stevenson, *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886). Nous nous penchons sur la manière dont ces auteurs ont modélisé leurs personnages humains et leurs monstres sur l'image de gentleman du vampire gothique pour choquer, séduire, psychanalyser et par-dessus tout, examiner la dangereuse proximité entre l'homme et la bête, entre le gentleman et le monstre. Ces contes de vampires nous instruisent sur ce qui définit l'être humain. Par la juxtaposition des monstres et de leurs contreparties humaines, ces histoires de vampires gothiques déstabilisent la distinction entre l'humanité et l'animalité. Elles mettent en question la compréhension traditionnelle de la relation entre l'homme et la bête.

Acknowledgements

I would like first and foremost to express my profound gratitude to Professor David Hensley, my thesis supervisor, not only for his knowledge, meticulousness, and resourcefulness but also for his endless patience, unwavering support, and constant encouragement. Thank you for being the compass and sunshine I needed when swimming in the ice-cold waves of Gothic vampirism. I would also like to thank all the professors who instructed me during my studies for the degree of Master of Arts in English at McGill University—Professor Erin Hurley, Professor Maggie Kilgour, Professor Fiona Ritchie, Professor Peter Sabor, Professor Tabitha Sparks, Professor Paul Edward Yachnin—and also Professor Peter Gibian, Professor Edward Schantz, and Ms. Maria Vasile for their continued support and assistance. Their work humbles and inspires me, and without them I would probably never have known that there are still so many dreams to earn.

I would like to thank all the professors who taught and influenced me when I was an undergraduate student. They gave me a place from which to start. I will also be eternally grateful to Professor Bennett Yu-Hsiang Fu for introducing this beautiful place to me and to Professor Shan-Shan Wang for always believing in me.

Special thanks to Sylvie Gélinas and Robert-Louis Stevenson (yes, like the author!) for being a blanket of warmth against the ruthless Montreal winter. I am especially grateful to Sylvie for helping me with the translation of the French abstract. Two-and-a-half years ago I contacted both of you for the first time from the other end of the earth, hoping to find a place to live. I am very lucky to have found two friends as well.

In addition, I would like to express my sincere thanks to Sharon Ya-Ren Jheng for reading the first draft of my thesis proposal and asking all the questions I could not answer. Her

wit, sarcasm, and refreshing unwillingness to sugarcoat the truth were invaluable to me. I am also indebted to her for tolerating my quirkiness, for pardoning my consuming enthusiasm for blood, murder, and mayhem, and, most of all, for being my friend.

Finally, I would like to express my appreciation for the person who is the germ of this project and the reason why the hard work has been so fiendishly entertaining. You have never ceased to fascinate me since I first met you at an inappropriately young age, and I hope that someday, if I am worthy, you will be not just the worst but also the best of me.

Introduction

Horace Walpole's novel *The Castle of Otranto*, which he dubbed "A Gothic Story" (63), is generally considered to be the first Gothic novel, initiating a literary genre of supernatural chaos and pleasing horror. Inspired by Walpole's Strawberry Hill, a fantasy villa in Twickenham, London, with extravagant towers, battlements, pointed arches, corridors, dungeons, wild ornamentation, and deliberate disharmony, *The Castle of Otranto* provided future tales of terror with Gothic components such as weird acoustics, doors and windows opening independently of a person, subterranean flights and pursuits, statues that bleed, animated skeletons, and walking portraits. Gothic fictions became a staple of late-eighteenth-to-nineteenth-century reading, and, according to Robert Miles, they had an average market share of thirty percent of all novel production from the late 1780s to the first decade of the next century (qtd. in Spooner 245). Setting the tone for future fictions of horrifying apparitions and psychological disintegration, *The Castle of Otranto* was a desperate attempt to secure freedom against the *ennui* of an age grown too fond of reason; it also represented the paranoid fear that the feeling of cozy security is an illusion, and that society is not as tranquil and stable as it seems. Living up to the fearsome reputation of the Goths, the fourth-century barbarians who sacked Rome and destroyed civilization, Gothic literature repudiated all norms and challenged the limits of rational discourse, including natural laws, logic, and even religious authority.

We can identify this relinquishment of rational defense in two defining episodes in *The Castle of Otranto*. The first is the opening scene, in which a headless helmet descends on the hapless Conrad, heir to the house of Otranto, thus extinguishing the family line. The enormous headpiece, without a thinking machine inside, is grotesquely alive and mobile in exerting its supernatural jurisdiction over Otranto. The second episode is an iconic moment frequently

repeated in horror movies: Frederic encounters an animated skeleton that he initially mistakes for a hooded clergyman in a scene that is customarily read as disillusioned mockery of the anticipated religious ideal. In sum, Gothic is a self-indulgent literary genre that displaces boundaries and disorders reason in quest of new understandings. As Susan Rowland shrewdly observes, Gothic literature is "a perpetually insecure attempt to 'map' unfixable borders of desire, identity, psyche and knowledge" (110).

The Castle of Otranto also introduces the first Gothic hero-villain, Manfred, a tormented tormentor who prefigures later aristocratic Gothic villains. More man than beast, Manfred is a character whose present is overdetermined by past events, and whose struggle against his imbedded animalistic decadence challenges the reader's understanding of human limits and beliefs. He also inaugurates the fascination with a new race of literary villains: charismatic and resourceful men with whom we cannot help but sympathize. An exemplary embodiment of this evil character is the Gothic vampire, a figure who has stepped into the limelight and invaded every sphere of popular culture and mass entertainment, spawning fantasy fictions, TV shows, movies, and their by-products. Literary vampires have no single origin; they can be traced back to folklore, in which they served as a convenient explanation for mysterious illnesses and deaths and provided a rationale for witch-hunting. Through careful domestication, vampires achieved theatrical as well as literary success in modern Western popular culture.

This MA thesis will begin with a discussion of the literary images of Gothic vampires developed by Lord Byron (1788–1824), John William Polidori (1795–1821), and Abraham "Bram" Stoker (1847–1912), three sources of modern literary vampires. Byron experimented with Gothic vampirism as early as in 1813 in his oriental romance *The Giaour* (1813), in which he recounted a folkloric version of vampires who return from the grave to torment their blood

relatives. Polidori's *The Vampyre* (1819) is the first vampire fantasy in prose. As will be elaborated in my discussion of Gothic vampires in chapter one, Polidori's story originated on the same night when Mary Shelley conceived *Frankenstein* (1818): both were products of a ghost story competition proposed by Byron in their Genevan summer in 1816. *The Vampyre* introduces the modern literary vampire, a figure modeled on Byron himself. From this moment onward, the Gothic vampire sheds the skin of a monster (and a master parasite) that spreads blood-lust like a disease and becomes a magnetic figure: a satanic rake who repels readers with his predatory instincts but also dazzles them with his deep cunning. Polidori's vampire character Lord Ruthven is a mentor to young Aubrey and an experienced traveler who can guide Aubrey on the grand tour; and the most memorable Gothic vampire of all, Stoker's Dracula, is believed to have been modeled on Stoker's employer and idol, the actor-manager Henry Irving (1838-1905). *Dracula* (1897) is often criticized as an execrable novel with embarrassing inconsistencies and pasteboard characters, and it undeniably lacks any subtle artistry or rhetorical value. It is also infused with misogynistic violence, with female characters divided into virgins and vamps, angels and whores. They are either willing victims or children-hunting demons deserving to be staked and mutilated. However, even with its titular character staying in the shadows for much of the novel, *Dracula* is still one of the most successful potboilers ever written, and it immortalizes the Count in the collective imagination.

Probably the most addictive of all Gothic texts, *Dracula* ostensibly presents a clear-cut moral battle between Western civilization and the superstitious primitivism of Eastern Europe that seeks to challenge it. However, the psychological depth of *Dracula* lies in a series of contradictions, especially in the protagonist Dracula (who is essentially a composite of oppositions) and his arch-nemesis Abraham Van Helsing (who seeks to bridge the divide).

Vampires display the fundamental Gothic spirit by defying any neat categorization and transcending all boundaries: they are the Dead Undead, beast and man, parasitical and wealthy, repulsive but mesmerizing, with a masculine physique but clearly discernible femininity. Considering the complexity of this character, Judith Halberstam in *Skin Shows* dubs Dracula (and therefore vampires in general) "not simply a monster but a technology of monstrosity" (88). Vampires are the archetypal monsters in horror movies, and they are immune to any temporary restoration of order: they can be stabbed, shot, beaten, exiled, burnt, or torn to pieces, but still they always return and can never be vanquished. I aim to examine this paradoxical characterization and explore how Gothic vampires are fashioned into hypnotic predators endowed with acute intelligence and erotic allure, as monsters walking among common men.

Vampires have been established as the first serial killers in literary tradition, and recent criticism has made serial killers into vampire figures. Stoker, in the preface to the Icelandic edition of *Dracula*, compares his arch-vampire Dracula to the first internationally famous serial killer, Jack the Ripper, reimagining Dracula's compulsion to procure blood as serial murder (qtd. in Spooner 254). Many contemporary criminologists believe that serial killers have existed as long as humans have existed, and early serial killers have been mythicized into supernatural threats such as vampires or werewolves as a coping mechanism to rationalize the brutality of the mutilation and cannibalism involved. Numerous real-life serial killers have vampire-related nicknames. For instance, Albert Fish, the notorious child murderer and alleged cannibal, is dubbed "The Brooklyn Vampire." The psychotic (rather than psychopathic) serial killer Richard Chase is often called "The Vampire of Sacramento" or "The Vampire Killer" because he not only cannibalized the remains of his victims but also drank their blood; actually, the schizophrenic Chase was driven to kill precisely because he believed that he needed to consume

blood to sustain his life. Elizabeth Báthory, nicknamed "The Blood Countess" and "Countess Dracula," is the female prototype of vampires, and legend has it that she bathed in the blood of virgins to preserve her youthful beauty. Although this accusation has been considered unfounded, Báthory was notorious for taking sadistic delight in torturing her household staff, particularly young girls; in any case, she has been regarded as the most prolific and infamous female serial killer in history.

Contemporary literary and cinematic characterizations of serial killers have also appropriated Gothic vampire conventions to eroticize evil and seduce the audience. The convergence of the serial killers with the vampire has often been identified in Thomas Harris's iconic fictional character Dr. Hannibal Lecter, who has inspired the cult worship of this charismatic and intelligent cannibalistic serial killer. The immense popularity of Harris's "Hannibal the Cannibal" is understandable, and no real-life serial killer is like the drawing-room dandy in the way Lecter is. He is no pasteboard villain. The complexities of this character are rooted in the blurring of boundaries between civilized humanity and animalistic savagery: he is both monster and man, with one permanently buried inside the other. When Lecter is introduced in *Red Dragon* (1981), he has already been apprehended and incarcerated in the Baltimore State Hospital for the Criminally Insane, so the reader gets acquainted with the monster before coming to know the man. However, it is intriguing that what the reader finds most mesmerizing about this full-fledged villain is not the monster but the man. Caroline Joan Picart and Cecil E. Greek in "The Compulsion of Real/Reel Serial Killers and Vampires: Toward a Gothic Criminology" elaborate on how the multi-Oscar-winning film *The Silence of the Lambs* (1991) and its equally celebrated sequel *Hannibal* (2001) endow the protagonist Hannibal Lecter with the seductive glamor of a Gothic vampire. Picart and Greek expatiate on the cinematic Lecter's vampiric

charm, his hypnotic gaze, and his supernatural ability to move silently into and out of chambers and corridors, as well as his unexplainable capacity to intimidate animals that normally would do people harm. Lecter in the films, as the leading actor Anthony Hopkins (who portrays Lecter) comments, has been elevated to the level of a "prime dark angel" (qtd. in Picart and Greek 242), given the privilege of adjudicating on the misbehavior of mere mortals.

Unnoted by Picart and Greek is the fact that both Gothic vampires and Harris's cannibal psychiatrist are European, a trait that makes them alluringly exotic. Lecter is also of noble birth—his parents are a count and a countess—like so many Gothic villains and the famous vampire Count Dracula. Like Dracula, a criminal mastermind who meticulously plans his invasion of England, Lecter is erudite and invincible both physically and intellectually. The Federal Bureau of Investigation, having no choice but to overlook the fact that he is a cannibalistic serial killer, seeks his insight into the murders committed by Francis Dolarhyde and Jame Gumb, a desperate approach unheard of in real life. In *Hannibal* (1999), Lecter ensconces himself in contemporary Florentine society under the alias "Dr. Fell"—a name that puns on his penchant for cruelty ("Fell" can be an adjective meaning "deadly" or "of terrible evil or ferocity") and also reminds the reader of the real-life Doctor John Fell, the influential seventeenth-century academic. Like the Gothic image of vampires, Lecter is polite but essentially isolated from society. He can be a cordial host in a dinner party, but he prefers his solitary existence to participating in a world full of what he describes as the "free-range rude." Dracula's most heinous pathology is his compulsion to drink the blood of the living—his desire to consume lives—a pathology later amplified by the behavior of the "zoophagous (life-eating) maniac" Renfield. Lecter's most terrifying criminal signature is his penchant for creating gourmet meals out of human flesh. Coincidentally, Renfield also admits that Dracula has been

bribing him with "[t]he *Acherontia atropos of the Sphinges*—what you call the 'Death's-head Moth!'" (279), the very same species of the moth pupae Jame Gumb shoves into the throats of his victims in the film *The Silence of the Lambs*. (Besides the Death's-head Moth, a different moth species, Black Witch, is also used in the original novel.) We can even find a direct reference to vampires in the film. When Clarice Starling is meeting Lecter for their last interview, a police escort asks her: "Is it true what they're sayin'? ...He's some kinda vampire," to which Starling replies: "They don't have a name for what he is." Tellingly, on the promotional poster for the film *Hannibal*, Lecter is portrayed with blood-red eyes, and the archetypal monster with blood-red eyes is the literary vampire.

Like Gothic vampires, Harris's highly idealized fictional serial killer falls easily into the category of the traditional Gothic villain, whose characteristics are detailed by Peter Larsen Thorslev. He is a charismatic and ingenious gentleman; unlike the misogynistic villains in the novels of Ann Radcliffe and Matthew Gregory Lewis, Lecter, besides being a sadistic serial murderer, is constantly cordial, courteous, and chivalrous even when caged. Throughout the series, Lecter is contrasted with other less successful serial killers such as Francis Dolarhyde and Jame Gumb or his simply offensive inmate Multiple Miggs, and his total lack of conscientious self-reproach and his commitment to evil carry heroic overtones. Lecter has also cultivated a refined predilection for highbrow savagery. In Jonathan Demme's cinematic rendition of the novel, Lecter escapes from the pathetically dramatic cage in the Shelby County Courthouse, gutting and transforming one of the guards into a hideous angel of doom suspended from the bars of the cage—a murder tableau representing an intoxicating mixture of artistic sublimity and ruling power. Although without conscience or a shred of humanity, Lecter is deeply interested in human struggles and failings, and his fascination with human possibilities is what makes him

empathetic. He is a psychiatrist who does not believe in psychoanalysis. In *The Silence of the Lambs*, Lecter calls psychoanalysis a "dead religion" (149), and he repeatedly refuses psychological evaluations and only uses his gift for psychological insight as a weapon to intimidate others. However, when the policemen try to decipher what makes a monster, we see that Lecter is equally eager to know what makes a hero.

Like Stoker's Dracula, Polidori's Lord Ruthven, and many other literary vampires, Lecter in the novels *Red Dragon* and *The Silence of the Lambs* (1988) does not have a backstory. Catherine Spooner observes that it is the inexplicability of his murders that makes Lecter so terrifying (255-56). Instead of being a pathological cliché whose crimes originate from childhood trauma or abuse, Lecter shows an unaccountable malevolence in Harris's first two novels and is thus a potent enigma. Lecter's background, the dreadful ordeal that incites him to kill, is later introduced in *Hannibal* and completed in *Hannibal Rising* (2006), and it becomes a recurrent theme in subsequent adaptations. Lecter's childhood trauma illustrates his fixation on the issue of legacy and firmly fastens the Lecter series to the gloomy realm of Gothic fiction instead of crime narrative. The horror in the past—only repressed but never truly eliminated—will ultimately make a dreadful intrusion into the present.

I aim to trace this interweaving between serial killer narratives and vampire fictions in the second half of my thesis in a study of the two influential nineteenth-century Gothic texts, Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818) and Robert Louis Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886), through the lens of vampire narratives. I will anatomize how Shelley and Stevenson model their serial murderers on the alluring images of literary vampires in order to shock, to seduce, to psychologize, and, above all, to elicit the reader's sympathy. At first glance, there are striking differences between the dashing Gothic vampire and the clumsy

Frankensteinian Monster: one is a smooth seducer and the other an eight-foot-tall engine of destruction; one is a natural-born killer and the other a victim-monster, an abused child who grows up to be an abusive parent (which coincidentally is more in concert with real-life serial offenders). Stevenson's story of a respectable doctor concocting a plan to hide his criminal double life is also more closely aligned with the formula for criminal psychology than vampire narrative. However, all of these stories bear traces of Gothic vampirism, and the connections between them are stronger than might have been expected.

Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, Stevenson's *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, and Stoker's *Dracula* all achieved the status of modern myths and became part of popular culture with various screen and theatrical adaptations. They more or less replay the traditional Gothic plot initiated in *The Castle of Otranto*, in which a powerful human monster persecutes defenseless maidens. This cookie-cutter formula can be found in the oldest vampire lore and in its most famous progeny, *Dracula*, in which the king vampire is the archetypal Gothic villain while his victims—Mina Murray Harker, Lucy Westenra, and even Jonathan Harker at the opening of the novel—play the role of sacrificial lambs who scream on cue. *Frankenstein* and *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, like *Dracula* and *The Castle of Otranto*, were allegedly inspired by nightmares, a claim that was conveniently self-promoting and novel-promoting. Their authors spent their childhood in enforced seclusion, frustrated by parental remoteness or entombed in a sickroom, with only imagination to entertain themselves. However, after the originating dreams, *The Castle of Otranto*, *Frankenstein*, and *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* were completed at breakneck speed. (Stevenson's effort to finish the first draft of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* in three days and a complete rewrite in another three days—a total of 60,000 words—on what eventually became his deathbed was documented by his widow Fanny Osbourne Stevenson [qtd. in Tropp 128].)

Dracula, on the other hand, took Stoker six-to-seven years of extensive research into vampire legends, geographical details, lunar cycles, and contemporary news (Tropp 135).

These vampiric tales are all about the relationships between creators and their creations. *Frankenstein* and *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, like other memorable vampire fictions, highlight the plight of the anomalies, noted for their distinctive or deformed appearance, primitive behavior, and yearning for kinship with their kind. The interest of all these monstrous stories is acknowledged when we realize that each anomaly and his adversary are mirror-image twins, and they have a relationship that is both maternal and marital. In *Dracula*, Lucy Westenra is first Dracula's prey and lover, but she is also reborn as Dracula's daughter. We see this pattern again in Anne Rice's 1976 novel *Interview with the Vampire*, in which Louis calls Claudia "my daughter" and "my love." In *Frankenstein*, Victor leaves his fiancée behind to create a life that later becomes a matrimonial rival for Elizabeth, and in *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, Jekyll admits that he carries inside him a partner who is "knit to him closer than a wife" (91).

In the realm of Gothic vampirism, monstrosity is never easily defined. The master of modern Gothic, Stephen King, famously says: "Monsters are real, and ghosts are real too. They live inside us, and sometimes, they win" (xvii). I hope that my analysis of allusions to literary vampirism in *Frankenstein* and *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* draws attention to how monsters are humanized and become scapegoats, how their civilized counterparts exhibit similar brutality and predatory instincts, and how the structure of each novel encourages us to violate the thin line separating the beast from the dandy, to recognize the blood-lust within ourselves, and to see whether we are also just a patchwork of morality, criminality, and wishful thinking.

Chapter One: Nineteenth-Century Gothic Vampires: Lord Byron, Polidori, and Stoker

The Gothic vampire was not a new literary invention, but its entrance into the milieu of English prose can be traced back to a clearly datable landmark: the publication of John William Polidori's novella *The Vampyre* on 1 April 1819 in *New Monthly Magazine* by Henry Colburn. Polidori's tale of the debauched aristocrat Lord Ruthven returning from the grave to ravage his former friend's sister disinterred vampires in nineteenth-century literature and resurrected the zombielike revenants in folklore as ladies' men preying on high society. Although quickly fading into oblivion and eclipsed by its most famous descendant—Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (1897)—Polidori's short work had a backstory that is as if not more riveting than the story itself. The bloodsuckers with class actually shared the same womb with another iconic Gothic nightmarish creature, but they were a pair of non-identical twins. Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein; or, The Modern Prometheus* (1818) and *The Vampyre* were the two most enduring products of an informal ghost story writing competition held by Lord Byron during his Genevan summer tryst with the Shelleys in 1816; and, just like *Frankenstein*, the central episodes in Polidori's work reflected the circumstances of its composition. However, whereas an eighteen-year-old girl's "waking dream" (Shelley 197) crystallized into *Frankenstein*, the novel that launched Mary Shelley's brilliant career as a writer, *The Vampyre* left its author vilified and disgraced. This was not a surprising turn of events since the work was Polidori's retaliation against his employer earlier that Genevan summer, the golden boy who had a lifestyle Polidori envied. This story behind the story, therefore, does not have an auspicious start.

