A STUDY OF MONSTROUS ABJECTION IN RELATION TO TWO GOTHIC NOVELS: *DRACULA* AND *FRANKENSTEIN*

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

BETÜL SELCAN ŞENTÜRK

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

AUGUST 2019

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sadettin Kirazcı
Director (Acting)

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____

Prof. Dr. Çiğdem Sağın Şimşek
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez Caro
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assist. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut-Naykı (METU, FLE)_____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez-Caro (METU, FLE)_____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Gökşen Aras (Atılım Uni., ELIT)_____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name: Betül Selcan Şentürk

Signature:

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF MONSTROUS ABJECTION IN RELATION TO TWO GOTHIC NOVELS: *DRACULA* AND *FRANKENSTEIN*

Şentürk, Betül Selcan
M.A., English Literature
Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez Caro

August 2019, 109 pages

The aim of this thesis is to study Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818) and Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (1897) to explore the function Gothic monsters have with respect to the dissolution of the Western subject, and the social/symbolic order they are settled in. In carrying out this argument, Julia Kristeva's understanding of psychoanalytical development, and her concept of abjection introduced in her work *Powers of Horror* (1980) will be taken as the theoretical framework underlying this thesis. It has been observed that in both of the novels, the elements and setting of Gothic, as well as the monsters it harbours dominates the narrative, and reveals the fragility of the human psyche, along with the anomalies, repressed thoughts and feelings humankind dispose upon an "Other." When confronted by this abject Other, the characters in *Frankenstein* and *Dracula* begin to lose their sense of unity and wholeness. Furthermore, the abject monsters disrupt and pose a threat to the existence of personal and social/symbolic

boundaries which ensure the safety of the subject. This thesis will thus conclude that it is necessary to "throw off," or "abject" the Gothic monsters in order to retain the subject's ideal sense of fullness and order. In addition to *Powers of Horror*, Kristeva's *Revolution in Poetic Language* (1974) where she introduces her ideas about "maternal abjection" will be made use of in the argumentation of this thesis, in relation to the monsters' symbolic representation of the "mother," who has a strong influence on the developmental phases of a subject.

Keywords: abject, gothic, monsters, subject development, symbolic order.

ÖZ

İKİ GOTİK ROMANA İLİŞKİN YARATIKIMSI İĞRENÇLİK ÇALIŞMASI:
DRACULA VE *FRANKENSTEIN*

Şentürk, Betül Selcan
Yüksek Lisans, İngiliz Edebiyatı
Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez Caro

Ağustos 2019, 109 sayfa

Bu tez Mary Shelley'in *Frankenstein* (1818) ve Bram Stoker'ın *Dracula* (1897) adlı eserlerini, Gotik Yaratıkların, öznenin analizi ve içine yerleştirildikleri toplumsal/sembolik düzene ilişkin sahip olduğu işlevi bulmayı amaçlar. Bu argüman ileri sürülürken, Julia Kristeva'nın *"Korkunun Güçleri: İğrençlik Üzerine Deneme" (Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection)* (1980) adlı çalışmasında belirtilen psikanalitik gelişim anlayışı ve iğrençlik (abjection) kavramı bu tezin temelini oluşturan teorik çerçeve olarak ele alınacaktır. Her iki romanda da gotik unsur ve çevrenin, içinde barındırdığı Yaratıklar kadar anlatıya yön verdiği ve aynı zamanda anomaliler yani insanların bastırılmış duygu ve düşünceleri bir "Öteki"sine atfetmesi ile birlikte insan ruhunun hassaslığını ortaya çıkardığı gözlemlenmiştir. Bu iğrenç Öteki ile karşı karşıya kaldığında *Frankenstein* ve *Dracula*'daki karakterler birlik ve bütünlük hissini kaybetmeye başlar. Dahası iğrenç (abject) Yaratıklar öznenin

güvenliğini sağlayan kişisel ve toplumsal/sembolik sınırların varoluşunu bozarak bir tehdit oluşturmaktadır. Buradan hareketle bu tez, öznenin ideal bütünlük ve düzen hissini kaybetmemesi amacıyla Gotik Yaratıkların ”atılması” (“throw off”) ya da “iğrençleştirilmesi” (“abject”) gerektiğini savunacaktır. Bu tezin savunmasında, *Korkunun Güçleri*’nin yanı sıra, öznenin gelişimsel evrelerinde güçlü bir etkiye sahip olan ve aynı zamanda Yaratıkların sembolik temsili olan “anne”ye ilişkin olarak Kristeva’nın “annesel iğrençleştirme” ile ilgili görüşlerini belirttiği *“Şiirsel Dilde Devrim” (Revolution in Poetic Language)* (1974) kitabından faydalanılacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: iğrenç, gotik, yaratıklar, özne gelişimi, sembolik düzen.