It began with an ending, when an elite group of fugitives retreated from the commotion of their troubled lives to the rural serenity at the Villa Diodati near Lake Geneva, accompanied by a very young and headstrong nobody. George Gordon Byron, once a literary powerhouse who had

enjoyed the prestige and celebrity of a rock star, was driven out of England in April 1816 by his wife's legal proceedings against him, and he hired Polidori, a young Italian Scotsman who had received his MD the year before at the age of only nineteen, to join his hegira. Polidori, an Edinburgh-trained physician, also harbored literary ambitions, and he was offered a generous payment to record the European trip of the most famous/infamous poet in England. Polidori must have regarded his European sojourn with Byron as the chance of a lifetime that would open innumerable doors, and Byron probably considered his new companion an up-and-coming prodigy of medicine and literature, a diamond in the rough. Sadly, the scales would soon fall from their eyes. The two travelers joined forces with a couple who were also in a personal crisis: Percy Bysshe Shelley (who was avoiding his wife Harriet Westbrook, his outraged father Sir Timothy Shelley, and his former mentor and future father-in-law William Godwin) and his current mistress Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin. Traveling with the Shelleys were Mary's stepsister Claire Clairmont, who would soon become Byron's new favorite, and Mary's infant son William.

Despite their emotional limbo, the wet, ungenial summer was not altogether unpleasant. Claire Clairmont soon became a mother and contributed to the ever-widening pool of Byron's illegitimate offspring. Mary Godwin, the biggest winner that year, officially became Mary Shelley in December and was reconciled with her father. Confined by the unseasonably rainy weather, the group passed time reading a ghost story collection translated from German to French: *Fantasmagoriana; ou Recueil d'histoires, d'apparitions, de spectres, revenans, fantômes, etc., traduit de l'allemand, par un amateur*, and on 16 June Byron launched an informal ghost story writing competition. Mary Shelley's contribution to the competition evolved into the first draft of *Frankenstein*, a novel that attained an assured place in the public

imagination and consolidated her reputation as a writer critically and commercially. Polidori published in 1819 what he claimed was a product of the same contest: *Ernestus Berchtold; or, The Modern Oedipus*, the title of which pays silent tribute to *Frankenstein; or, The Modern Prometheus*. However, Polidori's once magical summer soon ended in bitter disappointment. Constantly in conflict with his employer and even avoided by the Shelleys, Polidori had failed to fit in with the group of social outcasts. Byron's patience snapped, and he dismissed Polidori before the summer ended. Polidori failed to land a job as either a doctor or a writer in Italy and returned to England the following year in spring. He subsequently buried himself in gambling debts, resided in the slum neighborhood of Soho, London, and committed suicide at the age of twenty-five.

Polidori's association with Byron, however, ended with a beginning. He returned to England with no fame, no fortune, no job, no friend, and no complete record of Byron's European stay, but not really empty-handed. Besides *Ernestus Berchtold*, his *The Diary of Dr. John William Polidori* (1816) is one of the two accounts of Byron's and the Shelleys' eventful summer holiday (the other one being Mary Shelley's preface to the 1831 edition of *Frankenstein*) and the only contemporaneous statement. Most importantly, he had with him a rough outline of Byron's abandoned story for the writing competition. There is wild speculation over Byron's reason for discontinuing his tale. Byron had already had frequent experiences with Gothic vampirism, but he had never expressed much enthusiasm for it. In his short satiric poem *Windsor Poetics* (1813), the incorrigible Byron had lampooned the monarch with vampire metaphors, and his oriental romance of the same year, *The Giaour*, features a fisherman's curse on the Giaour, who would be reborn as the Undead to feast on the blood of his relatives as fitting punishment for murdering Hassan. Byron famously claimed in his letter to John Murray of 17

June 1816, "I have…a personal dislike to 'vampires,' and the little acquaintance I have with them would by no means induce me to divulge their secrets" (qtd. in Twitchell 113). *The Giaour* was probably his final flirtation with Gothic vampirism. The vampires in the few brief lines in *The Giaour* are akin to stereotypical vampires in folklore: they haunt specific locales and hunt their family members, a motif also adopted not by Polidori but by Mary Shelley, as Frankenstein vehemently condemns the Creature as "[his] own vampire, [his] own spirit let loose from the grave, and forced to destroy all that was dear to [him]" (57).

Of course, the work that led to the accusations of plagiarism Polidori faced was not Byron's fragmentary narrative poem but his 2000-word "Fragment of a Novel" (1819), the beginning of a story Byron had drafted but quickly discarded. The fragment, sometimes titled "The Burial: A Fragment," is dated June 17 1816, and it shares marked similarities with Polidori's novella in their opening plots and character development. The story unfolds as the narrator describes his fascination with his agreeable but eccentric traveling companion Augustus Darvell, but abruptly breaks off after Darvell with his last breath extracts a solemn oath from the narrator. Polidori's story appeared in April 1819 with a false attribution to Byron, a mistake neither Polidori nor the publisher Henry Colburn was eager to rectify since the association with Byron was responsible for the work's immediate massive sale. Just two months later John Murray published Byron's fragment—reportedly without the author's knowledge or permission—presumably to establish Byron as the legitimate author. Polidori's tale of a master parasite is therefore appropriately born out of multilayered parasitism. He continued Byron's fragmentary text for the ghost story competition, modeled the interaction between his two protagonists on his relationship with Byron, and promoted the sale of his work with Byron's fame. (This intensely parasitic origin of the first English vampire fantasy in prose provided a

model for the rich doubling in most subsequent vampire narratives, as we shall see.) Most importantly, Polidori's vampire protagonist is a replica of Byron: aristocratic, debonair, scheming, and above all sexually irresistible. Christopher Frayling's dedication of his study *Vampyres: Lord Byron to Count Dracula* is "For Dr John William Polidori, who came too close to a vampire," but Polidori's brief encounter with Byron was probably a blessing in disguise.

There is still vigorous debate over whether Polidori (and/or Colburn) was responsible for the hoax of the Byron attribution, and about how Byron dealt with this blunt reproduction of his ideas, but the relation between Polidori's novella and Byron's fragment is not as straightforward as it seems. Recent revival of interest in Gothic vampires has directed attention back to the first vampire in English Romantic prose and its inspiration; and literary scholars have observed that, ironically, Byron's fragment, which set Polidori's story going, has been misread because of Polidori's work. James B. Twitchell in his book *The Living Dead* provides comprehensive accounts of both Byron's and Polidori's experiments with vampirism, and he cogently argues that Byron's Darvell is actually not a vampire at all (114-15). Darvell is certainly enigmatic, evasive, and reserved, but absolutely nothing in his action or character suggests that he is evil or vampiric. If he were really to be exposed as a vampire later in the story, he would be a new and improved fiend very different from the folkloric version in *The Giaour*. The complicated rituals involving the stork with a snake in her beak, a seal ring, the Bay of Eleusis, and the ruins of the temple of Ceres have no significance whatsoever in preexisting vampire legends and only baffle the reader. Furthermore, after Darvell's death, the narrator notes, "his countenance in a few minutes became nearly black" (235), and this unnatural perishability of Darvell's flesh is antithetical to any established vampire myth. We do not know whether or not Byron scribbled other notes for his unfinished story or whether he revealed further designs to Polidori, but the

only dramatized episode Polidori purloined seems to be the oath sworn by the ingénue. Byron's fragment is probably not a vampire narrative at all.[1]

Polidori's *The Vampyre*, on the other hand, is really the progenitor of the modern vampire genre of fantasy fiction ranging from the Penny-Dreadful version *Varney the Vampire* (1845–47) to the serialized lesbian narrative *Carmilla* (1871), the definitive novel *Dracula*, Anne Rice's vampire fiction *Interview with the Vampire* (1976), and teen novels like *The Twilight Saga* (2005–08). The frequency with which Gothic vampires have been adapted in both the novel and the cinema testifies to how compellingly Polidori defined the modern form of literary vampires and initiated the cult following of vampire legends. Frayling in the same volume dubs *The Vampyre* "the first story successfully to fuse the disparate elements of vampirism into a coherent literary genre" (108). However, Polidori did not set out to write a groundbreaking literary treatment of the monster, and his novella is a work less of plagiarism than of slander. Polidori wrote the short novel mainly to caricature his former employer—the two parted on hostile terms before the end of that fateful Genevan summer. To make the joke obvious, Polidori named his vampire Lord Ruthven, probably after Clarence de Ruthven, the thinly-disguised Byron figure in Lady Caroline Lamb's first novel *Glenarvon* (1816). Byron was reportedly anxious about this unflattering and obvious portrayal of himself by his ex-mistress upon the novel's publication, and Polidori must have delighted in the prospect of Byron's unease upon seeing the loathed name in yet another story published by the same Henry Colburn. Yet Polidori's act of revenge became a happy accident, for the work recycles a character from the cobwebbed corner of Gothic

[1] Many of the details of the relationship between Byron's fragment and Polidori's *The Vampyre* are still debatable. Christopher Frayling, for example, argues that Byron published the fragment out of self-defense, and he deliberately omitted most of the more "vampiric" aspects of his story in this published version to stress the differences between his fragment and Polidori's *The Vampyre* (126).

triteness into a brooding Gothic villain. I aim to trace how Polidori revolutionized the bloodsucking monsters that would otherwise have remained in well-deserved oblivion, and how the same characterization was reiterated and consolidated in Bram Stoker's *Dracula* seventy-eight years later. Polidori transformed the decomposing body in folklore into a flattering and gentlemanly lady-killer (in both the figurative and literal sense), a criminal mastermind who devises or executes his schemes with precision and acute intelligence, and a monster masquerading as man who chills the reader by endangering all boundaries. Gothic vampires would never be the same again.

Polidori's first innovation was to jettison the lumbering, drooling, foul-smelling, and easily hoodwinked ghoul in folklore and make his vampire flesh and blood, someone displaying every human trait but giving just enough hints that he is something other than human. Modern vampires' appearance is often singular, but there is usually nothing particularly alarming about their physique. Stoker's Dracula, for example, first appears in the novel as merely "a tall old man, clean-shaven save for a long white moustache, and clad in black from head to foot, without a single speck of colour about him anywhere," and he shakes Jonathan Harker's hands with bone-crushing strength with his own hand "as cold as ice—more like the hand of a dead than a living man" (15-16). Harker later notes the vampire's aquiline face, thin nose, arched nostrils, lofty domed forehead, bushy eyebrows, cruel-looking mouth, peculiarly sharp white teeth, ruddy lips, pale ears that are extremely pointed at the top, extraordinary pallor, hair in the center of his palms, and particularly sharp nails (17-18). Dracula waits on Harker hand and foot in Transylvania until one day Harker is terrified to realize that there is something unsettlingly unhuman about his gracious host. Dracula casts no shadow and has no reflection in the mirror. He can see in the dark and—*pace* Stephenie Meyer—has magical control over wolves and

animals in general. Before Dracula actually proves himself to be a blood-guzzling demon and a shape-shifter, he already appears to be uncannily paranormal. Gothic vampires are also surpassingly strong. When Aubrey in Polidori's story rushes to save his beloved Ianthe, he is waylaid by the vampire later revealed to be Ruthven. Aubrey feels himself "grappled by one whose strength seemed superhuman" and is soon "lifted from his feet and hurled with enormous force against the ground" (48). In *Dracula*, Harker, deciding to free himself from Dracula's little house of horrors, demands to leave the lodging in the middle of the night, unaware that his host is about to pitch him into a pack of wolves. Dracula, ever the gentleman, leads the way and manually opens the door to his castle—the same "great door, old and studded with large iron nails, and set in a projecting doorway of massive stone" (14) that Harker could not open a few chapters earlier. Harker, fearing the ravening wolves, grudgingly agrees to stay, and "[w]ith one sweep of his powerful arm, the Count threw the door shut, and the great bolts clanged and echoed through the hall as they shot back into their places" (50).

Gothic vampires' most salient feature is their eyes, and it is their way of perceiving the world that sets them apart from mere mortals. They are often chameleons, effortlessly assimilating themselves into human society and history. In Stoker's *Dracula*, the king vampire changes appearance frequently, but it is not always clear whether such change is a deliberate design or the result of Stoker's notorious cack-handedness. (After all, *Dracula* is a book in which characters turn up at the wrong hotel, their hair changes color inexplicably, and blood transfusion can be performed without any regard to blood types.) The one constant feature of Dracula is his eyes, the pair of piercing, blood-red eyes that reappear on the faces of so many literary vampires. When Harker arrives in Transylvania, the peasants, knowing where his destination is, anxiously warn him of "the evil eye" (6). This is not an original expression, and Byron defines it in one of

his notes to *The Giaour* as "a common superstition in the Levant, and of which the imaginary effects are yet very singular to those who conceive themselves affected" (244). Soon Harker is conveyed to Dracula's castle by a mysterious coachman later revealed to be Dracula himself, and the coachman's only visible facial feature is a "pair of very bright eyes, which seemed red in the lamplight" (10). Later in England Mina Murray follows a sleepwalking Lucy Westenra to her clandestine meeting with Dracula in the churchyard, where Mina shouts out a warning but attracts the attention of only the vampire. Mina sees "a white face and red, gleaming eyes" hovering over her friend before the mysterious creature disappears without a trace into the night (90). In the only dramatized episode of Dracula's attack, the crew of vampire hunters, realizing that Mina is in mortal danger, charge into the Harkers' bedroom and are horrified to find Dracula grappling with Mina to force-feed her his blood. Dr. John Seward records that, upon seeing Mina's protectors, Dracula's "eyes flamed red with devilish passion; the great nostrils of the white aquiline nose opened wide and quivered at the edges" (282).

The eyes of Polidori's Ruthven and Ruthven's visual perception of the world divulge the vampire's predatory instinct and self-imposed isolation. Ruthven enters the narrative with his most eye-catching peculiarity, which is "more remarkable…than…his rank": he "apparently gazed upon the mirth around him, as if he could not participate therein" (39). The narrator immediately establishes that Ruthven's "dead grey eye, …fixing upon the object's face, seemed not to penetrate, and at one look to pierce through to the inward workings of the heart" (39); and two pages later Aubrey describes Ruthven as giving "few other signs of his observation of external objects, than the tacit assent to their existence, implied by the avoidance of their contact" (41). When he is harassed by the notorious flirt Lady Mercer, though Ruthven's "eyes were apparently fixed upon her's [*sic*], still it seemed as if they were unperceived" (39-40); and

later, seeing the vampire up close, Aubrey concludes that Ruthven's "eye spoke less than his lip" (43). Gothic vampires are of course the archetypal loners in literature, and they glide through human society showing no empathy and no compassion, not caring to socialize with what are to them animals bound for the slaughter. (The most famous Gothic vampire of all, Stoker's Dracula, is eventually defeated by group work and reviled as a monster by corroborative testimony.) Ruthven's flat, shark-like eyes come alive only when he is pursuing prey, and then "his eyes sparkled with vivid fire" (42). Oblivious to the world around him, Ruthven sees only young Aubrey, and Aubrey is therefore the only person living to tell what Ruthven looks like when he kills. When Ruthven is tending his feverish and delirious companion, Aubrey is "surprised to meet [Ruthven's] gaze fixed intently upon him, with a smile of malicious exultation playing upon his lips" (49). The invalid recovers, but his caregiver quickly becomes debilitated. When Ruthven, now near death, compels Aubrey to swear the oath of silence, Ruthven's eyes again "seemed bursting from their sockets" (51). The reader would register before Aubrey does that Ruthven is playing with his food, but the profound significance of his eccentric perspective does not end here.

Ruthven's non-participatory perspective also marks Aubrey as his natural companion, and the vampire's gaze reveals more about Aubrey's parasitic vision than about the monster himself. Before Aubrey falls prey to Ruthven's contagion, he is already a man living in a storybook: "He believed all to sympathise with virtue, and thought that vice was thrown in by Providence as by authors in Romances merely for the picturesque effect of the scene… He thought, in fine, that the dreams of poets were the realities of life" (40). Therefore, it is not surprising that when Ruthven enters his life, Aubrey "soon formed this person into the hero of a romance, and determined to observe the offspring of his fancy, rather than the individual before

him" (41). The reader can easily detect that Aubrey's fascination with Ruthven parallels the unnamed narrator's fascination with Darvell in Byron's fragment, which probably originated in Polidori's short-lived idolatry of his employer, but we also cannot ignore the psychological depth of the two travelers' natural alliance. Ruthven, a true parasite, breeds Aubrey's romantic fantasy and also actively feeds on it. He effortlessly arrests Aubrey's attention because he satisfies all the young man's wishes at once. Though old enough to be sought after by parents in the marriage market, Aubrey is a voracious reader of fictions of romance and supernatural horror, and he is naturally disappointed upon realizing that "there was no foundation in real life for any of that congeries of pleasing horrors and descriptions contained in the volumes" (40). He is also an orphan neglected by irresponsible guardians, an impressionable youth seeking a surrogate father and a mentor. He is devoted to the antiquarian study of dead civilizations, which speaks most convincingly to his loss of contact with the real world. Ruthven, a vampire, comes straight from the literary genre of Gothic horror and represents the lineage of defunct civilizations. He is also an experienced traveler who can guide Aubrey on the grand tour and someone with great social sophistication. Aubrey siphons from the fantasies he reads and Ruthven's otherworldly beauty a world of make-believe. The parasite Ruthven and the parasitic Aubrey are made for each other.

Aubrey, with his imagination kindled by novel reading and Ruthven's alluring otherness, constantly refuses to differentiate fact from fiction, and after he falls under Ruthven's hypnotic spell, Aubrey's worst fear comes true when he starts to resemble Ruthven more and more by becoming utterly incapable of distinguishing reality from fantasy. For example, arriving much too late to save Ianthe from the vampire's kiss, Aubrey finds only the "lifeless corpse" (48) of the beautiful girl. He then "shut his eyes, hoping that it was but a vision arising from his disturbed imagination" (48). Aubrey soon succumbs to a life-threatening fever, and while he is in

Ruthven's care, the images of the vampire and Ruthven merge into one in Aubrey's horrific hallucinations (49). Reunited with the vampire, Aubrey displays the same social apathy exhibited by Ruthven earlier: he is "now as much a lover of solitude and silence as Lord [Ruthven]" (49), and together they "hastened from place to place, yet they seemed not to heed what they gazed upon" (50). At the height of Ruthven's power, Aubrey "had become emaciated, his eyes had attained a glassy lustre" (56), reminiscent of Ruthven's "dead grey eye" mentioned earlier. Returning to England, Aubrey decides to leave the hurt and horror behind, until in a drawing-room party in his sister's honor, the fiend who has been plaguing him resurfaces. Aubrey wishes in vain that "his imagination had conjured up the image his mind was resting upon" (54), but ultimately he is unable to flee from the image that haunts him. Twitchell, in his analysis of the novella, mentions the battle of energy between the two protagonists and how the bloom of health flows to and fro between them (112). Aubrey's health improves at Ruthven's expense, but in Ruthven's presence the young man again wastes away. Ruthven never actually drains Aubrey of blood, but Aubrey is one of his intended victims and probably a potential mate. In Aubrey Ruthven finds a partner in crime of his kind, and, appropriately, at the end of the story Aubrey's "rage not finding vent…had broken a blood-vessel," and he is dying of "effusion of blood" (58).

Polidori's second innovation is to make the vampire a dangerous seducer, like Byron. Byron in his day was more than a high-profile poet in England whose reputation reached the Continent. He was a fighter who, despite the birth deformity of his right foot, was a good swimmer and also an excellent shot. He was a lover, rumored to have love affairs with both sexes and, notoriously, with his half-sister Augusta Leigh. He was also the model for the literary figure of the Byronic hero, not surprisingly since he was a narcissist who loved every extension of himself. Polidori's vampire is actually a Byronic vampire, reflecting Byron's elegant build, his

remarkable talent, his disrespect for societal norms or expectations, and his air of the fallen angel. Besides Byron, many critics also argue that Polidori might have been inspired by the most controversial villain in eighteenth-century literature, Robert Lovelace in Samuel Richardson's massive novel *Clarissa, or, the History of a Young Lady* (1747-48). Twitchell also finds a remarkable resemblance between the Gothic vampire Ruthven and some eighteenth-century Gothic villains such as Ambrosio in Matthew Gregory Lewis's *The Monk* (1796)—who is admittedly more of a rapist than a seducer—and Schedoni in Ann Radcliffe's *The Italian* (1797) (115-16). Indeed, vampires in nineteenth-century Gothic fantasy are seducers, and modern vampire narratives are often tales of seduction. It is easy to detect the undercurrent of sexuality in the nightmare imagery of *The Vampyre* or *Dracula*, even though their authors and first reviewers seemed oblivious to the sexual energy implied. Unlike the mindless animated corpses in folklore, these monsters have been revolutionized as bloodsucking villains with charm since Polidori's story. Literary vampires from this point onwards become dangerous predators that prefer allurement to force. They are the most polished and civilized of all monsters, gracious and courteous right up until the second they are not—not unlike some real-life serial killers who hide behind a perfect front. Aristocratic, wealthy, and charming, a Gothic vampire is the spider at the center of a vast web that waits for the heedless victims to visit his parlor. In short, literary vampires combine ideals with criminalities.

Byron the poet is of course consummate at issuing flatteries, and Gothic vampires' art of seduction also often involves language. We know little about Darvell in Byron's fragment, but Polidori highlights the vampire's seductive charm in his tale. Ruthven is introduced as someone whom "all wished to see" (39), a remarkable creature who attracts the attention of wanton females. More than once the narrator testifies that Ruthven's seductive approach is matched only

by Eden's subtle serpent. At the beginning of the narrative, Ruthven is described as having "the reputation of a winning tongue" (40). Aubrey is immediately beguiled by his seductive perversity, marveling at how generous Ruthven is, even though his charity is not always directed at the deserving: "His companion was profuse in his liberality;—the idle, the vagabond, and the beggar, received from his hand more than enough to relieve their immediate wants" (41-42). Even before Ianthe warns Aubrey of the vampires inhabiting the locale, Aubrey's guardians, dreading Ruthven's licentious menace, have already suggested that Aubrey stay away from the glamorous fiend: "His guardians insisted upon his immediately leaving his friend, and urged, that such a character was to be dreaded, for the possession of irresistible powers of seduction, rendered his licentious habits too dangerous to society" (43). Aubrey's sister is captivated by Ruthven as well, and when it is revealed that she is going to marry the vampire, who is now called the "Earl of Marsden," the narrator sighs: "Who could resist his power? His tongue had dangers and toils to recount—could speak of himself as of an individual having no sympathy with any being on the crowded earth, save with her, to whom he addressed himself; …he knew so well how to use the serpent's art" (57). Similarly, of course, Stoker's Dracula is known for his gentlemanly mannerisms and sweeping gestures, and when he welcomes Harker into his castle, Harker remarks that the Count "motioned [him] in with his right hand with a courtly gesture, saying in excellent English, but with a strange intonation" (15). Dracula is perpetually well-groomed and impeccably mannered, quite unlike the skeletal, rat-like, and shuffling Count Orlok in *Nosferatu* (1922), the first unauthorized film rendition of the novel. Many critics believe that Stoker modeled his vampire on his idol, the magnetic actor-manager Henry Irving, whose enchanting charisma the brilliant actor Bela Lugosi did justice to in the first authorized film adaptation of *Dracula* in 1931.

Drawing inspiration again from Byron, Polidori makes his vampire an aristocrat, which speaks to more than Ruthven's patrician bearing and introduces a new set of power relationships in most of the modern vampire fantasies and their backstories. Byron officially became "Lord Byron" at the age of ten after his father's death, and Polidori was probably envious of the privilege and prestige that came with the title. As I have been arguing, the tangled relationship between Aubrey and Ruthven very likely reflects the prolonged battle between Polidori and Byron, who in Polidori's novella is reborn as a bloodthirsty monster dominating a sweet, naive youth. Stoker probably also crafted the interaction between Dracula and Jonathan Harker on the basis of his hero worship of Irving, who, unlike Byron, had a harmonious working relationship with his employee. The world of the Undead is strictly hierarchical, and the vampire represents the feudal overlord. No matter whether he is in his native country Transylvania or in England, Dracula controls the scene and consumes everything that comes his way. The first aspect of the power relationships in vampire narrative is of course that between the predator and his prey.

Since the nineteenth-century vampire is conventionally figured as the libertine or rake, a predatory upper-class male, it is only logical that he exploits the innocence of young women, particularly those of lower social rank, the traditional target of victimization. Readers have noted that vampires probably never bite a man at all. Ruthven never actually tears up Aubrey's arteries, and Dracula even fends off the three female vampires to protect Harker. Vampire literature has long been noted for its misogynistic violence, and the monsters' depredations usually reflect the pernicious myth of male dominance. Vampires' victims are usually the purest specimens of beauty and pictures of perfection—angelic little simpletons for the villain to prey on. Ruthven, for example, "had required, to enhance his gratification, that his victim, the partner of his guilt, should be hurled from the pinnacle of unsullied virtue, down to the lowest abyss of infamy and

degradation," and he selects victims "apparently on account of their virtue" (43). However, after he has his way with them, the victims soon have "thrown even the mask aside, and…not scrupled to expose the whole deformity of their vices to the public view" (43). Dracula's first victim in England is the virginal Lucy Westenra, an idle and wealthy nineteen-year-old engaged to marry a future lord. Lucy parodies the archetypal heroines in popular romantic literature, who are always languishing for their lovers and wasting away in the most heartbreakingly beautiful fashion.

Vampire myth—or Gothic literature in general—is also noted for its characteristic eroticism and sadomasochism, and Jean Lorrah asserts that "[t]he attack of the vampire is an obvious symbol for rape" (31). Vampire literature is often considered a replay of a typical nineteenth-century pornographic theme that indulges male fantasy: a potential rape victim who looks terrified but surreptitiously desires her victimization. This victim later becomes a willing—and often an eager—accomplice, leading other maidens to their ruin (Tropp 138). A fundamental principle of vampire lore, reiterated by Abraham Van Helsing in *Dracula*, is that vampires cannot break into a house uninvited; this implies that Lucy and Mina, for all their "innocence," must have desired the vampire kiss. Even before Dracula arrives at England, Mina frustratedly notes that Lucy has resumed "her old habit of walking in her sleep" (72) as a prelude to the vampire's attack. This fantasy stereotypes female characters as corruptible innocence and passive, even willing, victims.

Critics have examined the gender politics in vampire literature and its violently patriarchal undercurrents, and it is interesting that in all of Byron's, Polidori's, and Stoker's narratives, and also in *Frankenstein* and *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, all the principal characters, humans and monsters alike, are male. (In this regard fact and fiction converge: the majority of real-life serial killers are male, a fact that still cannot be satisfactorily explained by criminal

profilers.) In *Dracula*, the only acceptable occupation for women is to be a mother and a wife—a breeding machine. In Dracula's castle, Harker watches petrified as the three vampire women pounce on the child the Count snatches for them, and later the heartbroken mother of the child cries her heart out in Dracula's courtyard. The mother is instantly devoured by a pack of wolves sent by Dracula, and Harker remarks, "I could not pity her, for I knew now what had become of her child, and she was better dead" (45). Without a child, a woman's life is without meaning. Dracula's second victim, Mina Murray Harker, is a wife and a mother, but at the same time she is perhaps even more innocent than her friend Lucy. Lucy has been noted for her beauty, which captures three suitors in a single day. Mina, on the other hand, is the only woman in the novel who demonstrates any resourcefulness and practicality, but she carefully balances her superior capabilities with expected femininity and is hardly the "New Woman" she mentions in her correspondence with Lucy. Van Helsing praises Mina as "one of God's women fashioned by His own hand to show us men and other women that there is a heaven where we can enter, and that its light can be here on earth. So true, so sweet, so noble, so little an egoist" (188). Mina is first and foremost a dutiful wife and mother, idolized by the band of vampire hunters whose fight to retain their dominance over women is masqueraded as a moral crusade. She is also very much asexual and never exhibits much physical intimacy even with her husband Jonathan Harker. The sex-starved Jonathan gains more sexual gratification from the three female vampires in three pages than from Mina during the course of the entire novel.

The second aspect of the power relationships in vampire literature is the ultimate battle of the sexes. Judith Halberstam discusses the differences between male and female monsters in the Gothic imagination, and she observes that, while the male monster often becomes a worthy adversary to the protagonist or his equal, female monsters often signify the limits and boundaries

of the power of horror. Female monsters are like the phantom pain of amputees; they do not dominate the narrative, but they still linger in the plot on the margins and make psychic returns (Halberstam 49). In the vampire narratives that I discuss, one sees how the male and female vampires seem like two different species. In *Dracula* particularly, the vampire overlord is a powerfully alluring and formidable adversary to the army of vampire hunters, which also consists of macho tough guys carrying masculine weapons: Van Helsing with his anti-vampire accoutrements such as crucifixes, bulbs of garlic, holy water, and communion wafers; Dr. Seward with his lancet; Quincey Morris with a bowie knife; Jonathan Harker with a Kukri knife; and Arthur Holmwood with the destructive wooden stake and hammer. The female vampires in the novel, though predators themselves, are pathetically weak and debilitated. Unlike the Count, who can fight victims of all sizes and body shapes, the female vampires—including the Undead Lucy—prey on defenseless children: in the opening section in Dracula's castle, Dracula feeds the three vampire women a child to keep them away from Harker in the same way someone feeds his pack of dogs to assert dominance; and Lucy, the "Bloofer Lady," lures children effortlessly with her charm and beauty. Halberstam also observes that the female vampires cannot even reproduce their forms (101). The Undead Lucy and the three beautiful female vampires Harker encounters in Transylvania feed on children, but Stoker never specifies whether they will create vampire children. This, of course, is not a concrete proof of their infertility. Vampires' most legendary and abhorred trait is their power to spread blood-lust like a disease, and Van Helsing, the walking textbook of everything vampire, warns Holmwood after he nearly succumbs to the seduction of the vampire Lucy near her grave, "last night [if] you [had] open[ed] your arms to her, you would in time, when you had died, have become *nosferatu*" (214). These three "weird sisters" and the Undead Lucy are more like prostitutes than Gothic monsters. In the realm of

Gothic nightmare they are no different from sexually aggressive harlots who spread an enervating disease and are notorious for their voluptuousness. Female characters in *Dracula*—like those, as we will see, in *Frankenstein* and *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*—fit the stereotypes of women as either easy prey (like Lucy and Mina) or nymphomaniacal whores (like the female vampires).

Gothic vampires are attractive not only because of their superficial charm or aristocratic manner but also because of their criminal intelligence. Van Helsing in his characteristic broken English describes Dracula as someone with a "child-brain" (341) or an "imperfectly formed mind" (342), directly referring to the now-debunked theories by Cesare Lombroso (1835-1909). Lombroso, an Italian doctor and early criminologist, in his masterwork *Criminal Man* (1876) associated a proclivity for crime with atavistic instincts and depicted criminals as throwbacks to prehistory. However, Gothic vampires' assault is no child's play, and vampires are criminal masterminds. In *The Vampyre*, Aubrey, though having sworn that "for a year and a day [he] will not impart [his] knowledge of [Ruthven's] crimes or death to any living being, in any way, whatever may happen, or whatever [he] may see" (51), soon realizes that there can be no honor when dealing with fiends. He then proceeds to warn everyone in his social circle of Ruthven's real nature, but unfortunately his enfeebled state discredits his words, and everybody believes instead that it is only his madness talking, a madness that has been precipitated by the delirious fever to which he succumbs in Greece after Ianthe's death. Ruthven is only too happy about this recent development: "When he heard of Aubrey's ill health, he readily understood himself to be the cause of it; but, when he learned that he was deemed insane, his exultation and pleasure could hardly be concealed from those, among whom he had gained this information" (57). Aubrey then makes a last desperate attempt to stop his sister's wedding, but Ruthven quickly

intercepts him and whispers in his ear, "know, if not my bride to day [*sic*], your sister is dishonoured. Women are frail" (58). Ruthven's warning is not in vain, and within minutes, he skillfully brings the situation under control.

In *Dracula*, Jonathan Harker testifies that the Count is extremely meticulous about planning his evil schemes:

> Everything had been carefully thought out, and done systematically and with precision. He seemed to have been prepared for every obstacle which might be placed by accident in the way of his intentions being carried out. To use an Americanism, he had "taken no chances," and the absolute accuracy with which his instructions were fulfilled was simply the logical result of his care. (226)

Halberstam argues that "in the Gothic novel at the end of the nineteenth century, monsters are always born bad" (44), and vampires are certainly natural-born killers. However, even Van Helsing, the leader of the vampire hunters, has to agree that Dracula was once a most erudite and accomplished man: "he was in life a most wonderful man. Soldier, statesman, and alchemist—which latter was the highest development of the science-knowledge of his time. He had a mighty brain, a learning beyond compare, and a heart that knew no fear and no remorse. …there was no branch of knowledge of his time that he did not essay" (302).

Vampires display the fundamental Gothic free spirit by breaking all rules. Ornella Volta says: "The vampire can violate all taboos and achieve what is most forbidden" (qtd. in Frayling 387-88). Anything goes. However, the true chill is that this beast is also a dandy. By characterizing the Gothic vampire as a gentleman, a seducer, an aristocrat, and an intelligent psychopath, Polidori transforms the vampire in nineteenth-century fantasies into an active villain, a phantom prince, a monster in a person suit; and he also brings into vampire narrative

the human's dangerous proximity to beast, a theme that had long existed in Gothic fiction in general but not in vampire literature in particular. In order to neutralize the unnatural presence of a Gothic monster, the landscapes of those tales of horror often correspond with the villain's vicious nature. Thus the conventional Gothic backdrop of an ancient castle is often situated at the furthest reaches of the earth; the gestures of the aristocratic villain are alluringly exotic, and his voice is often thick with accent. However, many nineteenth-century Gothic fictions shift the focus from a remote locale in ancient times to the familiar geography of Europe or England, and much of the horror in Gothic literature lies in the grotesque propinquity between supernatural chaos and everyday reality familiar to readers, between the normal and the pathological, between the native and the foreign, and between the real and the fictional. For example, in the quintessential Female Gothic plot of Bluebeard, the new bride discovers a bloody chamber in her own house and thus becomes the next victim of her murderous husband. In the popular genre of sensation novels, prim and proper angels in the house in the ordinary and often domestic settings are guilty of secret sins such as bigamy, adultery, or (attempted) murder for a family heirloom. The climactic moment of Gothic horror frequently occurs in the very second when what (or whom) you think you know turns out to be horrifyingly alien—when the man you trust turns out to be not a man at all or when a locked door divides domestic bliss from a scene of blood-curdling crime.

Similarly, in vampire literature, creatures of Gothic fantasy intrude into daily existence in realistic settings—places that can be identified on a map and with a date that can be marked on a calendar. For instance, in the vampire curse embedded in Byron's *The Giaour*, a loving father can be transformed into a bloodsucking monster who visits his children at their bedside at night and deprives them of life. In Polidori's *The Vampyre*, Aubrey's sophisticated friend, who guides

him on their grand tour and initiates him into adult circles, feeds on the women Aubrey loves. We also get a glimpse of social realism and even social criticism in Polidori's work, and a bloodsucking demon seems the least of Aubrey's problems. The grand tour, for example, instead of being the culmination of one's education, "for many generations had been thought necessary to enable the young to take some important steps in the career of vice, [and] put themselves upon an equality with the aged" (41); and scandals, secrets, and vices "are mentioned as the subjects of pleasantry or of praise, according to the degree of skill shewn in their conduct" (41). We see also the scramble for suitors in the marriage market, where mediocre women are reduced to competing for equally disappointing men. Aubrey's ultimate failing is that he finds a role model in a vampire, but had the creature of the night never crossed Aubrey's path, there is no guarantee that the young man's future would have been bright and sunny.

Dracula also introduces supernatural nightmare to the civilized society of London. Stoker moves the lair of his vampire to Transylvania, presumably on the model of the legendary image of Elizabeth Báthory, the female prototype of the monster. Literally "Tran-sylvania" means "across the woods" or "the land beyond the forests," and vampires belong to both realms: they are the Living Dead, monster and man, parasitical and wealthy, immortal but still destructible. The novel opens with the standard Gothic plot: the protagonist, unaware of the imminent danger he exposes himself to, crosses the border and enters the Gothic territory in the form of an ancient foreign castle, but the narrative quickly directs the reader back to the familiar ground of England, where the majority of the plot unfolds. Although Stoker is notorious for his stereotypical portrayal of foreign characteristics and exotic accents—as exemplified by Mr. Swales's regional dialect and the ludicrous idiosyncrasies of Quincey Morris—he characterizes his arch-vampire Dracula as familiarly chivalrous and gentlemanly. Dracula's manners, for instance, maintain the

Victorian standard of decorum Jonathan Harker cherishes back in England: he waits on Harker hand and foot in the castle, posing not only as a gracious host but also as his coach driver, personal chef, and chambermaid; and even when he is going to feed Harker to a pack of wolves, Dracula never utters vulgarities. The media that carry the narrative in *Dracula* also connect the supernatural tale to familiar territories, and the reader learns of the events in the novel through a secondhand relationship much as one would by reading newspaper. Indeed, in a comparable reading experience, about ten years before the publication of *Dracula*, newspaper readers had learned the factual and gruesome details of Jack the Ripper's killing spree from August to November 1888. Novels composed of journal entries and epistles were common enough, but such newspaper clippings as those first announcing that Lucy has been reborn as the "Bloofer Lady" tie Stoker's narratives more closely to the reader's day-to-day life. Furthermore, other recent inventions (such as the phonograph and the typewriter), skills (such as stenography), and source materials (such as the phonographically recorded case notes of psychiatry and the ship's log) establish historical realism and foster a false sense of security. In *Dracula* familiar geography becomes uncharted waters—far less than safe physically and psychically.

To accentuate this threatening blurring of boundaries, Gothic fictions often set up endless duplications of an identical image to challenge the relationship between surface and depth, between mirage and substance. Gothic vampire narratives effectively exploit the theme of double. In my analysis of *The Vampyre*, I have discussed how the vampire Ruthven and his quarry Aubrey are a match made in heaven, and Stoker's *Dracula* especially abounds in such mirroring. *Dracula* ostensibly is built on a series of oppositions and related oppositions, and the first opposition is established in the first chapter, when Jonathan Harker crosses the border between West and East at Budapest. From that moment on, we see that, while West means

precision (where a woman's pastime is memorizing railway timetables), East is a world where the trains do not run on time, and there are no detailed timetables or map-references; West implies reason, medical advancement, scientific discovery, and domesticity (where not even the uneducated Mr. Swales is as superstitious as the Transylvanian peasants), and East is where powerful superstition and godless magic prevail. West is where Jonathan's fiancée Mina, the epitome of all that is good and virtuous in a woman, patiently waits for him in the seaside town Whitby that summer, and East is where Jonathan exchanges day for night and enters into a world of lust and all sorts of sexual perversion and crime such as sadism, masochism, rape, necrophilia, pedophilia, incest, and homosexuality. West is inhabited by the middle class, whereas East is ruled by the aristocratic feudal overlord. Van Helsing leads a holy war and patriotic crusade, aiming to annihilate Dracula's demonic atheism with Christian salvation. Dracula is often interpreted as the Antichrist, and Van Helsing denounces the vampire as "abhorred by all; a blot on the face of God's sunshine; an arrow in the side of Him who died for man" (237). Martin Tropp shrewdly observes in *Images of Fear* that, while the name "Dracula" in Romanian literally means "the dragon" and in its modern sense "the Devil," Arthur Holmwood, one of the vampire hunters, is later elevated to "*Lord God*-alming" (153). Even though for a while Dracula's demonic power seems to overwhelm those not privy to legends or superstitions, it is Van Helsing's band of vampire hunters who secure the final triumph. Stoker's characterization undeniably renders the vampire hunters flat and indistinguishable, and it allows no character development or psychological insight. But this characterization also sets the stage for a clear-cut moral battle between Dracula's otherness and the homogenizing power of his opponents, who are ultimately interchangeable.

Appearances, however, often deceive. For example, Frank Grady in one of his notes to

"Vampire Culture" observes that Dracula, though planning his invasion of England, turns out to have been a defender of the West: "For centuries, Dracula had declared to Harker, his people guarded the Turkish frontier and represented Christian Europe's last line of defense against Islamic invasion" (239). Moreover, as established in *The Vampyre*, vampire narratives are stories of a double, and in *Dracula*, Stoker emphasizes the uncomfortable resemblance between the Count's alleged vices and the vampire hunters' equally questionable morals in their pursuit. Dracula the arch-vampire and Van Helsing the arch-vampire-hunter (as well as his secretary Mina) mirror each other, and one cannot help but wonder why Van Helsing knows the Count so well. Critics have noticed that Van Helsing's crew fight vampires with vampiric methods: Van Helsing draws blood from young men to pump into Lucy Westenra, and Mina draws words from every last scrap of documentation and feeds them into her voracious typewriter. Van Helsing, a foreigner who defeats Dracula's evil schemes by bridging his mastery of Western medicine with his knowledge of Eastern superstition, is not dissimilar to his archenemy, another foreigner who, as Harker testifies in Transylvania, diligently studies British customs (as in the English Bradshaw's Guide) before his immigration to Britain. In addition, immediately after Dracula's attack on Mina in the Harkers' bedroom, Dr. Seward draws an unnerving parallel between Mina's interaction with her persecutor Dracula and her protector Jonathan (who, by the way, is asleep the whole time during the attack). After Dracula is shooed away, Seward notes how Jonathan adopts the same position Dracula just did with Mina. As Seward observes, Jonathan at that moment, with his nostrils twitching, eyes blazing, and a ghostly pallor in his face, becomes physically no different from the tormentor, except that his hands are tenderly and lovingly stroking his wife's ruffled hair (284). Dracula, the most courteous of all monsters, commits no atrocities other than seducing and victimizing innocent English maidens, but for this he is hunted

down by those who break into houses and tombs, commit bribery and forgery of death certificates, and stake and decapitate women and stuff their mouths with garlic. Dracula admittedly has predilection for defenseless young virgins, but we can recognize the same pathology in the fact that Lucy's suitors consider her most beautiful when she is drained of energy, blood, and life. Halberstam contends that Gothic heroines at the end of the nineteenth century have a new role: "Where the heroine fails to distinguish, the distinction fails to hold" (38). Therefore, when Lucy and Mina fail to distinguish between the vampire's bite and the proper penetrations of their husband and fiancé, the reader is invited to question the juxtaposition between Dracula's monstrosity and the vampire hunters' alleged sense of morality. In *Dracula*, vampire and vampire hunters are birds of a feather: Dracula dominates women by transforming innocent maidens into perverts and brainwashed slaves, and the Western "saviors" dominate women by transforming angels in the house into bodies in the tomb when they become aggressive and uncontrollable.