To my father, Şenol Şentürk

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my thesis advisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez-Caro for her guidance and continuous support throughout the process of writing this thesis. Without her, I could not have gathered the will and strength to start working. I am forever indebted to her for her understanding and kindness in a time of sorrow, and will continue to admire her for her positive attitude, sincerity and compassion as a person, as well as for her immense knowledge on the field.

I would also like to acknowledge Assist. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut Naykı as the second reader of this thesis, and I am greatly indebted for her very valuable comments throughout my endeavours to gather this study into a whole. Her support and guidance has been invaluable for me since the day I started my university education in METU. I am also grateful to Assist. Prof. Dr. Margaret J. Sönmez for helping me find my way and ask the right questions to myself over a year ago when I had just begun working on my argument. I would like to thank them both for their encouragement and support.

My thanks go to my friends, and my family who propelled my enthusiasm in learning and teaching likewise, and have supported me thus far in life. Especially, I would like to thank my dear friend Pisei Sudhiragandhi Kim, who has accompanied me in every step and who has showed her immense encouragement, support and love.

Finally I would like to thank my father, Şenol Şentürk, who supported me all through my life, and was the greatest teacher, friend, and father. I dedicate this entire thesis to him, to his memory which will be in my heart forever and after.

.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

PH Powers of Horror

DL Desire in Language

RPL Revolution in Poetic Language

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In English literature, Gothic motifs and elements of horror have always been present. As a literary genre however, Gothic emerged shortly after the rise of the novel in Britain, after such works as *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) and *Moll Flanders* (1722). While novels have received generous literary criticism and analysis so far and continue to do so, the interest around Gothic novels per se, were initially scarce and relatively new. Earlier attempts to analyse such novels has focused on locating them in a specific, cultural and/or political context; however, with the emergence of modern theoretical criticism, Gothic novels have been read under the light of different theories and practises such as Marxism, colonialism, and most importantly psychoanalysis. With Sigmund Freud's studies of the unconscious and his theory of "the uncanny" introduced in the early 20th century, the popularity and academic studies around Gothic literature exponentially increased. The first example of this can be seen in 1959, with Maurice Richardson's analysis of Gothic fiction in "The Psycho-analysis of Ghost Stories" after which many influential studies such as Christopher Bentley's "The Monster in the Bedroom: Sexual Symbolism in Bram Stoker's Dracula" (1972) and Robert Mighall's "Sex, History and the Vampire" (1998) follows.

Many scholars of Gothic fiction as aforementioned, have made use of psychoanalysis in interpreting the works – on occasion biographical elements of an author's life have been included in an analysis. In a way, Freud himself started the tradition with his analysis of E.T.A Hoffman's short story "The Sand Man" which was written in 1817, and for some scholars with his publication of *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1899),

after which many critics likewise generally interpreted Gothic works as bearing repressed feelings, traumas, primal anomalies and contradictions of a human being. In psychological renderings, monsters, vampires, ghosts and similar beings are believed to embody these anomalies, and cause their beholders to face their own fears as well as desires which are deeply concealed. As an "extension *and* critique of Lacanian psychoanalysis," (Hogle "Theorizing the Gothic" 33) Julia Kristeva's *Powers of Horror* (1980) attempts to locate the horror felt in confronting an "Other," and emphasizes the influence of modern art in depicting the "ultimate coding of our crises, of our most intimate and most serious apocalypses" (*PH* 208). For Kristeva, "the literature of abjection," in this regard, may provide us with "some insight into the fate of the modern subject" (*PH* 16).