Besides the moral ambivalence of Van Helsing's crew, other mirror images can be easily discerned. Renfield's life-eating pathology mirrors that of Dracula, as both of them aim to prolong their existence by devouring lives. (The theme of consumption also mirrors the novel's textual construction, as we shall soon see.) Furthermore, though Dracula's castle in Transylvania may be shouting foreignness, Harker detects Englishness and familiarity in what at first seems to be ancient castle ruins (Tropp 143). Admiring the opulent furnishings that, though centuries old, are still in excellent shape, Harker realizes that he "saw something like them in Hampton Court, but there they were worn and frayed and moth-eaten" (19). Later, Harker notices that Dracula is reading an English Bradshaw's Guide, a choice matched by the eccentric behavior of Stoker's second heroine, Mina Murray Harker, who memorizes railway timetables. We can also discover

other pairings involving Mina, who takes over after Lucy's death as the focus of the battle between Dracula and the band of men, but who is a much more complex character. Van Helsing favorably describes Mina as having a "man's brain—a brain that a man should have were he much gifted—and woman's heart" (234), and the vampire slayers have no idea where to place her in their crusade. They want to leave her out of the war, but she proves to be a valuable asset to the team. Actually, Mina possesses strong links with Dracula, apart from being the telepathist to him. As Tropp points out, both Mina and Dracula bear scars on their foreheads, and their scars signify contagion, marking them as both social outcasts and impure (163). Mina's scar was left by Van Helsing with communion wafers, and Dracula's was caused by Harker when he struck the vampire with a shovel.

Martin Tropp also elaborates on how Stoker, in writing *Dracula*, could have found his own doppelgänger in Mina, who edits and compiles every piece of information that makes up this novel. Literary critics like Tropp (135) and Christopher Frayling (297-99) recount how Stoker spent six-to-seven years painstakingly researching his novel, surveying legends of vampires and necromancy, geographical details, lunar cycles, contemporary news, railway timetables, engravings on tombstones, and even how surgeons treated head injuries and the ways animals at the Regent's Park Zoo expressed rage. Correspondingly, Mina, who by day nurtures Van Helsing's vampire hunters, by night faithfully documents their pursuit with a persistence and enthusiasm bordering on perversion. It is worth noting that Stoker during his lifetime was better known as the indefatigable secretary to his employer and idol Henry Irving's Lyceum Theatre, and he managed the theatre and its productions with all the dedication of a wife (Tropp 161-62). The ultimate parallel appears at the end of the novel, when Mina gives birth to Quincey Harker on the anniversary of the death of Quincey Morris, and little Quincey actually carries the

names of all the vampire fighters. Many commentators have observed that, since Dracula drinks from Lucy (whose blood is transfused from Arthur Holmwood, Van Helsing, Dr. Seward, and Quincey Morris) and Mina is forced to drink from Dracula, there is really no unadulterated corpuscle in the novel. Therefore, Quincey Harker is hardly the authentic reproduction of his parents. The novel's ending ominously throws humanity into question. Quincey Harker is not really a reincarnation of the dead Quincey Morris or even the glory of the brotherhood of vampire hunters; he is just a reservoir of collective blood—where human blood has been tampered with Dracula's blood and where monsters literally merge with men.

The textual construction of *Dracula*, though hardly original, distinctly echoes its subject matter. *Dracula* is a collection of journal entries, letters, phonographically recorded psychiatric case notes, and newspaper clippings. It is a dossier of evidence accumulated by the vampire hunters to make an otherwise incredible story more believable. Judith Halberstam contends that "the merger of book and monster is a typical Gothic strategy" (57), and the construction of *Dracula* is replicated in the pathology of the two monstrous characters in the story: the first one is of course the king vampire Dracula, who is fundamentally a reservoir of blood drawn from others; and the second one is the "zoophagous (life-eating) maniac" Renfield, who wishes to "absorb as many lives as he can" (70) by eating birds that have eaten spiders that have eaten flies. The technique of piecing together a novel from different materials and powerfully distinctive narrative voices can be traced back to epistolary novels written by eighteenth-century English writers such as Samuel Richardson (1689–1761) and Tobias Smollett (1721–71), and even Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818) has the same narrative framework. However, while the collaborative textual mosaic in *Frankenstein* betrays the contradiction between the conflicting accounts and challenges the reliability of each narrator, the fragments constituting *Dracula*

consolidate the testimonies of the vampire hunters. We hate the things we fear, and we fear the things we do not understand. *Dracula* therefore can be read as a collective endeavor to defeat the solitary force of the unknown.

The apparent argument of *Dracula*'s construction, however, is not altogether convincing. Some reservations about its logic can be highlighted by comparing the implications of its design with the narrative method of *Frankenstein*. In *Frankenstein*, the Creature speaks with alarming infrequency, but the quality of his narrative compensates for its quantity. The Creature's statement, bracketed by Frankenstein's, makes only a brief appearance but is literally the heart of the novel. In the third volume, therefore, the Creature is able to efficiently destabilize the seemingly authoritative voice of Frankenstein—the ostensible author of the experiment—by prompting readers to consider that perhaps the picture Frankenstein paints in the first volume is distorted and biased. The narrative in *Dracula* seems to aim at producing the opposite effect yet also undermines the authority of the predominant narration. Many critics have noticed that the majority of the story is told by a restricted group of three respectable English middle-class characters: Jonathan Harker, Mina Murray Harker, and Dr. John Seward. The main characters—Dracula and his adversaries—can be neatly categorized by class and origin; and the foreigners (Abraham Van Helsing, Quincey Morris, and Dracula) and the upper-class characters (Arthur Holmwood, Lucy Westenra, and Dracula again) are generally allowed a voice only if it is recorded by the three main narrators. Dracula, the titular character, is virtually silent throughout; and his disciple Renfield is considered clinically insane; and we see only transcribed speech from Seward. Halberstam notes how, in *Dracula*, the textual body, like the bodies of the English maidens, must be protected from foreign influence and corruption (90).

Writing, or at least who writes, therefore implies power. (And Mina, though a woman, is

arguably the most powerful character in the novel because she has unrestricted access to other characters' eyewitness accounts as she amasses narratives.) The vampire hunters in *Dracula* justify their house-breaking, bribery, forgery of death certificates, staking and decapitating women and stuffing their mouths with garlic, but Dracula, the eponymous villain, stays in the shadows for the majority of the novel and actually has no voice. Dracula maintains only a shadowy presence after the opening four chapters, and we only see transcriptions of his conversations with Jonathan Harker and the aftermath of his atrocities. Unlike *The Vampyre*, in which the reader is often given access to the plot from the perspective of the vampire protagonist Ruthven, it will be extremely difficult to identify closely with the blood-guzzling monster in *Dracula*. In the short coda to *Dracula*, the heroes return to Transylvania and retrieve the documents of their past glory. The reports are neatly transcribed by Mina. Jonathan says: "We were struck with the fact that, in all the mass of material of which the record is composed, there is hardly one authentic document! nothing but a mass of type-writing… We could hardly ask anyone, even did we wish to, to accept these as proofs of so wild a story" (378). The textual construction of *Dracula*, like that of *Frankenstein* and *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, demonstrates that monsters not only exist in the context of the novel's events, but may also question the form of the text and the validity of its narrative through their presence as the suppressed or distorted voices.

Polidori's *The Vampyre*, in retrospect, was probably the most influential horror story of all time. The novella initiated the dazzling popularity of vampire literature in the nineteenth century that culminated in Stoker's *Dracula*. *Dracula* is a curious case. Though a classic vampire narrative, it is not read by many, not even by vampire fanatics. However, even those who have never read *Dracula* and have no basic understanding of its plot or characters know who the

vampire Count Dracula is. The novel was written in a time of turmoil: the Industrial Revolution had drastically changed the previously agrarian England, and Charles Darwin's theory of evolution had implied that men and animals are not produced by a series of separate acts of creation. Many such cherished myths had been obliged to give way to new realities. Dracula the vampire reflects the resulting social and mental instability. He economically condenses human and beast, man and woman, virtue and vice into one body. Just like Van Helsing's paradoxical suggestion—"To believe in things that you cannot" (193)—vampire literature tells us that truth is all too often stranger than fiction, and there is always more than meets the eye. Even before the advent of the fin-de-siècle Dracula, Gothic vampires had already been reincarnated in many nineteenth-century fictions as respectable men living a double life—for example, in Robert Louis Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886) and Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1891). Alternatively, Twitchell also identifies the Gothic vampire as the model for the brooding but sympathetic villain Heathcliff in Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights* (1847) (116-22), near the end of which Ellen "Nelly" Dean muses on whether or not this stranger with no known origin, identity, or even surname is "a ghoul or a vampire" (qtd. in Twitchell 118).

Polidori's *The Vampyre* is also the progenitor of a new generation of Gothic vampires in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, such as the vampires in Anne Rice's series *The Vampire Chronicles* and Stephenie Meyer's *Twilight* series. These creatures often become overtly domesticated, reimagined as figures of romance rather than horror. They are also elevated to aesthetes or connoisseurs of elite culture—devils in three-piece suits who listen to classical music. Rice introduces multiple kinds of vampires, but her vampire protagonist Lestat de Lioncourt is a French nobleman of the eighteenth century—an extension of Polidori's Ruthven and Stoker's Dracula. Frank Grady, in his survey of Rice's vampire series, observes that, rather

than parasitically siphoning blood off humans, Rice's vampires are more concerned with "the preservation of art and music and literature" (229). Furthermore, Grady argues that Rice's vampires are "predators who are always erotic and occasionally ethical" in as much as Lestat and some of his companions, for example, claim that they only feed on murderers (226). Polidori may have transformed vampires into wolves in sheep's clothing, but Rice transforms those wolves into angels of justice like Dexter Morgan—a serial killer who targets other serial killers. Rice, when commenting on the film adaptation of her novel *Interview with the Vampire* (1976), concludes that the story is "not just about vampires—it's really about us" (qtd. in Grady 241). This common ground is what gives Gothic vampires endless opportunities for cultural resurrections.

Chapter Two: Gothic Vampirism and Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*

Starting my study of Gothic vampirism in nineteenth-century novels with Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818) may seem eccentric, but Mary Shelley's monstrous book and the modern literary vampire share the same famous creative origin. They are the two Gothic nightmarish creatures conceived on the same night at the same venue: the informal ghost story writing competition held by Lord Byron during his Genevan summer with Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin, her lover Percy Bysshe Shelley, her stepsister Claire Clairmont, and Byron's personal physician (and some say lover) Dr. John William Polidori at the Villa Diodati on 16 June 1816. Although numerous details of this writing project launched by a group of bored sophisticates during that "Year Without a Summer" are still unknown, the event was recorded by both Polidori in his *The Diary of Dr. John William Polidori* (1816) and Mary Shelley in her famous preface to the 1831 edition of *Frankenstein*, in which she noted the two sources of her famous novel. The first one was the scientific debate about the vitalist controversy between Percy Shelley, Polidori, Byron, and herself, and the group considered three different approaches to the problem: Erasmus Darwin's experiments with a piece of vermicelli, reanimating a corpse by electricity, and assembling remains into a corpse that can also be animated by galvanic methods (Shelley 195-96). Mary Shelley's second source was the translated ghost story collection the Genevan group read that summer: *Fantasmagoriana; ou Recueil d'histoires, d'apparitions, de spectres, revenans, fantômes, etc., traduit de l'allemand, par un amateur*. This volume contained numerous stories with a vampire motif and inspired the group to write their own ghost stories. Mary Shelley's contribution to the competition devised to fill the empty hours of a rainy summer evolved into the first draft of *Frankenstein*, and Polidori appropriated Byron's notes for his vampire fragment—a 2000-word "Fragment of a Novel"—and published *The Vampyre* in 1819,

the granddaddy of modern Gothic vampirism.

Therefore, it is not surprising that Mary Shelley's tale about a grotesque creature created by a disastrous scientific experiment bears traces of vampire myth in the Genevan Gothic melting pot. If at the outset the story of generating life through resurrection of the dead and grave robbing is not vampiric enough, clear allusions to vampires are easily traceable in Mary Shelley's text. For instance, on the night when the Creature first comes to life, Victor Frankenstein dreams that he sees his fiancée Elizabeth in the streets of Ingolstadt, but his first kiss on her lips transforms Elizabeth into the corpse of his mother Caroline (39). Mary Shelley recollected in 1831 that this premonitory episode is an appropriation of some of the ghost stories in *Fantasmagoriana* (194), in which an adulterer embraces his new love but only finds in his arms the corpse of the woman he previously abandoned. A direct reference to vampires also appears after the murder of Frankenstein's brother William, when Frankenstein denounces the Creature as "[his] own vampire, [his] own spirit let loose from the grave, and forced to destroy all that was dear to [him]" (57). Frankenstein later justifies his insistence on hunting down his only progeny with this much quoted passage: "…one of the first results of those sympathies for which the daemon thirsted would be children, and a race of devils would be propagated upon the earth, who might make the very existence of the species of man a condition precarious and full of terror" (138), reminiscent of, almost eighty years later, Jonathan Harker's fear that Dracula is attempting to "create a new and ever-widening circle of semi-demons to batten on the helpless" (Stoker 51).

Both men's worst fear that monsters might run loose and propagate came true. Polidori's *The Vampyre* transformed the vampire from a ghoulish folklore caricature into a debonair aristocrat who forever changed the literary landscape of Gothic vampirism, but the short work

was soon overshadowed by his most famous progeny: Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (1897). *Frankenstein*, on the other hand, immediately attained an assured place in the public imagination and turned into a catchphrase applicable to any foolish endeavor that would become uncontrollable and destructive. It was a brilliant novel with rich psychological subtext that can be anatomized from a wide variety of approaches. The story can be read as a straightforward domestic drama, portraying the merits of mutual support and the danger of parental remoteness. It is also the horror novel that initiated the Gothic preoccupation with bodily monstrosity, identifying a monstrous embodiment as the locus of fear. Paradoxically, as well, it is considered an early science fiction, with a product concocted by elaborate laboratory experiments. Chris Baldick in his study *In Frankenstein's Shadow* notes that the scientific aspects of the novel are often offshoots of literary interpretations, and therefore regarding the Creature as a mechanical assembly would be to miss the significance of the design (44-45). I agree that *Frankenstein* is far from the typical science fiction genre, but the relationship between a scientist and his creation resonates suggestively with that between an author and her monstrous novel, and every detail of Frankenstein's construction of the Creature reminds the reader of Mary Shelley's composition of the novel. Like the Creature, the novel is assembled from dead fragments of its author's reading; like the Monster that terrorizes the village, Mary Shelley's text also acquired a fearsomely independent life outside the book and became immortal. The roles of author, reader, mother, and creator thus mirror and overlap one another, and one really cannot engage in discussion of the text without first deciding who (or what) is a monster, what the Monster is, and whether the Monster is a "he," "she," or "it."

The series of unanswered and unasked questions constitute the narrative interest of *Frankenstein*, so does the blurred line between monsters and humans. Monstrosity, or rather the

parallel between monstrosity and humanity, is Mary Shelley's major concern in the novel. However, in a work where a blind man has a better insight than his physically clear-eyed children and a child becomes the dominant partner in a tragic dance with his father, these concepts are never easily defined. Like the activity of the undead entity that drinks the blood of the living, the uncanny otherness inherent in Frankenstein's Creature is a fundamental defect that saps and destroys the life of others. The Creature, of course, is the ostensible monster in the text: his monstrosity consists not only in his deformity, size, agility, enormous strength, and ability to adapt to severe natural environments, but also in the unnatural method of his creation, a secretive and ultimately destructive brand of alchemy that achieves more than Frankenstein bargains for. Victor Frankenstein is the human monster in the text, the creator of all this madness whose narcissism makes him unpardonable. Frankenstein's underlying motivation, questionable to say the least, in his act of creation and his reluctance to take responsibility for the Creature's development make him undeniably culpable. He even spurns any deathbed repentance: Frankenstein's final words—"Farewell, Walton! Seek happiness in tranquility, and avoid ambition, even if it be only the apparently innocent one of distinguishing yourself in science and discoveries. Yet why do I say this? I have myself been blasted in these hopes, yet another may succeed" (186)—show that he still considers his catastrophic act of creation "apparently innocent," and that he still incorrigibly basks in his hallucinatory ideals of heroism. The polar explorer Robert Walton, a new addition nonexistent in the novel in its ghost story form, is at best a potential murderer who flatters Frankenstein's enormous ego and is ready to sacrifice the lives of the family men who make up his crew for a final push to the North Pole.

Those three murderers—including Walton as a potential murderer—are also explorers and investigators of their environments, and together they tell the story of the assembly of a male

monster and the abortion of a female one. Although their sins are unforgettable and unforgivable, their standing as sinners is still debatable; like Frankenstein with his dying breath encouraging another to engage in the same dangerous pursuit he did, the novel as a whole defies neat categorization or definitive judgment. In response to this puzzle, I will examine allusions to Gothic vampirism that appear in Mary Shelley's text, references to Polidori's *The Vampyre* that were reiterated and consolidated in Stoker's *Dracula* seventy-eight years later. I will decipher how monstrosity functions in *Frankenstein* through careful examination of Frankenstein's Creature, his murderous *modus operandi*, his powerful intellect that both mitigates and exacerbates his savagery, and the textual construction of the novel. Mary Shelley invests her monster with the seductive power of Gothic vampires to appeal to the reader's compassion and to challenge the reader's understanding of monstrosity. Judith Halberstam in *Skin Shows* identifies the dissolution of boundaries as the ultimate Gothic horror (36), and, in the story of the two Gothic creatures, monstrosity becomes an intrinsic part of humanity and vice versa. In *Frankenstein*, monsters merge with men, and sometimes the tale of the making of a monster is actually about the making of a human.[2]

Before I investigate the scramble of man and beast, I would like to first draw attention to the textual construction of the novel. Mary Shelley in her 1831 preface brilliantly observes that what we often call literary "creation" actually has its foundation on preexisting texts: "Invention, it must be humbly admitted, does not consist in creating out of void, but out of chaos; the materials must, in the first place, be afforded: it can give form to dark, shapeless substances, but

---

2 Throughout my discussion of *Frankenstein* I will refer to the 1818 edition of the novel because the revised 1831 text was written after the original novel was denounced as "impious" by some contemporary readers and also after Mary Shelley lost the first three of her four children as well as her husband Percy Shelley, who drowned off the shore of Tuscany in 1822. The 1831 text is therefore somewhat adulterated with Mary's hero worship of her late husband, and the revisions also show how Mary bowed to pressure to issue a text with clear moral lessons.

cannot bring into being the substance itself" (195). Halberstam makes a strong case that *Frankenstein*, and Gothic novels in general, have an essentially cannibalistic form (33), and a long litany of literary (and somewhat social-scientific) sources for *Frankenstein* can be culled from Baldick's *In Frankenstein's Shadow*, which discusses at length the allusions in the novel to Mary Shelley's reading, her parents' writings, Madame de Genlis's dramatization of the Pygmalion and Galatea myth, and the frequently quoted *Paradise Lost* (1667). Frankenstein's Creature is Mary Shelley's innovative contribution to the literary Gothic, but the idea of an ungovernable monster is not entirely original. A gargantuan monster, similar to Frankenstein's, already appears in William Godwin's *St. Leon: A Tale of the Sixteenth Century* (1799), generally considered to be Mary Shelley's thematic (and perhaps emotional) inspiration for her first and best novel (Baldick 37-38). In *St. Leon*, the misanthropic giant Bethlem Gabor heralds Frankenstein's Creature, and the protagonist, Count Reginald de St. Leon, trades domestic bliss for the chimera of wealth, immortality, and power.

Careful investigation into the literary inspiration of *Frankenstein* shows that the novel was emotionally close to home and reflected the influence of Mary Shelley's intellectual circle as well as her upbringing. The motherless Mary Shelley wrote a novel in which numerous orphaned (especially motherless) characters strive to find their place in the world. As Baldick notes, her family background taught her to challenge facile moral labels and empathize with social outcasts (38). Her mother, Mary Wollstonecraft, a radical feminist who already had a three-year-old daughter with the American trader Gilbert Imlay, accepted marriage to William Godwin as a necessary evil to cover her premarital pregnancy; and, as revealed by Godwin in a posthumous memoir, the passionate Wollstonecraft once attempted suicide after being abandoned by a lover. Mary Shelley more or less inherited both fame and notoriety from her mother, who was

considered a freakish and mischievous social pariah. Mary herself was courted by Percy Shelley when he was married to Harriet Westbrook, whose marriage to Percy was also preceded by a scandalous elopement. Most infamously, Percy's career at University College, Oxford, was cut short in 1811 because of his share in the pamphlet *The Necessity of Atheism*, an incident that was used by many to justify his drowning off the shore of Tuscany in 1822. In addition to all the tumult in her young adulthood, Mary was an unmarried mother long before she officially became Mrs. Shelley in December 1816. Her suffering in her turbulent life must have been aggravated by her sense of guilt about her birth having caused her mother's death and by two reproachful suicides at the end of 1816: those of her half-sister Frances "Fanny" Imlay and Percy's wife Harriet. Mary Shelley's questioning of moral assumptions led her to merge the identities of Frankenstein the creator and his Creature, man and monster.

Exhaustive studies have been dedicated to the self-referentiality of Mary Shelley's novel and how her family background and/or emotional trauma might have influenced the gestation and context of *Frankenstein*. Mary Shelley recalls in the 1831 preface the dreamy vision that helped inspire her story: "I saw—with shut eyes, but acute mental vision—I saw the pale student of unhallowed arts kneeling beside the thing he had put together. …He sleeps; but he is awakened; he opens his eyes; behold the horrid thing stands at his bedside, opening his curtains, and looking on him with yellow, watery, but speculative eyes" (196). This image is developed in the novel as Frankenstein's first encounter with the animated Creature, the scene in volume one, chapter four, which Mary Shelley claims was written first: "…when, by the dim and yellow light of the moon, as it forced its way through the window-shutters, I beheld the wretch—the miserable monster whom I had created. He held up the curtain of the bed; and his eyes, if eyes they may be called, were fixed on me" (39-40). Excusing the dramatics of Mary Shelley's 1831

preface, sharp-eyed readers must have noticed that the Creature introduces himself to Frankenstein in exactly the same way the story presents itself to Mary Shelley—when both the creator and the author are in the same drowsy state. In the preface Mary Shelley also dubs her novel her "hideous progeny" that she wishes would "go forth and prosper" (197), a frequently quoted passage that may betray Mary Shelley's ambivalence about the popularity of her novel and its subsequent adaptations. Taking this hint, many commentators have associated the novel itself with the Creature and Mary Shelley with Frankenstein the creator on the basis of the novel's multilayered structure.

The text of *Frankenstein* is like a Russian doll. The frame is Robert Walton's letters to his sister. We read in those letters Frankenstein's account of his construction of the Creature, and inside Frankenstein's account we have letters from Frankenstein's family and friend, and we also have the Creature telling us about the time he spends with the De Laceys, his reading of *Paradise Lost*, and how he stumbles upon Frankenstein's laboratory journal and realizes his unnatural conception. The Creature's narrative, as provided by Frankenstein, appears in the second volume, which is the center of the novel; his story is actually wrapped in his "parent's" story, an image suggestive of pregnancy. This technique, a novel stitched together from somewhat conflicting accounts into a concentric Russian-doll structure, is also often considered by critics to be a mirror of the Creature's construction, and reading the text inevitably becomes similar to constructing the Creature out of pieces of animal and human remains. *Frankenstein* is ultimately a text that specifically asks the reader to achieve a unitary interpretation from disjointed accounts and to participate in Frankenstein's monster-building. As Martin Tropp observes, similarly to how Frankenstein infuses life into the flesh and blood he collects from charnel houses and dissecting rooms, readers breathe life into the mythical status of the Creature every time they

turn the novel's pages (41). Halberstam notes that, because this text lacks a stand-in for the reader, the reader is encouraged to read, interpret, and participate in this monstrous productivity (51). She observes: "Monsters, like the one Frankenstein builds, embody a multiplicity of fears and invite the reader to participate in charting the shapes and contours of each one" (34). Maybe as a direct result of this self-generating power, Frankenstein's Creature cannot be confined between the covers of the book and has now escaped, as he does at the end of the novel, into the collective imagination of the powerfully enduring popular myth and numerous theatrical or cinematic adaptions.

Certainly epistolary novels or novels with multiple narrators were nothing new, and, almost eighty years later, the construction of *Dracula* repeated the pattern. *Dracula* is a collection of journal entries, letters, phonographically recorded case notes of psychiatry, and newspaper clippings, a technique Stoker probably learned when writing for newspapers or when organizing Henry Irving's Lyceum Theatre as well as his stage productions. It is a dossier of evidence accumulated by the vampire hunters to make an otherwise incredible story more believable. Like *Frankenstein*, the structure is also echoed in the two monstrous characters in the story: the first one is the king vampire Dracula, who is basically a reservoir of blood drawn from others; and the second one is the "zoophagous (life-eating) maniac" Renfield, who wishes to "absorb as many lives as he can" (70) by eating birds that have eaten spiders that have eaten flies. Here it is interesting to note that, whereas the collaborative effort in *Frankenstein* betrays the contradictions between the conflicting accounts and challenges the reliability of each narrator, the fragments comprising *Dracula* seem to confirm the testimonies of the vampire hunters, justifying their housebreaking, bribery, and forgery of death certificates, not to mention staking and decapitating women and stuffing their mouths with garlic.

The physical hideousness of Frankenstein's Creature is easy to register. He is undeniably quite different from the suave Count Dracula, who, though with eccentric physical traits, is generally beautiful and refined on the outside. The Creature's skin, collected from dissected humans and tortured animals, marks him as a ghoulish outcast hovering between life and death and banishes him forever from the human community. His outright ugliness is not only a projection of his creator's guilty conscience (because if it were merely a psychological projection, his grotesquery would have no effect on others) but also a reflection of the unhealthy secretive conditions of his creation. Frankenstein selects "hair…of a lustrous black, and flowing" and "teeth of a pearly whiteness" (39) to assemble his scientific design but discovers that the Creature's "yellow skin scarcely covered the work of muscles and arteries beneath; …these luxuriances only formed a more horrid contrast with his watery eyes, that seemed almost of the same colour as the dun white sockets in which they were set, his shrivelled complexion, and straight black lips" (39). To Frankenstein's dismay, the monster is inside out and has nowhere to hide. Dilating on the Creature's transparency, Baldick argues that the Creature is the very violation of the principle of Romantic Idealism, which advocates that "the beauty of the whole can arise only from a pure vital principle within" (35), not from any random aggregation. The Creature, it seems, is doomed from the very beginning: he is born bad, made to sin. He later recalls bitterly his discovery of his deformity: "how was I terrified, when I viewed myself in a transparent pool! At first I started back, unable to believe that it was indeed I who was reflected in the mirror" (90). In the human world the Creature recognizes no counterpart. Though made of essentially organic parts, the Creature can never be in perfect harmony with the world of men and nature and must be eternally in opposition to its inhabitants.

In my discussion of the differences between male and female vampires in *Dracula*, I mentioned how the male monster achieves an almost heroic status in the text and becomes not only a worthy adversary to the vampire hunters but also a mirror image of their predatory nature. On the other hand, the three female vampires and the Undead Lucy prey on defenseless children and are subordinate to Dracula in the vampire hierarchy. They have to obey when Dracula commands them to leave Jonathan Harker alone, and they wait patiently for the fresh prey Dracula brings home. Even in the disorienting world of the Undead, male monsters assert dominance while the females hover on the border. Similarly, the male Creature in *Frankenstein*, whose intelligence and sublimity constantly blur the line between humanity and monstrosity, becomes his inventor's double and assumes a martyred and almost heroic role. The female Creature, on the other hand, repels her maker even before she comes to life. However, there is more than one female "monster" in the text. The aborted female Creature, though shapeless, is the chief reason why Elizabeth is killed and why Frankenstein later exhibits the raging thirst for revenge. She symbolizes the moment when Frankenstein's survival and happiness hang in the balance, the impetus that drives both the Creature and Frankenstein into much of the known world, the ticket for Frankenstein to exit from hell, and all the wrong choices he makes. Frankenstein's Creature also makes a female "monster" out of Justine Moritz, the innocent servant who stands in for the Creature during the trial and is later executed for his murder, and it is through the Creature's killings that the novel starts to appear grimly vampiric.

Traditionally, vampires prey upon those closest to them: the vampires in Byron's *The Giaour* butcher their blood relatives; Polidori's Lord Ruthven drains the blood of the sister of his former friend Aubrey and Aubrey's beloved Ianthe; in *Dracula*, the Count invades every enclosed space—cemetery, boudoir, and asylum—to hunt the women in the crew of vampire

hunters; Van Helsing warns the vampire hunters that, should they fail, they too would be transformed into "foul things of the night like [Dracula]—without heart or conscience, preying on the bodies and the souls of those [they] love best" (237). Vampires are also the quintessential loners in literature, not interested in interacting with what is basically their provender. J. P. Telotte in "A Parasitic Perspective: Romantic Participation and Polidori's *The Vampyre*" discusses how the arch-vampire Ruthven's indifference to participate in the human community can be observed in his non-participatory perspective, and it is Ruthven's way of seeing the world that sets him apart from mere mortals. Ruthven gives "few other signs of his observation of external objects, than the tacit assent to their existence, implied by the avoidance of their contact" (41), and after Aubrey falls prey to his contagion, they "hastened from place to place, yet…seemed not to heed what they gazed upon" (50). Dracula is indeed unceasingly recruiting for his prosperous empire of the Undead, but he too travels and hunts alone.

In *Frankenstein* all three protagonists demonstrate a similar hermitic tendency, but, while the Creature's withdrawal from society is enforced, both Frankenstein and Walton are voluntary recluses. In this respect they are more akin to vampires than the Creature, who craves affection from his kin. When Frankenstein departs for the University of Ingolstadt, he grows melancholy at the thought that he now has to make new connections: "My life had hitherto been remarkably secluded and domestic; and this had given me invincible repugnance to new countenances. …I believed myself totally unfitted for the company of strangers" (28). A common reading is that Frankenstein's Creature is a projection of his asocial nature, and the Creature's crimes expose Frankenstein's sibling rivalry or resentment towards Elizabeth for his mother's death. (Caroline Frankenstein dies of the scarlet fever she contracts from Elizabeth while she is taking care of the girl.) Both Frankenstein's and Walton's projects are internally contradictory, but they produce

similar results: Frankenstein aims to create a new race of beings that will honor him, an obsession that alienates him from the human beings who love him; and Walton wishes to distinguish himself through his polar exploration by turning away from his sister's domestic comfort. Their shared narcissism can be observed in Walton's premature admiration for Frankenstein, which is not dissimilar to Aubrey's inexplicable fascination with Ruthven. Moreover, if we take into consideration that the Creature is Frankenstein's means of reproducing without a sexual partner, the antisocial implication can be easily decoded. Frankenstein recollects his dedication to his scientific project: "I wished, as it were, to procrastinate all that related to my feelings of affection until the great object, which swallowed up every habit of my nature, should be completed" (37), and later the Creature's appalling deformity and his namelessness brand him with his creator's social disinterest and force him into exile (as opposed to Frankenstein's voluntary withdrawal from human community). Frankenstein should be very careful about what he wishes for, because his wish is the Creature's command. Frankenstein's dreams all come true in the grimmest sense.

Unlike vampires, Frankenstein's Creature is not born a predator, but there is certainly a shared method in their murderous madness, and the victims William Frankenstein, Henry Clerval, Elizabeth, and the framed Justine are all victims of choice, not victims of chance. During their brief reunion in Chamounix, the Creature threatens "the blood of [Frankenstein's] remaining friends" (77), but even before this meeting Frankenstein has dubbed the Creature "[his] own vampire, [his] own spirit let loose from the grave, and forced to destroy all that was dear to [him]" (57). Frankenstein's description is accurate. After being rejected by the De Laceys, the Creature abandons his attempt to enter the gate of Paradise and casts himself as the Devil. However, though seething with anger, the Creature says he is still "unable to injure

anything human" and therefore has to "[turn] [his] fury towards inanimate objects" (113). He could have slaughtered the De Laceys or watched them burn to death inside their cottage, but instead he watches them escape and later mourns for the departure of his only link to the human world. In fact, the reason why the Creature's killings have such a powerful effect is because they are directed exclusively at the Frankenstein clan. The Creature kills Frankenstein's baby brother William, hastening the falsely accused Justine to the gallows. His murder of Henry Clerval sends Frankenstein to prison and gives him life-threatening pyrexia. As Chris Baldick notes, *Frankenstein* is, as much as anything else, a social criticism of injustice, and the Creature's crimes are essentially reproductions of the injustice he feels has been inflicted on him (52-53). In *Frankenstein*, the gentlest and most vulnerable members in the community become sacrificial lambs. William is little more than an infant, and Clerval is like a brother to Frankenstein (Frankenstein's brothers are significantly younger than he is). Clerval is also Frankenstein's source of stability, an eager student who, unlike him, does not let obsession to take over his whole existence. He nurses Frankenstein back to health when the latter succumbs to hallucination and fever. Among the two female victims, Elizabeth is Frankenstein's sister-bride, and Justine nurses Caroline Frankenstein during her illness and takes care of young William. Frankenstein leaves his family, his friend, and his fiancée to assemble corpses into a living being, who later turns his family, friend, and bride into corpses. The Creature does not want Frankenstein to have anybody in his life who is not him.

Criminologists agree that the first crime of a serial offender is of the greatest importance because it is the most telling. It is generally committed in the offender's comfort zone, and it is the most accurate demonstration of his criminal pathology. The murder of Frankenstein's five-year-old brother William falls neatly into this generalization, and it is also the turning point when

the battered child becomes a battering parent. If the refusal to shelter an enchantress in disguise can transform a prince into a beast, the Creature's outright rejection by the De Laceys transforms him into a murderer. After being expelled by the De Laceys, whom the Creature repeatedly describes as his "protectors" (112) and "the only link that held [him] to the world" (113), the Creature becomes "a wild beast that had broken the toils; destroying the objects…and ranging through the wood with a stag-like swiftness" (111). With his dream of becoming a part of human society shattered to pieces, the Creature allows himself to relapse into bestial barbarity. He declares war against humans ("…from that moment I declared everlasting war against the species, and, more than all, against him who had formed me, and sent me forth to this insupportable misery" [111]) and burns the De Laceys' cottage to the ground—but not before he watches them escape unscathed, knowing that he will never make another human connection. (Incidentally, many serial killers such as David Berkowitz, aka "the Son of Sam," and the fledging killers Nathan Leopold and Richard Loeb, aka "Leopold and Loeb," began their criminal career with arson, which eventually escalated into murder.) The Creature then proceeds to Geneva, in search of Frankenstein, his "father" and "creator" (114). He saves a young girl who has slipped into a river *en route*, but her companion mistakes the Creature for her attacker and shoots him (115-16). Seething with wrath, the Creature becomes even more determined to take revenge on Frankenstein for his loathed existence.

The Creature encounters William Frankenstein by chance and, instead of murdering him, initially wishes to adopt him as a companion, believing that the child is "unprejudiced, and had lived too short a time to have imbibed a horror of deformity" (116-17). William, predictably, rejects the Creature vehemently and calls him a "hideous monster," an "ugly wretch," and an "ogre" (117) before announcing that he is from the Frankenstein household. The Creature

realizes now that even an unbiased child will denounce him as a cold-blooded brute from a fairy tale, and, upon hearing the name of his sworn enemy, he strangles the child as his "heart swelled with exultation and hellish triumph" (117). Examining his handiwork, the Creature discovers that he too can bring deaths that will devastate his creator. He removes the portrait of Caroline Frankenstein from the deceased William and subsequently puts the portrait into the pocket of Justine Moritz—but not before attributing his act of vengeance back to the human guile he has learned from his time with the De Laceys: "thanks to the lessons of Felix, and the sanguinary laws of man, I have learned how to work mischief" (118). After the murder, the Creature haunts the locale in the way some real-life serial killers linger in their crime scenes, hoping to meet his only legitimate parent.

Anne K. Mellor suggests that the episode of the strangulation of William is fueled by Mary Shelley's own repressed hostility towards the Godwin household and even sibling rivalry (52). William is the name not only of Mary's father but also of her half-brother, William Godwin's son by Mary Jane Clairmont, and Mary Shelley may be expressing a subconscious protest against her father's parental remoteness in her upbringing and his disapproval of her relationship with Percy Shelley. More alarmingly, William Frankenstein bears a striking physical resemblance to William Shelley, the son Mary was raising while writing *Frankenstein*, and this similarity may suggest Mary's maternal anxiety and deepest fear, namely the fantasy of killing her own children (Mellor 52). William Shelley died in June 1819, but even without considering his premature demise, Mary Shelley's lesson is clear: an unloving family produces homicidal offspring.

If the murder of William makes Justine the scapegoat, the murder of Henry Clerval makes Frankenstein a convicted prisoner. After Frankenstein dismembers the female Creature,

the Creature vows revenge. The corpse of Clerval is soon discovered in Ireland, strangled like the young William, and is not even cold when found. Finger marks on the body confirm Frankenstein's worst fear, and eyewitnesses report that the killer is on the very boat on which Frankenstein has just arrived. Upon seeing the corpse of his best friend, Frankenstein succumbs to a raging fever and, considering himself "the most miserable of mortals" (151), sinks into suicidal despair. Here Frankenstein once again measures a catastrophe only by its impact on him ("Why did I not die? More miserable than man ever was before, why did I not sink into forgetfulness and rest?" [148]), but when he is released from prison, someone sees through his pathetic charade: "He may be innocent of the murder, but he has certainly a bad conscience" (154). Actually, Frankenstein has received the Creature's message: introduced by a dream about Frankenstein's cousin-bride turning into a semi-incestuous nightmare, the Creature will always be associated with Frankenstein's circle. He aims to make Frankenstein see that Frankenstein is the true murderer of his relatives and acquaintances, and till death do they part. The Creature murders William, Henry, and Elizabeth and indirectly causes the deaths of Justine, Frankenstein's father Alphonse, and Frankenstein himself. Yet, considering his act of creation, his silence, and his reluctance to take responsibility for what he has created, Frankenstein is implicated in the Creature's crimes. Given the duty of a man's protective role towards the women in the household, he is especially complicit in the deaths of Justine and Elizabeth. Frankenstein recognizes this: "William, Justine, and Henry—they all died by my hands" (156).

Unlike the execution of Justine, which results from the social injustice inflicted on the Creature, the murder of Elizabeth is the thrilling climax of the novel, the last straw that breaks the camel's back, and the decisive moment when Frankenstein sheds the skin of a man and surrenders to animality. The Gothic genre is of course famous for its obsession with the

foreboding description of wedding night terror and the death of a bride, and this touch is not lost in vampire fictions. At the end of Polidori's *The Vampyre*, Aubrey's men intrude on the wedding night of Aubrey's sister but only find the corpse of the bride, who has been drained of blood by the vampire she marries. In Stoker's *Dracula*, the king vampire feasts on the blood of the virginal Lucy Westenra and later force-feeds his own blood to the equally innocent Mina Murray Harker in a pattern of interaction suggestive of both oral sex and breast-feeding. In *Frankenstein*, Elizabeth, the character who introduces the Creature and ends his murderous career, bears the most significance among all his murder victims. She signifies the ultimate exchange: an eye for an eye; a human bride for a monster mate. Frankenstein's signature self-centeredness is almost hilarious during this episode, in which everybody except for him can foresee that Elizabeth will be present during the appointment the Creature makes with him. The Creature warns Frankenstein: "I shall be with you on your wedding-night" (140), but that night Frankenstein arms himself with a pistol and sends Elizabeth alone to bed. Only when he hears Elizabeth's scream does he realize that he is not the only intended victim, and the sight of the strangled Elizabeth reduces Frankenstein to his habitual fainting.

Vampires are often associated with Christian theology or considered anti-Christian. In Stoker's *Dracula*, for example, we see that Christian talismans such as crucifixes and communion wafers can end the vampires' reign of terror. In fact, vampires predated Christianity but were later exploited by the Church. Moreover, except for Byron's vampire curse, Gothic vampires generally lack any backstory. There is no explanation of why Ruthven or Dracula is reborn as the Undead, and therefore one view of these interpretations of the vampire myth is that the vampires are really the persecuted party. It is true that Dracula seduces Lucy and Mina, and Ruthven replenishes himself with the women his companion loves. However, considering the

cardinal rule that vampires cannot invade any space without being invited first, those victims, despite their "innocence," must have to some extent welcomed the lethal kiss. Yet in *Dracula* we see the Count is pursued by a gang of men acting as judge, jury, and executioner in one. The gang breaks into Dracula's London estate of Carfax and is surprised by the vampire's return. They turn the vampire into an intruder in his own home, slashing at him with a knife and driving him out of the window.

Similarly, though it is easy to lay blame on Frankenstein or plunder Milton's *Paradise Lost* for meanings, I believe it is crucial to focus attention on the individual responsibility of each character as a tormentor and murderer. The Creature is no fairy-tale specter or spiritual being but an independent existence, and *Frankenstein*, despite its frequent allusions to *Paradise Lost*, is a purely secular text. Victor Frankenstein, for example, is never intimidated by the supernatural horrors: "Darkness had no effect upon my fancy; and a church-yard was to me merely the receptacle of bodies deprived of life, which, from being the seat of beauty and strength, had become food for the worm" (33-34). As Baldick convincingly concludes, even though *Paradise Lost* is the ostensible literary backdrop of the novel, the text itself is ultimately a *Paradise Lost* without Satan, angel, or God, and no evil tempter can be found in the story (41-42). Frankenstein is a Faust without a Mephistopheles to tantalize him and a Prometheus without a Zeus to defy. Considering the Creature's killing spree, we recognize that his deformity is more than skin deep. Even though he shows emotions akin to human needs and human feelings and—especially in assisting the De Laceys—is sometimes almost virtuous, he is still a vicious killer. Lucifer was indeed an archangel before his fall, and, in terms of criminal behavior, monsters are often made, not born. Still, everyone has an intrinsic responsibility for his or her own life, and what has been done to us does not ever justify what we do. The famous epigraph of the novel from Milton's

Paradise Lost, "Did I request thee, Maker, from my clay / To mould me Man? Did I solicit thee / From darkness to promote me?" (10. 743–45), the quotation that made Mary Shelley's original readers gasp at the implication of impiety, shows that the Creature attributes responsibility to Frankenstein for his vice. The interplay of Frankenstein/Creature is indeed similar to the relationship between God and Adam/Eve/Satan in the epic poem, but the Creature should also have learned from his "history textbook" that "[t]he mind is its own place, and in it self / Can make a Heaven of Hell, a Hell of Heaven" (1. 254-55). The monster is in the eye of the beholder, and the novel passes this judgment on the Creature himself as well as his maker.

Vampires in nineteenth-century Gothic fantasy are perhaps the most knowledgeable monsters in literature. They are seducers, and their art of seduction often involves language and intelligence. Ruthven glides through sophisticated society and wins the heart of a cultured Englishwoman, and Dracula is a criminal mastermind who methodically plans his immigration to Britain. Frankenstein too is erudite and has received an excellent education, but his education derails even before the creation of the Creature. Despite his happy childhood and the decent education he has at home, Frankenstein in his youth is somehow obsessed with defunct, pseudo-scientific studies such as necromancy, alchemy, and astrology. He recounts his early fascination with the works of Cornelius Agrippa, which are unquestionably the seeds of his later experiment, and immediately attributes responsibility for his dangerous obsession to his father:

> I cannot help remarking here the many opportunities instructors possess of directing the attention of their pupils to useful knowledge, which they utterly neglect. … If…my father had taken the pains to explain to me, that the principles of Agrippa had been entirely exploded, and that a modern system of science had been introduced, which possessed much greater powers than the ancient…I

> should certainly have thrown Agrippa aside… It is even possible, that the train of my ideas would never have received the fatal impulse that led to my ruin. (22-23)

Through both Frankenstein's and the Creature's education Mary Shelley introduces the problematic relationship between nature and nurture, but she offers no straight answer to the questions it raises. Many critics agree that the Creature at first embodies Jean-Jacques Rousseau's ideal of the state of nature, finding berries to eat, drinking from brooks, and imitating the tweeting of birds, but his emotional and intellectual development makes a catastrophic detour when he is seized by hatred and bitterness. However, considering that the overweening Frankenstein and the saintly Elizabeth both spend their formative years in the same household, we doubt whether even a harmonious family can guarantee the maturation of a healthy and normal adult.

Of course, the "monster" whose intelligence impresses the reader is not Frankenstein but his Creature, and the Creature's monstrosity is complicated or mollified by his humanity. Most scholarly criticism focuses on the Creature's humaneness instead of his physicality. The Creature is not a mindless brute; he walks, reads and speaks French, rationalizes, demands, shows emotion, and can be charmed by music. He is the hidden benefactor of a picture-perfect family, the De Laceys. He becomes civilized because of their involuntary lessons and demonstrations of mutual affection and support. Moreover, the vegetarian Creature does not even hunt for food, and during his transatlantic chase with Frankenstein he only hunts for Frankenstein to keep him alive. The Creature's range of sympathies and his need for companionship, which Frankenstein's obsession with his esoteric brand of science never shows, reveal that he is perhaps more human than his creator. From the social history he learns during his stay with the De Laceys, he realizes that only blood kin will treat him with kindness (Hirsch 131). The Creature asks for a mate in the

name of companionship, but Frankenstein, in full mode of world-conquering maniac, projects his own apocalyptic vision and transforms this simple wish into a master plan of propagating an alien army and waging war against mankind. As the creator, Frankenstein should be able to engineer a bulletproof contraceptive plan, but, without even considering it, he leaves the responsibility to the Creature. *Frankenstein* succumbs easily, perhaps too easily, to Freudian theoretical constructs of the human psyche—Id, Ego, and Super-ego—and many would argue that the Creature is the Id, following his instinctual whims in the way the Ego (Frankenstein) cannot. As the story unfolds, however, the Creature starts to resemble Frankenstein's Super-ego, craving for his lost ties to humanity. This psychoanalytic reading of the return of a "repressed self" probably fits better with Robert Louis Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886), as we shall see.

Most importantly of all, the Creature, against all the odds, masters language and speaks impressively. The eloquent narration by the Creature of his own maturation and observation of the De Laceys, as provided by Frankenstein, reveals his remarkable sensitivity and benevolence, and when he argues for his right to exist and begs for tolerance, his monstrosity is overshadowed by his intellect and eloquence. The second volume of *Frankenstein* is mostly narrated by the Creature, and here Mary Shelley uses language experimentally and imaginatively. Many critics dwell on the contrast between the Creature's invisible monstrosity and his power of speech. The Creature's grotesque form disgusts everybody who sees him, but the reader, like the blind old De Lacey, is spared from his ugliness and thus can judge him without prejudice according to his statement of events. Judith Halberstam discusses the contrast between the horror registered by visibility and the humanity conveyed through language (44), and Chris Baldick also refers to the Creature's "articulate voice" as "Mary Shelley's most important subversion of the category of

monstrosity" (45). Hearing the Creature's own account of events, we are re-orientated from Frankenstein's inequitable rendition and are encouraged to sympathize with the Creature. Unfortunately, this original dimension of the novel did not survive in its first theatrical adaptation by Richard Brinsley Peake at the English Opera House in 1823, which was called *Presumption; or, the Fate of Frankenstein*, or in Henry M. Milner's *The Demon of Switzerland* of the same year. In both productions, the Creature was silenced and had the mind of an infant. Five years after *Frankenstein*'s first anonymous publication, Mary Shelley lost control over this dynamic of her novel, and without the Creature's eloquence, he was nothing but a huge, deformed child whose savagery was terrifyingly perceptible. Once the monster was muted, his monstrosity became painfully unmitigated.

Although Frankenstein calls his Creature "[his] own vampire" (57), the Creature is of course not the only demon in the novel. I discussed earlier how Frankenstein is imprinted with vampires' asocial tendency, and Frankenstein is also Draculan in the sense that he is outwardly harmless but actually has a twisted mind. While vampires are beasts who pretend to be men, Frankenstein is a man with a beast within. Percy Shelley summed up the moral lesson of the novel as "[t]reat a person ill, and he will become wicked" (qtd. in Tropp 14). If the Creature appears uncannily human, then treating him inhumanely is monstrous. Frankenstein's inhumane insanity is contagious. He is the archetypal "mad scientist" in literary tradition: "an aspiring young medical student who dabbles in galvanism, and whose long hours in the seclusion of the laboratory engender or reinforce a misanthropic, or at best insensitive, disregard for his social bonds and duties," as Baldick describes him (142). However, compared to another "mad scientist," Dr. Henry Jekyll, whose experiments begin with perhaps the best of reasons (i.e., the attempt at moral purity), Frankenstein's act of creation is inspired by base motives. Although the

scientist dubs himself an artist—the aestheticized ideal of a human—he actually demonstrates a misanthropic, callous disregard for his family duties. As the Creature becomes increasingly human as the narrative progresses, Frankenstein becomes less and less so, especially when he is in the Arctic waste, where his humanity is incapacitated by the polar ice. Moreover, the Gothic genre is all about legacy, tales of past transgression that hopefully will prevent any repetition of history. Too often in Gothic fictions, however, we see representatives of a new generation, after witnessing the destruction of the old, still follow the same path. The Gothic vampire is a derivative of this theme, a terrifying signpost that indicates past transgression and foretells future retribution. Byron's vampire curse predicts that a young girl will pay in full for her ancestor's crimes, and in *Frankenstein* Victor on his deathbed drives Walton to follow his last lethal advice, a death-defying act that is only terminated by the crew's threat of mutiny. The lesson of "Frankenstein's Monster" is completely lost on Frankenstein himself.

It is also Frankenstein's "science project" that exposes him as extremely vampiric. Like Dracula or vampires in general, Frankenstein aims to procreate by resurrecting the dead rather than by sexual reproduction. His enterprise is essentially narcissistic and masturbatory, if not misogynistic. Frankenstein models the Creature on his own image, and tellingly, his shadow-self is a gigantic creature with superhuman strength, intelligence, and agility—overcompensation, perhaps, for his sense of masculine inadequacy, which he seeks to alleviate by manipulating his male friends such as Clerval and Walton. It is also hard not to consider Frankenstein a misogynist, and his fear of female sexuality is self-evident when he dismembers the unfinished female Creature and scatters her remains in the room. It is unsettling to dwell on whether or not Frankenstein in this episode realizes what his act of mutilation implies. In a way the appalling pulverization of the female Creature directly correlates with Frankenstein's fear of the prison of

domestic bliss and marital love, as the Creature soon systematically decimates his family and kills his bride. In *Dracula*, the violent and patently sexual staking of Lucy Westenra and the female vampires takes place in the context of the righteous and proper punishment for Lucy's polyandrous desires and her susceptibility to the vampire's attack. Frankenstein defends his moral integrity with similar explanations: "a race of devils would be propagated upon the earth, who might make the very existence of the species of man a condition precarious and full of terror. Had I a right, for my own benefit, to inflict this curse upon everlasting generations?" (138).

Vampires are strictly hierarchical, and, if we take into account Frankenstein's effort to create a subspecies with him as the human overlord, the resemblance is uncanny. Anne K. Mellor examines Frankenstein's grandiose fantasy of creating a race entirely indebted to him with reference to Lawrence Stone's taxonomy of different types of family structures from early modern to the nineteenth century. Mellor classifies Frankenstein's master plan as Stone's Restricted Patriarchal Nuclear Family, "in which the father is, as Stone comments, virtually 'a legalized petty tyrant within the home'" (58). In this respect, Frankenstein also resembles the undeniably evil protagonist in H. G. Wells's *The Island of Doctor Moreau* (1896). *Doctor Moreau* is a post-Darwinian variant on the Frankenstein motif. In this science fiction the exiled vivisectionist Doctor Moreau (another "mad scientist") creates a race of Beast Folk—animals with human-like natures—through experiments and vivisections. He cruelly casts aside the animals representing undesired results or those relapsing into their original animal instincts, leaving them confused and dying painfully. Although Frankenstein is, of course, as suggested by Joyce Carol Oates, much less sadistic than Moreau (34), their scientific aims are similar: the mass production of a genetically modified (or "improved") species. Frankenstein's experiment

also betrays his total disregard for the Creature's free will. Because the mechanical construction necessitates it, he creates a "being of a gigantic stature…about eight feet in height, and proportionably large" (35-36) without even questioning how this gigantic creature will be received in society. His lack of empathy or imaginative identification with the Creature dooms their relationship from the very beginning. Moreover, his original motive, as he avows, is to gain adulation: "A new species would bless me as its creator and source; many happy and excellent natures would owe their being to me. No father could claim the gratitude of his child so completely as I should deserve theirs" (36). Frankenstein would thus never consider the Creature an equal. Seeing that the Creature is not only an ungovernable brutal beast but also an intelligent individual who will pose a threat to his hierarchical domination, Frankenstein probably wants to destroy it out of jealousy as much as revulsion.

Gothic vampire narratives are stories of doubling. Aubrey, after the death of his beloved Ianthe, visibly wastes away and develops physical traits exhibited by the vampire; and the line between villains and heroes blurs in Stoker's novel when his vampire hunters display equally questionable morals during their pursuit. A Gothic vampire casts no shadow and has no reflection, but his monstrosity is constantly shared by a humanized double. *Frankenstein* and *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* are both classic tales of the theme of a double, and the relationship between a vampire and his victims who invite him in can be likened to that between a monster and his maker, or that between a monstrous serial killer and those who trigger his blood-lust. *Frankenstein*, of course, is teeming with doubles. The term "Frankenstein" is too frequently attributed to the Creature instead of the creator, but this mistake is actually the intuitive projection of a "correct" reading of the novel. Frankenstein, the Creature, and Robert Walton are the most obvious identical triplets in the text. They are all explorers and investigators, willing to

risk their own and others' lives for their obsession. They are also "Modern Prometheuses" (inventors and discoverers whose search for fire becomes their undoing) and would-be Adams turned into modern Lucifers. The Creature finds his mirror image in his two female victims as well. After he is deprived of a female companion, the Creature seeks compensation in an accomplice and makes a female monster of Justine. More disturbingly, it is the Creature, not Frankenstein, who visits Elizabeth in her marriage bed on her wedding night. In the former instance, Justine doubles the female Creature; in the latter, the Creature doubles his creator. The Creature, moreover, is no less of a wife to Frankenstein than Elizabeth, as he is "bound [to Frankenstein] by ties only dissoluble by the annihilation of one of [them]" (77). Furthermore, when Elizabeth is sacrificed to the Creature, it is not far-fetched to say that she is doubling the Creature's aborted mate. Accordingly, when Frankenstein dismembers the unfinished female Creature with the long-suppressed sexual energy nonexistent on his own wedding night, he is presenting a cruel parody of consummation.

Even at the initial stage of the Creature's murderous frenzy, Elizabeth has already shared the Creature's laments about the unfair and unjust treatment in a passage that most neatly summarizes one of the central themes of the novel. After the absurd execution of the ironically-named Justine, Elizabeth expresses her disenchantment and fragile faith in humanity. She laments that she "no longer see[s] the world and its works as they before appeared to [her]" since "now misery has come home, and men appear to [her] as monsters thirsting for each other's blood" (71). Judith Halberstam observes that this remarkable passage has all the more impact in that it is uttered by Elizabeth, the living embodiment of domesticity and community in Mary Shelley's novel (37). After the Creature's first strike, the moral compass in the novel directs doubt back upon humanity, letting humans, not the Creature, fall into doubt. In this delicate

passage of social criticism, the fairest character in the novel sees the world through the eyes of the ugliest, and she becomes the only character who can detect the Creature's message in framing Justine. In this dizzying mirroring between humanity and monstrosity, we see that the novel is not only about the human monster or the monster that is uncannily human *per se* but also about what hides behind a perfect façade. The Creature warns Frankenstein ahead of time, "my form is a filthy type of yours" (105).

Recent interest has exhumed vampires from their graves into popular culture, and they will probably never be reinterred, and Frankenstein's Creature has escaped from the constraint of an eighteen-year-old girl's "waking dream" (Shelley 197) and terrorizes our collective imagination. Although the Creature bears no physical resemblance to the polished bloodsuckers in vampire fictions, and it is chronologically impossible that *Frankenstein* was influenced by the most famous vampire in literary history, the novel is derived from a profound mine of Gothic vampire conventions. If monsters can appear as perfect gentlemen, then certainly perfect gentlemen can be the real monsters in disguise. In *Frankenstein*, all the categories of monster and man are adrift. For Victor Frankenstein, his creation is first and foremost a gigantic killing machine, a satanic force programmed to wage war against the human race. During their marathon chase, however, we see that Frankenstein is no more innocent than the misshapen Creature. At the end of the novel the Creature relapses into self-loathing and promises self-immolation—a fitting death for a miserable being created with electricity as the "spark of life"—but he never dies within the covers of the book. Together the three protagonists in the novel continue to tell a story of universal significance and to push the boundaries of man and beast.

Chapter Three: Gothic Vampirism and Robert Louis Stevenson's *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*

Near the end of the century, two monsters in an eighteen-year-old girl's "waking dream" (Shelley 197) merged into a single body in Robert Louis Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886). Whereas Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818) was written by a young girl in her early motherhood during a playful ghost story writing contest with friends, *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* was written by a bedridden author with lightning speed to be converted into cash. Stevenson allegedly wrote the first draft in three days and, after receiving a written objection from his wife Fanny Osbourne, promptly threw the draft into the fire. He then finished writing a revised version in another three days, all the while never leaving his sickbed. The story was immediately received with enthusiasm but was not until recently considered an artistic triumph. The work's best-seller status often overshadows Stevenson's brilliance and makes the book look like a tawdry tale straight from a Penny Dreadful. After all, popular fictions about horror and crime were a staple for the Victorian reading public because of their insatiable appetite for tales of murder and mayhem. Nevertheless, like Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, nowadays *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* has become a modern myth, and the term "Jekyll and Hyde," like the expression "Frankenstein's Monster," has become a shorthand recognizable to all who wish to describe contradictory moral behaviors.[3]

Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, like so many Gothic novels, was allegedly inspired by a nightmare. Stevenson, in a manner reminiscent of Edgar Allan Poe's "The Philosophy of Composition" (1846), details the dream origin of the story and his literary ideology in "A

[3] Details of the composition of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* are drawn from accounts by Martin Tropp in *Images of Fear*, by Martin A. Danahay in his introduction to the Broadview edition of the work, and by Stevenson in "A Chapter on Dreams."

Chapter on Dreams." The piece first appeared in *Scribner's Magazine* on 3 January 1888, and in it Stevenson provides an exquisitely poetic account of a young boy tormented by nightmares but fortunately endowed with a vivid imagination. Later in the chapter Stevenson admits that the boy was no other than himself, and Martin A. Danahay in his introduction to the Broadview edition of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* argues that Stevenson here duplicates the uncertainties about identity in his tale (95). Noting the inseparability of experiences and dreams, Stevenson remarks: "There is no distinction on the face of our experiences; one is vivid indeed, and one dull, and one pleasant, and another agonising to remember; but which of them is what we call true, and which a dream, there is not one hair to prove" (95). On the theme of a double life he notes, "I had long been trying to write a story on this subject, to find a body, a vehicle, for that strong sense of man's double being which must at times come in upon and overwhelm the mind of every thinking creature" (104). Stevenson touches, as well, on one of his stories on the double-life theme, "The Traveling Companion," which was rejected by the editor as "a work of genius and indecent" (104).

Although almost seventy years apart in their publication dates, Stevenson's *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* share many features. Like *Frankenstein* and vampire literature in general, *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* was regarded as a mere piece of sensational writing when it appeared, and for a long time it was not taken seriously. Literary critics have noticed the resemblances of the two monsters in these tales. For example, Gordon Hirsch's "*Frankenstein*, Detective Fiction, and *Jekyll and Hyde*" highlights similarities and differences between the stories. Chris Baldick in *In Frankenstein's Shadow* lists *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* as one of the end-of-the-century derivatives of the *Frankenstein* theme, and he comments that *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* adopts the "mad scientist" cliché *Frankenstein* initiates.

Indeed both works focus on a guilty individual hiding from the world in his isolated, Faust-like enterprise, an obsession that not only betrays his questionable motives but also turns out to be a recipe for disaster. The protagonists in both books are scientists, embarking on projects to distinguish themselves in a noticeably male world of isolation. Very soon they will be exposed as damaged, delusional, and duped by belief in their superior intellectual prowess, and their projects will only turn out to be imprisoning. Victor Frankenstein anatomically assembles the Creature, and Dr. Henry Jekyll chemically conjures up Edward Hyde—the two grotesque physical embodiments of repressed or forbidden desires. (Hirsch also notes that, even though, unlike Frankenstein, Jekyll is more of a chemist than a vivisectionist, his house was once inhabited by "the heirs of a celebrated surgeon" [50], and his chemical laboratory had once been a dissecting room and a surgical theatre, where human bodies were publicly dissected after death for educational purposes—an echo, perhaps, to Frankenstein constructing the Creature out of pieces of animal and human remains.)

Both Frankenstein's Creature and Hyde are products of secretive experimentation and a guilty conscience—a possible explanation for their physical deformity—and their violent nature immediately poses major threats to their creators' families and friends. Frankenstein understands that he is the true murderer of his family and friend: "William, Justine, and Henry—they all died by my hands" (156), and Jekyll professes in his final statement that "[i]f I am the chief of sinners, I am the chief of sufferers also" (55). They are both implicated in the outcome of their science projects, and both stories are about the primal struggle between a scientist and his monstrous creation. As Hirsch observes, the two works even contain similar dream sequences that usher in the creation's confrontation with the creator (224). In *Frankenstein*, the animated Creature pulls back Frankenstein's bed curtains as Frankenstein drifts out of a nightmare and

meets something even more sick and appalling (39-40), and Mary Shelley confessed in her 1831 preface to the novel that it was her own night terror that gave the germ of this masterpiece (196). In *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, Jekyll's lawyer and friend Gabriel John Utterson starts dreaming the most peculiar pictures after his conversation with Richard Enfield about Hyde, and Utterson dreams that, persecuted by Hyde, Jekyll would not have a moment's peace: "…then the door of that room would be opened, the curtains of the bed plucked apart, the sleeper [Jekyll] recalled, and lo! there would stand by his side a figure to whom power was given, and even at that dead hour, he must rise and do its bidding" (39). Moreover, we also see a reprise of Frankensteinian terror in "Henry Jekyll's Full Statement of the Case": "He had now seen the full deformity of that creature that shared with him some of the phenomena of consciousness, and was co-heir with him to death" (91). Furthermore, the narratives of both *Frankenstein* and *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* masquerade as rational, even scientific, discourse, but the stories themselves are essentially anti-scientific, even anti-intellectual, and they have to be read instinctively.

Hirsch even notices some biographical ties between Mary Shelley and Stevenson. Stevenson wrote *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* during his stay in Bournemouth with his wife Fanny Osbourne and his stepson Lloyd. The Stevensons located in Bournemouth mainly because Lloyd went to school in the area, and some commentators suspect that Stevenson names Jekyll's manservant Poole after the town of Poole, which is situated next to Bournemouth. Mary Shelley died in February 1851 and was buried in Bournemouth, near the new home of her son and daughter-in-law. Hirsch notes that Stevenson was actually acquainted with Mary's son and daughter-in-law, and Stevenson later dedicated *The Master of Ballantrae: A Winter's Tale* (1889) to the couple (242-43).

Admittedly, there are striking differences between Frankenstein's Creature and

Stevenson's Hyde. The Creature is gigantic and easily towers over everyone else—"about eight feet in height, and proportionably large" (36)—and the terrified Frankenstein, during his short reunion with the Creature on the slippery Chamounix glacier, throws at him every insulting term he can find: "devil," "vile insect," "abhorred monster," "fiend," "wretched devil," "abhorred devil" (77-78). Hyde, on the other hand, is smaller than Jekyll, "pale and dwarfish" (41), "[s]omething troglodytic" (42). He is constantly associated with petty pests—a "masked thing like a monkey" (65) that also "cr[ies] out like a rat" (64)—instead of any supernatural threats, and a witness recalls that he clubs Sir Danvers Carew to death "with ape-like fury" (46). The Creature is hideously deformed, a patchwork of dead men's skin, but witnesses cannot put their finger on why they find Hyde so despicable: "he gave an impression of deformity without any nameable malformation" (41). The Creature is born with the mind of an infant, like a blank slate, and his murders are reactive reproductions of the bars of his plight—the unjust and unfair treatment he receives. The same cannot be said of Hyde's crimes. Both of them target a cross section of the most vulnerable members in the society—women, children, and the elderly—but Hyde commits acts of unprovoked aggression, and he is promiscuous in his choice of victims. Whereas Frankenstein's Creature is not born a criminal but made one through systematic abuse, Hyde's murders suggest no apparent motives. Stevenson famously described Hyde as "the essence of cruelty and malice and selfishness and cowardice" (qtd. in Tropp 100), and Judith Halberstam also writes, "Hyde is born bad and he is bad through and through; he also represents the evil core of his author, Mr. [*sic*] Jekyll" (57).

One reason why Stevenson's *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* became an immediate publishing phenomenon may unfortunately be its ties to the case of Jack the Ripper. The English actor-manager Richard Mansfield (1854-1907) and Thomas Russell Sullivan adapted the story for the

stage just one year after its publication, and the play was performed for the first time at the Boston Museum and soon moved to New York. Mansfield's adaptation was favorably received, and, in the summer of 1888, Mansfield moved the production to the prestigious Lyceum Theatre in London. At that time, a wave of vicious attacks on East End female prostitutes was causing hysteria. Suspicious deaths of prostitutes were sadly not uncommon in Victorian England, but the appalling mutilations of the victims were. The heinous crimes were believed to be perpetrated by a serial offender, and implausible theories and hare-brained advice soon inundated the police. The murderer eventually walked free, and many details of the case still remain unclear. *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* was actually an example of collateral damage of the Ripper witch-hunt: Mansfield, the leading actor in the show, was applauded for the realism of his performance in the United States, but in London his chilling portrayal of the title character(s) appalled the audience. After continuing to be fingered as the Ripper during a successful ten-week run of the show, Mansfield wisely chose to close down the play. The fictional murderer Mr. Hyde was thus forced off the stage by a real-life serial killer.

Even though the Ripper was certainly not the first serial killer, he was undeniably the first internationally famous one. The case ended up being largely responsible for many of the reforms in the deplorable social conditions in the East End of London, a shadowy corner the powerful and privileged chose to forget. The highlight of each retelling of the case, however, is still the brutality in the killer's greatest hits. The Ripper murders are still widely alluded to, and even used as educational materials by the experts in behavioral science in the Federal Bureau of Investigation. One reason why the case of Jack the Ripper captured the public imagination is probably that the killer committed dreadful atrocities (such as murder, mutilation, and possibly cannibalism) with impunity and upset everything logical and rational–everything Sherlock

Holmes represents. Arthur Conan Doyle (1859–1930) introduced this fictional detective the year before the Ripper went on his killing spree, but the mysteries in the Ripper case never entered the casebook of the master. Doyle ventured some theories about the identity of the perpetrator, claiming that, since he could be drenched in blood but still remained unsuspicious to the onlookers, he was probably a butcher or disguised as a midwife. All these rational speculations remain unhelpful, and the Ripper seems more similar to a creature belonging to the dark recesses of the literature of terror than to a real-life criminal. Here life imitates art, and the name of Jekyll the doctor will forever be linked with Jack the Ripper.[4] In one of the screen adaptations of this novel, *Dr. Jekyll and Sister Hyde* (1971), for example, Jekyll's transformation into Hyde actually involves a sex change, and the doctor commits the murders later attributed to Jack the Ripper in order to harvest the female reproductive organs for his experimentation (Linehan 86). Stevenson's novel is often described as a blueprint for serial killer narrative or the psychological study of criminal minds also because of its strong tie to the themes of hypocrisy and a secret double life that must remain hidden.

To discuss the textual construction of Stevenson's novel, I would like to reiterate Judith Halberstam's argument that "the merger of book and monster is a typical Gothic strategy" (57). Just like the physically stunted Hyde, the work is short and contains wickedness running more than skin deep. Like the power struggle between Jekyll and Hyde, we see the textual battle

---

4 Martin Tropp, for example, in his analysis of Stevenson's story, includes a comprehensive account of the Ripper mystery. However, I generally do not agree with Tropp's understanding of the case, which is almost antithetical to the criminal profile presented in Robin Odell's *Ripperology* and in *The Cases That Haunt Us*, written by John Douglas, a retired special agent with the FBI and one of the first criminal profilers. Modern profiling shows that the Ripper was a killer with more luck than criminal intelligence. He was unlikely to have been a member of elite society, and he was not the kind of offender who would want to communicate with the authorities. This means the majority of the Ripper letters would have been written by impostors, with the possible exception of the "From Hell" letter.

between Hyde (who strives to undermine the conventional tale of a good man's undoing) and Jekyll (who manages to literally have the last word). As in *Frankenstein* and Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (1897), the textual frame of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* mirrors its subject matter. Halberstam appropriately observes that *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* "is finally a costume drama" (59), and disguise is indeed the heart of the story. The narrative structure of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* consists in some fantastic disguise. It is a Gothic tale disguised as a moral fable preached during church sermons, a supernatural sequence of events camouflaged as a whodunit detective story. The narrative frame of the work differs noticeably from that of *Frankenstein* or vampire fantasies in that it is structured like a detective fiction, a logical puzzle. Sherlock Holmes, the world's first fictional "consulting detective," debuted in *A Study in Scarlet* in 1887, just a year after the publication of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, but fictional detectives had long existed before Holmes's name became synonymous with deduction and inevitable detection. Crime narrative, of which the detective novel is a subgenre, and Gothic literature cannot really be disentangled: Gothic tales often involve crimes, and crime fictions are frequently Gothicized. The canonical authors of Gothic narratives such as Edgar Allan Poe (1809–1849), William Wilkie Collins (1824–1889), and even Charles Dickens (1812–1870) were also indisputably writers of crime fictions. Poe's C. Auguste Dupin in "The Murders in the Rue Morgue" (1841), "The Mystery of Marie Rogêt" (1842), and "The Purloined Letter" (1844) is widely considered the first fictional detective, and both Dickens's *Bleak House* (1852–53) and Collins's *The Woman in White* (1860) contain intricate plots, conflicting accounts, and pseudo-investigator-protagonists to plumb the mysteries.

Because of our familiarity with the outcome of the story, the mystery in *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* has become history. Still, the work is presented as a detective novel, as the frequent

appearance of the word "case" reminds us. The full title of the book is *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*; the chapter titles include "The Carew Murder Case" and "Henry Jekyll's Full Statement of the Case"; a strange clause in Jekyll's will dictates that "in case of Dr. Jekyll's 'disappearance or unexplained absence for any period exceeding three calendar months,' the said Edward Hyde should step into the said Henry Jekyll's shoes without further delay" (37); and Dr. Hastie Lanyon, Jekyll's old colleague and professional antagonist, upon reading Jekyll's desperate note, believes that he is "dealing with a case of cerebral disease" (73). Detective novels often feature misdirection, delayed gratification, and false supposition, and so does *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. The novel opens with hints of blackmail, scandal, and a mysterious figure. At the center of the story we have the cold-blooded murder of Sir Danvers Carew, a murder suspect on the run, and an inquirer-protagonist Utterson acting as the ratiocinative detective. The story is structured around an inquiry into the mysteries surrounding Hyde—Who is he? What is his relationship with the good Doctor Jekyll? What kind of hold does he have over the respectable Jekyll?—and we follow Utterson, the investigator, from the beginning to the moment when he and Poole break into Jekyll's laboratory and find the body of Hyde. Hirsch observes, "[d]etective fiction characteristically ends with a retelling of its story—from a more informed point of view" (235), and the last two chapters, "Dr. Lanyon's Narrative" and "Henry Jekyll's Full Statement of the Case," are such retelling of the story. These two chapters contain the majority of what we remember about the novel. At the end the case evidence has to be directly presented to the readers, as the chief investigator in the case resigns himself to failure, and the readers step into Utterson's shoes to solve the puzzle.

Similarly to how the narrative technique of *Frankenstein* and *Dracula* encourages readers to participate in these texts' monstrous productivity and to arrive at their own conclusions,

Stevenson's story also emphasizes the importance of inscription and interpretation, reading and interpreting. Diverse written documents are amalgamated in the text, seemingly telling readers that, if we only scrutinize carefully enough, we will see the truth underneath every lie. The detective plot starts with "the startling clauses of [Jekyll's] will" (39), and later we are presented with signatures that may or may not be genuine and cryptic messages including Jekyll's desperate note to Messrs. Maw and Lanyon, both Jekyll's and Lanyon's confessional statements, and the sealed letter Sir Danvers Carew is said to be out mailing when he is murdered, the contents of which are never known. For a time, faces, voices, and personalities seemingly can also be read like written accounts. The novel's opening sentences ask us to read the facial features of Utterson, the investigator-protagonist: "At friendly meetings, and when the wine was to his taste, something eminently human beaconed from his eye; something indeed which never found its way into his talk, but which spoke not only in these silent symbols of the after-dinner face, but more often and loudly in the acts of his life" (31). Utterson believes that he can "read Satan's signature upon [Hyde's] face" (42) and, after Lanyon is also dragged into the mess, the lawyer is appalled to find Lanyon's "death-warrant written legibly upon his face" (54). When Utterson and Poole listen for Jekyll's voice outside the laboratory but only hear the pleading of Hyde, they show no mercy and violently break down the door. Jekyll mentions in his "Full Statement of the Case" that Hyde "bore the stamp, of lower elements in [his] soul" (80). He also introduces a mirror to his room "for the very purpose of these transformations" (80-81), and from that moment on the metamorphosis can only be considered completed after Jekyll looks at himself in the mirror.

Like the identity of Hyde, however, the supposedly unequivocal nature of spoken and written words is a lie. Signatures and handwriting are generally considered distinctive forms of

identification because they are as unique as each individual, but in this story they are pointless because, as Hirsch brilliantly points out, Jekyll and Hyde can write in either hand (238). Enfield witnesses Hyde disappearing into Jekyll's laboratory building and quickly re-emerging again, bringing the family of the young girl he tramples a cheque signed by Jekyll. Are we to believe that Hyde performs a speedy transformation just to write the cheque? Or is Jekyll's signature actually forged by Hyde? Lanyon in his statement recalls that he receives a brief note signed by Jekyll, asking him to bring back home a drawer from Jekyll's laboratory along with its contents, but later we realize that the note is actually scribbled by a Jekyll imprisoned in the body of Hyde. Utterson also finds that Hyde has annotated a pious book Jekyll likes "with startling blasphemies" (68) *in Jekyll's own hand*. Hirsch even detects the significance in the name of the person who analyzes the handwriting—Guest—"one who himself belongs and yet does not belong" (245). Voices too can deceive. Utterson and Poole may be confounded when they find the corpse of Hyde after they hear him uncharacteristically screaming for mercy, but readers understand that at that moment, though the body is Hyde's, the call is actually from Jekyll. Many critics also expatiate on the topic of all the unclear nouns and pronouns in the text, especially in Jekyll's "Full Statement of the Case," and some of the pronouns can never be clearly identified. Therefore, language itself becomes suspect, identity becomes murky, and people become no more than, as Jekyll says in the last statement, "the trembling immateriality, the mist-like transience, of this seemingly so solid body in which we walk attired" (79). Jekyll's and Lanyon's written statements, the traditional detective *dénouement* in a mystery fiction, therefore actually ask more questions than they answer.

All these narrative instabilities undermine everything in the final confessions, coming in nested series of envelopes, and leave the reader treading on thin ice. We may start with the

central tenet of the story: “that man is not truly one, but truly two” (78-79). It is a concept that can be easily grasped, but Stevenson never actually specifies what these two are. Are they angel and demon, man and beast, or unity and multiplicity? The appendix that follows renders the problem even more perplexing: “I say two, because the state of my own knowledge does not pass beyond that point. Others will follow, others will outstrip me on the same lines; and I hazard the guess that man will be ultimately known for a mere polity of multifarious, incongruous and independent denizens” (79). These frequently quoted lines already add too much to the existing mysteries in the last two chapters: How does Jekyll’s statement survive since he has been worrying that Hyde will certainly obliterate the document once Hyde knows of its existence? Who commits suicide, Jekyll or Hyde? We are told that, when Utterson finds the deceased Hyde, he “knew that he was looking on the body of a self-destroyer” (67), but this act of cowardice still seems a little out of character. (Jekyll, after all, notes that Hyde worries that Jekyll will annihilate them both through self-destruction.) Is it possible that Jekyll flees after murdering Hyde (and possibly Lanyon too) and makes up the improbable explanation of physical transformation? Since, as aforementioned, Jekyll and Hyde can write in either hand, we really have to take everything in the confessional letters with a grain of salt.

The concluding “Full Statement of the Case” is also far from a full statement. Hirsch reminds us that even if we regard everything in Jekyll’s final statement as true, we see merely one side of the story (235), and we still need Hyde’s version of the case. Moreover, sharp-eyed readers would notice that, even though Stevenson provides Jekyll’s metamorphic potion as the ultimate answer, the mysterious adulterant in that drug that is responsible for the transformation remains unilluminated. More alarmingly, Martin Tropp shrewdly observes that Jekyll’s “Full Statement of the Case” contains a voice that speaks of both Jekyll and Hyde with equal

detachment (131). Therefore, the document seems to be written by neither Jekyll nor Hyde but by a major player who is never defined. Hirsch concludes: "The horror [in *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*] resides in a kind of absence or gap" (226), and the ending denies any kind of reassurance that readers usually find in the orderly realm of the detective novel. "Henry Jekyll's Full Statement of the Case" proves to be neither autobiographical nor a full report of the truth. *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is therefore, in a way, plotless: the story actually ends when Utterson and Poole find the corpse that is Hyde, and even the final confessional chapters hesitate to actually tell the reader anything.

Why do all the rational, analytical, and scientific approaches (adopted, for example, by the lawyer Utterson and the doctor Lanyon) fail so miserably to unravel the mysteries or to subdue the supernatural forces? Elementary, my dear Utterson: it is because the story as a whole has a Gothic premise. *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is ultimately a tale that resists logic or rationality. Traditionally, the Gothic, mystical, or supernatural has no place in a detective plot or is antithetical to the genre. For instance, through the investigation of Sherlock Holmes, the Hound of the Baskervilles is revealed as merely an enormous and vicious dog treated with phosphorus. Also in the Holmes series, the attacks upon Robert Ferguson's infant son are not perpetrated by "the Sussex Vampire" but by a jealous half-sibling, who shoots poisoned darts at the baby, and Ferguson's wife is only trying to save the child's life by sucking the poison out. In P. D. James's *The Black Tower* (1975)—a retelling of Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights* (1847)—the detective Adam Dalgliesh temporarily dips into Gothic horror when he mistakes the sound caused by a bramble in the wind for a ghost's scraping its bone against cold stone, but later Dalgliesh saves his own life by simulating the same terror to destabilize the murderer who has him at gunpoint. Even though sometimes the spectralization of detective power may discredit the

inspectors, by the end of the narrative paranormal chaos still cedes control to deductive logic. However, in the coda to *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, the reader sees only the loss of control to the forces of unreason. When "the great Dr. Lanyon" (38)—whose house on Cavendish Square is a "citadel of medicine" (37)—physically declines, the logical, rational, and scientific standards and expectations in the text start to crumble into dust, and the reader is led away from a celebration of a triumph of rationalism and back into the Gothic moorland territory.

The story's resonating power lies in the way that it makes readers paranoid about each minute detail and character, for we know that there is definitely more than one Edward Hyde hiding in the text. Texts and words prove to be ultimately unreadable, let alone faces and personalities. The first character that should be under the microscope is probably the central intelligence in this failed detective plot—Utterson. At first, Utterson looks and sounds like a detective, pouncing on Enfield when the latter tells him about his unexpected encounter with Hyde. Utterson warns Enfield that he is one step ahead of him because he knows the signatory to the cheque Hyde uses to pay off the family of the young girl he tramples underfoot. Utterson then is determined to confront Hyde, believing that "[i]f he could but once set eyes on him…the mystery would lighten and perhaps roll altogether away, as was the habit of mysterious things when well examined" (39). Utterson's most frequently quoted line follows: "If he be Mr. Hyde…I shall be Mr. Seek" (40). Utterson initially suspects that Hyde is blackmailing Jekyll, and Hyde would possibly murder the doctor in order to inherit his fortune. He later confidently proclaims that Jekyll "is plainly seized with one of those maladies that both torture and deform the sufferer; hence…the alteration of his voice; hence the mask and the avoidance of his friends; hence his eagerness to find this drug, by means of which the poor soul retains some hope of ultimate recovery" (64). It is an explanation "plain and natural, hang[ing] well together" (64)

certainly, but also very wrong. Utterson is no Sherlock Holmes, not a champion bloodhound, and he never enthralls anybody with his acumen. The chief inquirer in the novel is hopelessly incompetent. Every deduction he makes is wrong, and the solution has to be finally presented to him in the form of Jekyll's confession at the same time it is presented to the reader.

Perhaps the real reason why Utterson is so utterly confounded is that he is not a detective at all, not the antithesis to Hyde, not on the safe side on the moral scale. Surely fictional detectives are on the side of the angels, but they are never one of them. It takes one to know one. The knowledge required to apprehend a criminal often makes the detective dangerously complicit in crime. In Poe's "The Purloined Letter," the investigator Dupin shares more than initials with the culprit, Minister D—. They have a previous relationship, the exact nature of which is unclear (some critics suggest that it may be fraternal), and they are in constant conflict with each other. Holmes and his arch-nemesis James Moriarty chase and dodge each other in endless games, and always with proud mutual respect. In Thomas Harris's *Red Dragon* (1981), readers are told that the detective-protagonist Will Graham understands murder uncomfortably well. An officer is too often a knife thrust away from an offender; they are peas in a pod. In the opening scene of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* Utterson is described as "the last reputable acquaintance and the last good influence in the lives of down-going men" (31), but he is suspiciously bitter and evasive. He shows an unfathomable obsession with Hyde: he is afflicted with Hyde-infused nightmares and eventually decides to haunt the door through which Hyde might pass. Some critics even suggest that Utterson identifies with Hyde. Even the seemingly objective third-person narrative voice borders on bitter sarcasm at his expense: "The death of Sir Danvers was, to his way of thinking, more than paid for by the disappearance of Mr. Hyde" (54). At the height of Hyde's murderous career, a sealed letter addressed to Utterson is found with the

body of Sir Danvers Carew. The reader never learns the contents of the letter, but, considering Utterson's reserve when he is informed of the existence of the letter and the fact that all the other written documents in the novel (Jekyll's will and his "Full Statement of the Case," Jekyll's/Hyde's notes, and Lanyon's testimony, etc.) bear incriminating evidence, the nature of this letter could be far from innocent.

The problem with Utterson does not lie in any serious moral ambiguity but in the fact that he is more concerned about protecting his friend Jekyll's reputation than uncovering the truth—even when Jekyll is suspected of criminal activities such as sheltering a murder suspect. Hirsch calls Utterson "an inquiring detective who really does not want to know, a Mr. Seek who does not in fact wish to find" (233), which is not far from truth. In the opening scene where Utterson and Enfield converse, we see that Utterson is the opposite of what an investigator should be. He is not at all chatty or inquisitive, and he would rather stay out of trouble than open a can of worms. Enfield tells Utterson, "I make it a rule of mine: the more it looks like Queer Street, the less I ask" (35), and the latter heartily agrees. Later Utterson hopes that Hyde will not stand trial for the murder of Carew for fear that Jekyll might be implicated: "If it came to a trial, your name might appear" (51). After Utterson and Poole find the corpse of Hyde, Utterson momentarily wonders whether Jekyll murdered Hyde and fled the scene. Utterson warns the butler against telling anyone about the explanatory letters they have yet to read: "If your master has fled or is dead, we may at least save his credit" (69).

Other than Utterson, through whom we gain access to the majority of the story, nobody in this book is completely innocent. As reiterated by many commentators, Jekyll is not an angel, not the opposite of Hyde. Jekyll never embodies virtue the way Hyde personifies evil. Jekyll's motive for chemically manufacturing a doppelgänger, though described as an attempt at

achieving moral purity, is questionable to say the least. Even before Jekyll unleashes Hyde, he is "already committed to a profound duplicity of life" (78). One cannot help but wonder what kind of secret vices the doctor goes to such pains to conceal and what compromising evidence Utterson thinks can be used by Hyde to coerce Jekyll. Jekyll's project produces only the dark side of him, and his better self is nowhere to be seen. Even Jekyll's professional foil Lanyon shows a blinding obsession with practicing and believing in material and physical science that is hardly better than Jekyll's brand of self-destructive alchemy. Other minor characters evince equally questionable morals. The outwardly gentlemanly Richard Enfield admits that, when he first encountered Hyde, he was "coming home from some place at the end of the world, about three o'clock of a black winter morning" (32-33), a place that is never specified. Sir Danvers Carew, "an aged and beautiful gentleman with white hair" (46) who is also an important Member of Parliament, becomes Hyde's victim in rather suspicious circumstances. The maid who witnesses the murder states that, unlike other people who loathe Hyde on sight, Carew never expressed hostility to Hyde; instead, seconds before the murder he "bowed and accosted [Hyde] with a very pretty manner of politeness" (46). Why is Carew not intimidated by Hyde? What makes Hyde resort to animalistic savagery and club Carew to death until "the bones were audibly shattered and the body jumped upon the roadway" (46)? Jerome Charyn muses, "[i]sn't it possible that the kind old man is attempting to 'proposition' Hyde, and that Hyde trampled him out of rage?" (qtd. in Hirsch 245).

Since bodies can be in danger of being read like a document, Jekyll strives to erase all traces by altering his form, his skin. The central theme of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is disguise—clothing oneself in a mask, in a flawless public façade, and the ultimate impossibility of doing so. This theme is also where the story becomes noticeably vampiric. Judith Halberstam observes:

"The monster is always a master of disguise" (59), and no monster is a more virtuosic con artist than the life-sucking leech masquerading as a man. In my analysis of nineteenth-century vampire texts, I have discussed how Gothic vampires charm and deceive. In Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (1897), we even see the king vampire Dracula assume the shape of a gentleman in the literal sense. During the time when Dracula imprisons Jonathan Harker in his castle, he goes hunting dressed in Harker's clothes so witnesses will misidentify him. Harker is well aware of the threat: "It was a new shock to me to find that he had on the suit of clothes which I had worn whilst traveling here…This, then, is his new scheme of evil: that he will allow others to see me, as they think…and that any wickedness which he may do shall by the local people be attributed to me" (44). Jekyll and Hyde presumably also share clothing. When Utterson and Poole find Hyde's body, he is "dressed in clothes far too large for him, clothes of the doctor's bigness" that seem to drown him (67).

Of course, Hyde is Jekyll's ultimate costume, a suit he wears. Jekyll confesses, "I had but to drink the cup, to doff at once the body of the noted professor, and to assume, like a thick cloak, that of Edward Hyde" (82). Halberstam notes that Hyde's name puns on skin—"hide" (82)—and also on his fundamental purpose—"hide." Hyde is Jekyll's invisibility cloak, made for him to move under cover. By altering his skin—the ultimate bodily boundary, the membrane that divides outside from inside—Jekyll violates that "hide-bound" (44) restriction and therefore can overstep all bounds. Because Hyde is a kind of surface effect, Jekyll makes him the opposite of himself: hirsute, troglodytic, and foreign. Halberstam contends that "Hyde combines within his repulsive aspect the traces of nineteenth-century stereotypes of both Semitic and black physiognomies" (80). In the nineteenth century, pseudo-science such as physiognomy and phrenology argued unconvincingly that one's penchant for violence is branded on one's skin and

physique, and we can identify a criminal through the person's physical traits such as height, moles on the skin, or even the dimensions of the skull. Interestingly, in *Frankenstein*, *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, and *Dracula*, the ostensible monsters are all variations of an illiterate and primitive underclass preying on respectable members in the community. I have mentioned in my comparison of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and *Frankenstein* that the dwarfish Hyde is constantly associated with animals: a "masked thing like a monkey" (65), "a rat" (64), a homicidal maniac "with ape-like fury" (46). Halberstam notes that Hyde "functions within the novel as a stereotype of otherness," and he "embodies the traits of the ugly and the undesirable and makes those traits essential signifiers of evil" (80). Dracula the vampire looks and talks like a man, but he has, among other disturbing physical qualities, pointed ears, hair in the center of the palms, and extremely sharp fingernails (18). Van Helsing also describes Dracula as someone with a "child-brain" (341) or an "imperfectly formed mind" (342), referring to the theories advanced by Cesare Lombroso (1835-1909) that criminals are throwbacks to prehistoric men. Frankenstein's Creature, when first animated, has the mind of a newborn, and, even after he matures, his gargantuan size still reminds readers of the destructive but gullible mythological giant Cyclopes. Such myths and bias, we realize now, are *invented* not discovered by science.

Of course, characters are definitely not the only things in disguise in *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. Anthropomorphized buildings, too, help to shed light on the perplexing relationship between Jekyll and Hyde. For instance, when Utterson and Enfield are out on their Sunday walk, they notice "a by-street in a busy quarter of London [where] the shop fronts stood along that thoroughfare with an air of invitation, like rows of smiling saleswomen" (32). Many literary critics also comment on the house symbolism in the text. Stevenson makes Jekyll's home a house with two entrances, close to each other physically but worlds apart in the impressions they

create. When Utterson visits Jekyll, he is admitted "into a large, low-roofed, comfortable hall, paved with flags, warmed (after the fashion of a country house) by a bright, open fire, and furnished with costly cabinets of oak," and Utterson considers it "the pleasantest room in London" (42). Hyde is permanently linked with the other end of the building, the laboratory, separated from the luxurious main house by the surgical theatre or dissecting-room. Poole tells Utterson that they "see very little of [Hyde] on this side of the house; [Hyde] mostly comes and goes by the laboratory" (43), and Hyde is hereafter defined as the man who enters and leaves Jekyll's house through the back door. One popular interpretation of Hyde is that he represents "the return of the repressed": Hyde embodies what is hidden inside Jekyll's mind, namely, his subconscious. The house symbolism seems to support this idea: like the laboratory that is located at the other end of the building, Hyde is perpetually embedded in the back of Jekyll's skull.

Nevertheless, the big problem with a disguise is that, however hard you try, it will always be a self-portrait. Judith Halberstam uses Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1891) as a device to read *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, an approach I find extremely useful. Wilde quips: "Sin is a thing that writes itself across a man's face. It cannot be concealed. People talk sometimes of secret vices. There are no such things. If a wretched man has a vice, it shows itself in the lines of his mouth, the droop of his eyelids, the moulding of his hands even" (126). Likewise, what is supposed to be the opposite of Jekyll reveals everything about him. Many critics link *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* with *Frankenstein* because both novels are about a scientist and his product, a human and his monster, and the original and his double. I find, however, that *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* aligns more with nineteenth-century Gothic vampire fantasy because, in both cases, the monster gets literally under the skin, and the horror of these stories lies not in the erroneous "split personality" reading of the novel, not in that a cohesive existence can be split into two or

more distinct forms of life, but in that the origin of evil is actually goodness. Throughout my discussion of nineteenth-century vampires I have been arguing that these monstrous bloodsuckers can also be model citizens. Irving Massey in his book *The Gaping Pig: Literature and Metamorphosis* reminds us that in vampire literature, especially in *Dracula*, we repeatedly see that virtuous people are transformed into the Undead (98-100). The vampire expert Abraham Van Helsing knows only too well that the vampire hunters should never underestimate Count Dracula: "In a hard and warlike time [Dracula] was celebrate that he have more iron nerve, more subtle brain, more braver heart, than any man. In him some vital principle have in strange way found their utmost; and as his body keep strong and grow and thrive, so his brain grow too" (320). The bloodsucking demon is embedded in a man of sterling character, and evil is inherent in good. The wide-eyed Lucy Westenra, after being reborn as a vampire, disgusts even her former suitors Dr. John Seward, Quincey Morris, and Arthur Holmwood, and together they stake her vampiric body without hesitation. When Jonathan Harker is ambushed by the three voluptuous female demons in Transylvania, he notes that, while two of them look like Dracula ("Two were dark, and had high aquiline noses, like the Count's, and great dark, piercing eyes, that seemed to be almost red when contrasted with the pale yellow moon" [37]), the other one is different: "The other was fair, as fair as can be, with great, wavy masses of golden hair and eyes like pale sapphires" (37)—the image of an angel. This fair-haired fiend was possibly once a prim and proper lady like Lucy. One common reading of the novel is that, instead of transforming angels in the house into predatory she-devils, Dracula unleashes their underlying instincts from the restrictions in a patriarchal society. Massey's observation about *Dracula* can also be perfectly applied to *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*: "The good in man is identified with duality. It has an alternative: it can escape into the condition of being bad" (99).

Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde is certainly a story of duality, of a double life, the point being emphasized by the frequent appearance of the word "double" (Hirsch 237-38). "Double life" texts were extremely popular throughout the nineteenth century. Other than Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, another widely read novel of double life was *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner* (1824) by the Scottish author James Hogg (1770–1835), often credited as an inspiration for Stevenson's *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. Stevenson's novel is different from Wilde's in that it does not involve the externalization of the double, in which the extracted soul sits in judgment of the original. Therefore, I believe it is crucial to acknowledge that Stevenson's work is the tale of a double life that is still lived by a single person, two souls in one breast. This person is also wicked in a specifically vampiric way. Hyde, like a vampire, is an unwelcome guest. He infiltrates Jekyll's home and soul and then slowly seizes full control. Chris Baldick describes Jekyll's experiment as "an attempt to escape that world of personal responsibilities which only reappears in more humiliating forms the more one tries to evade it" (162). At the beginning Jekyll is confident that he has the upper hand: "the moment I choose, I can be rid of Mr. Hyde" (45). Before he knows it, though, the two have become inseparable. Like the vampire lady-killer, Hyde is also sadistic by nature: unlike Frankenstein's Creature, Hyde is literally made for sin. Jekyll confesses: "All things therefore seemed to point to this: that I was slowly losing hold of my original and better self, and becoming slowly incorporated with my second and worse" (85). Modern readers may find it difficult to gauge how evil Edward Hyde is, since in the text we see merely three examples of his atrocities (trampling a young girl underfoot, striking a woman selling boxes of matches, and cold-bloodedly murdering Sir Danvers Carew).[5] Vladimir Nabokov, without diving into the details of Hyde's murderous career, contends: "the

[5] The almost contemporaneous Jack the Ripper had a higher body count. The number of Ripper victims remains debatable, but most Ripperologists stick to the "canonical five."

only thing we do guess about Hyde's pleasures is that they are sadistic—he enjoys the infliction of pain" (qtd. in Hirsch 243). But no matter what Hyde's abusive and predatory practice is, it is an addiction that needs to be fed.

Like Gothic vampires, the archetypal loners in literature, Hyde also walks alone, which can be counted as extraordinary in a novel where men meet frequently and go out for a walk every Sunday. Unlike Jekyll, who is always surrounded by a group of male friends (Utterson, Lanyon, and Poole, for example), Hyde enjoys his solitary existence. When Utterson tracks Hyde down to the deserted and undignified area of Soho, he "thought he had never seen that part of London so deserted. He could have wished it otherwise; never in his life had he been conscious of so sharp a wish to see and touch his fellow-creatures" (61). *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is also similar to *Dracula* (published nearly a decade later) in that the horror resides in the familiar setting of contemporary London. In my discussion of *Dracula*, I emphasized how Stoker painstakingly brought the supernatural dread to the geography his readers were familiar with, thus giving the evil and the paranormal a dreadful immediacy. Stoker planted Dracula's house Carfax and Dr. Seward's asylum, where the madman Renfield is an inmate, in the heart of London. In *Dracula*, therefore, the homes of the vampire and the lunatic are at the center of the city. Similarly, Jekyll lives in London, where a gentleman's pocket change was a workman's monthly wages and where the hypocrisy prevailing in Victorian drawing rooms could be unimaginable. Inside the body of Jekyll, we see a distinguished doctor and a maniacal murderer cohabiting as polar opposites who are inverted twins, tenants of one house and one body. Jekyll and Hyde, human and monster are never without each other.

Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick has treated homosexuality, especially male homosexuality, as an integral feature of Gothic horror. Vampire fictions, of course, teem with homosexual taboos.

Joseph Sheridan Le Fanu's *Carmilla* (1871) is a haunting story of lesbian vampirism, and James B. Twitchell describes it as "LeFanu's conscious attempt to render Coleridge's *Christabel* into prose" (129). *Dracula* is also notorious for its eroticism, and many commentators interpret the Count's sexual threat as homosexual perversion. For example, when Harker is besieged by the three female vampires, Dracula comes to his rescue. Dracula hisses at the trio and proclaims: "This man belongs to me! Beware how you meddle with him, or you'll have to deal with me" (39). Later Dracula taunts the vampire hunters: "Your girls that you all love are mine already; and through them you and others shall yet be mine—my creatures, to do my bidding and to be my jackals when I want to feed" (306); and indeed Dracula does end up drinking the blood of those brave men when they pump it into Lucy. Numerous studies of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* also focus on the sexualities in the story, even though none of Hyde's crimes is straightforwardly a sex crime. Stephen Heath, for instance, argues in "Psychopathia Sexualis: Stevenson's *Strange Case*" that Hyde's violence in the novel is actually displaced sexuality: "Random violence…has replaced a sexual drive which it thus serves to express" (93–94).

In my discussion of nineteenth-century Gothic vampire texts, I have noted the strict gender hierarchy in the world of the Undead. Female characters in vampire literature are usually two-dimensional, either maidens as defenseless as sitting ducks or sirens with the tongues of serpents. In the world of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, women are reduced to an even lesser role and are virtually nonexistent. The women in the novel are all unnamed, insignificant, and of low social status, and they mainly serve only two functions: as Hyde's victims and as examples of evasive but definitely devious character. Those who fit into the first group include the young girl Hyde tramples, the girl's female relatives, and the woman selling matches on the street; the one who fits into the second group is Hyde's Soho landlady: "[a]n ivory-faced and silvery-haired old

woman [with] an evil face, smoothed by hypocrisy; but her manners were excellent" (48). We also have Jekyll's cook and maids, and the maid who witnesses the murder of Sir Danvers Carew. This embarrassing paucity of female roles and participation has led readers to interpret Jekyll and Hyde's "depravities" as acts of homosexuality. Katherine Bailey Linehan in "'Closer Than A Wife': the Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll's Significant Other" notices that "[n]one of these male characters gives the slightest evidence of involvement with a female friend or relative, let alone any indication of interest in sexuality" (87), and she examines the purpose behind the exclusion of female characters in the bachelor world of the novel. Linehan also cites numerous critics who interpret Hyde's secret sexual debauchery as homosexual activity. Halberstam, one of the many critics who discuss hints of homosexuality in Stevenson's novel, comments: "Secret selves, in Gothic, denote sexual secrets, secrets of the closet more often than not" (71). Jekyll, on this view, in a particularly inverted, forbidden, and gruesome parody of pregnancy, carries inside him a life partner who is a parasite that is slowly eating his life away.

Conclusion

I believe Stevenson's *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is an appropriate place to close my survey of the nineteenth-century fascination with Gothic vampirism. John William Polidori's *The Vampyre* (1819) revolutionized the modern form of literary vampires, and by the end of the century Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (1897) immortalized the captivating race of bloodsucking monsters. Nowadays Gothic vampires have reemerged to define a new genre of mass entertainment. Throughout the nineteenth century, writers drew inspiration from the enthrallingly contradictory characteristics of Gothic vampires: their mysterious primordiality, their well-bred air and well-honed wit, and their devious cunning and tact. My thesis has followed the footsteps of these Gothic creatures into the intense mirroring between Victor Frankenstein, his double the Creature, and his alter ego Robert Walton in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818), and also into the strained relationship between Dr. Henry Jekyll and his hidden Hyde in Robert Louis Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886). Neither Mary Shelley's nor Stevenson's allusions to Gothic vampirism are incidental borrowing. Oscar Wilde quips in his preface to *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1891): "Those who go beneath the surface do so at their peril" (3); and beneath the surface of these tales of the relationship between monster and man is a disconcerting account of our relationship with ourselves. These complex and multivalent works chart the inner contours and contradictions of the modern individual, telling us that the lure of the dark side is a part of our humanity that we do not understand well and may not want to recognize. Frankenstein's unabashed foray into genetic engineering and Jekyll's laboratory-based enterprise suggest that we should scan our own minds as well as bodies for signs of degeneration. In *The Shining* Stephen King says that an "inhuman place makes human monsters" (158). If monsters live inside men, what does it say about where we are?

Works Cited

Baldick, Chris. *In Frankenstein's Shadow: Myth, Monstrosity, and Nineteenth-Century Writing*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987. Print.

Byron, George Gordon. *Byron: the Major Works*. Ed. Jerome J. McGann. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. Print.

Douglas, John E, and Mark Olshaker. *The Cases That Haunt Us*. Pocket Books, 2001. Print.

Frayling, Christopher. *Vampyres: Lord Byron to Count Dracula*. London: Faber, 1991. Print.

Grady, Frank. "Vampire Culture." *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*. Ed. Jeffrey Jerome Cohen. Minneapolis, Minn: University of Minnesota Press, 1996. 225-41. Print.

Halberstam, Judith. *Skin Shows: Gothic Horror and the Technology of Monsters*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1995. Print.

Harris, Thomas. *Hannibal Rising: A Novel*. New York: Delacorte Press, 2006. Print.

---. *Hannibal*. London: W. Heinemann, 1999. Print.

---. *Red Dragon*. 1981. New York: Dutton, 2000. Print.

---. *The Silence of the Lambs*. 1988. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2013. Print.

Heath, Stephen. "Psychopathia Sexualis: Stevenson's *Strange Case*." *Critical Quarterly*. 28 (1986): 93-108. Print.

Hirsch, David A. Hedrich. "Liberty, Equality, Monstrosity: Revolutionizing the Family in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*." *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*. Ed. Jeffrey Jerome Cohen. Minneapolis, Minn: University of Minnesota Press, 1996. 115-40. Print.

Hirsch, Gordon. "*Frankenstein*, Detective Fiction, and *Jekyll and Hyde*." *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde: After One Hundred Years*. Eds. William Veeder and Gordon Hirsch. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988. 223-46. Print.

King, Stephen. *The Shining*. 1977. New York, N.Y: Pocket Books, 2001. Print.

Linehan, Katherine Bailey. "'Closer Than A Wife': the Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll's Significant Other." *Robert Louis Stevenson Reconsidered: New Critical Perspectives*. Ed. William B. Jones. Jefferson, N.C: McFarland, 2003. 85-100. Print.

Lorrah, Jean. "Dracula Meets the New Woman." *The Blood Is the Life: Vampires in Literature*. Eds. Leonard G. Heldreth and Mary Pharr. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1999. 31-42. Print.

Massey, Irving. *The Gaping Pig: Literature and Metamorphosis*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976. Print.

Mellor, Anne K. "Making a Monster." *Harold Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: Mary Shelley's* Frankenstein. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House, 2007. 43-59. Print.

Meyer, Stephenie. *Breaking Dawn*. New York: Little, Brown, 2009. Print.

---. *Eclipse*. New York: Little, Brown, 2007. Print.

---. *New Moon*. London: Atom, 2007. Print.

---. *Twilight*. New York: Little, Brown and Company, 2005. Print.

Milton, John. *Paradise Lost*. Ed. Philip Pullman. 1667. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. Print.

Oates, Joyce Carol. "Frankenstein's Fallen Angel." *Harold Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: Mary Shelley's* Frankenstein. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House, 2007. 29-41. Print.

Odell, Robin. *Ripperology: A Study of the World's First Serial Killer and a Literary Phenomenon*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 2006. Print.

Picart, Caroline Joan, and Cecil E. Greek. "The Compulsion of Real/Reel Serial Killers and Vampires: Toward a Gothic Criminology." *Monsters in and Among Us: Toward a Gothic Criminology*. Eds. Caroline Joan (Kay) Picart and Cecil Greek. Madison [N.J.]: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2007. 227-55. Print.

Polidori, John W. *The Diary of Dr John William Polidori: Relating to Byron, Shelley, Etc*. Ed. William Michael Rossetti. 1816. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. Print.

---. *The Vampyre: A Tale; and Ernestus Berchtold, Or, the Modern Oedipus*. Eds. David L. Macdonald and Kathleen D. Scherf. Peterborough, Ont: Broadview Editions, 2008. Print.

Rice, Anne. *Interview with the Vampire: A Novel*. New York: Knopf, 1976. Print.

Rowland, Susan. "Gothic Crimes: A Literature of Terror and Horror." *From Agatha Christie to Ruth Rendell: British Women Writers in Detective and Crime Fiction*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave, 2001. 110-34. Print.

Shelley, Mary Wollstonecraft. *Frankenstein, Or, the Modern Prometheus: The 1818 Text*. Ed. Marilyn Butler. 1818. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. Print.

Spooner, Catherine. "Crime and the Gothic." *A Companion to Crime Fiction*. Eds. Charles J. Rzepka and Lee Horsley. Chichester, U.K: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010. 245-57. Print.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. "A Chapter on Dreams." *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. Ed. Martin A. Danahay. Peterborough, Ont: Broadview Press, 2005. 95-105. Print.

---. *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. Ed. Martin A. Danahay. 1886. Peterborough, Ont: Broadview Press, 2005. Print.

Stoker, Bram. *Dracula*. Ed. Maud Ellmann. 1897. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. Print.

Telotte, J. P. "A Parasitic Perspective: Romantic Participation and Polidori's *The Vampyre*." *The Blood Is the Life: Vampires in Literature*. Eds. Leonard G. Heldreth and Mary Pharr.

Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1999. 9-18. Print.

Thorslev, Peter Larsen. "The Gothic Villain." *The Byronic Hero: Types and Prototypes*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1962. 51-61. Print.

Tropp, Martin. "The Monster." *Harold Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: Mary Shelley's* Frankenstein. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House, 2007. 13-27. Print.

---. *Images of Fear: How Horror Stories Helped Shape Modern Culture, 1818-1918*. Jefferson, N.C: McFarland Classics, 1999. Print.

Twitchell, James B. *The Living Dead: A Study of the Vampire in Romantic Literature*. Durham, N.C: Duke University Press, 1981. Print.

Walpole, Horace. *The Castle of Otranto: A Gothic Story; And, the Mysterious Mother: A Tragedy*. Ed. Frederick S. Frank. Peterborough, Ont: Broadview Press, 2011. Print.

Wells, H. G. *The Island of Doctor Moreau*. Ed. Mason Harris. 1896. Peterborough, Ont: Broadview Press, 2009. Print.

Wilde, Oscar. *The Picture of Dorian Gray: Authoritative Texts, Backgrounds, Reviews and Reactions, Criticism*. Ed. Michael Patrick Gillespie. New York: W.W. Norton & Co, 2007. Print.