While Kristeva's theoretical framework in *PH* does not explicitly involve an analysis of Gothic fiction, her theories can be adapted to the literary criticism of the genre easily. The process of "abjecting" something metaphorically entails an action of "throwing off," "throwing under" or "casting away;" however, what is abjected in the end cannot be completely erased or eliminated. Thus, Kristeva argues that the abject is a perennial element in the human psyche, and it occasionally returns to haunt us as "an inescapable boomerang, a vortex of summons and repulsion" (*PH* 1). Both abjection and Gothic fiction in this way, deal with the inner fears and desires of a person, as well as the individual's place within a society. The binary oppositions which Gothic fiction so elaborately disrupts and distorts, are reified in abjection from the point of view of the individual and the society as inside/outside, I/Other, pure/impure, and so on. Furthermore, Gothic fiction's tendency to point at the shortcomings of these binaries, and the often political and cultural satire are also highlighted in abjection as its drawing attention "to the fragility of the law" (*PH* 4) on which it is based. Most importantly however, Gothic and the abject describe experiences where an individual's identity is threatened, and is systematically constructed and/or deconstructed. For this reason, they are suitable forms to discuss "the quandaries and dangers implied in any attempt at a conventionally unaltered identity" (Copati and La Guardia 202).

In his chapter entitled "The Gothic on Screen" Misha Kavka argues that Kristeva's theory of abjection "may help to delimit the conventionalized themes or obsessions of the Gothic," (211) and re-read such characters as the tyrannical, aristocratic male, and the fainting, oppressed "damsel in distress" under a new light. With reference to these words, this thesis has attempted to divert current and previous studies of *Dracula* (1897) and *Frankenstein* (1818) from a conventional, Freudian psychoanalysis, to a hybrid, more maternally focused Kristevan one. The two novels are specifically chosen for this attempt as they both involve individuals who are settled in a patriarchal, social-symbolic society where their ideal and conventional identities never seem to be threatened.

Written in 1897, *Dracula* marks the impending end of the Victorian Age in which these rigid social and behavioural norms will be implemented. On the other hand, *Frankenstein* marks the beginning of the same century in which Queen Victoria will come to power. Mary Shelley wrote her "hideous progeny" in 1818, when the Enlightenment ideas were very much in favour. Reason and scientific exploration dominated Shelley's time and so it can be observed that Victor Frankenstein is as fascinated with science and discovery as the scholars of his time. The narrative however, does not idly investigate science itself, as Shelley includes religious concerns about creator/creation, hell/heaven, vice/virtue, and such topics as the origin of humanity, and the relationship between science and religion. The criticism around *Frankenstein* thus revolves around such topics as the novel's correlation with the Miltonic myth of creation, the myth of Prometheus, and the depiction of Romantic and Enlightenment ideas, as well as the novel's connection with the current revolutionary and political ideas which swept through Europe after the French Revolution.

The literary criticism around *Frankenstein* initially focused on feminist theories, beginning with Ellen Moers' landmark study of the novel in *Literary Women* (1976). The focus on psychoanalysis emerged later on, with Peter Brooks' Lacanian reading of the Creature in *Body Work: Objects of Desire in Modern Narrative* (1993). In effect, the influence of Kristeva's *Powers of Horror* and the concept of abjection can

be observed in the more recent literary criticism surrounding the novel. Marie Mulvey-Roberts in "The Corpse in the Corpus" (2000) reads Shelley's story as a quest of the Female Gothic to reunite with the mother, and thus the Creature as a "spectre of the maternal body as well as Frankenstein's monstrous child" (199). Similarly, Margaret Homans in *Bearing the Word* (1986) analyses the novel in relation to "women's writing," and argues that writing *Frankenstein* is an experience on Shelley's side which leads her "both to figure her writing as mothering and to bear or transmit the words of her husband" (100). Homans' argument also involves the mother and child relationship where the former is seen as an "object of desire," an idea Kristeva emphasizes in the theorization of abjection. Many of the critics has chosen to focus on the feminist aspect of the novel and the maternal imagery in Frankenstein; however, their work is still beneficial in supporting this study.

The literary criticism regarding *Dracula* and especially the "Otherness" of the monsters in the novel, begins with such important studies as Stephen Arata's "The Occidental Tourist: Dracula and the Anxiety of Reverse Colonization" (1990). In this study, Arata analyses the narrative through the lens of "reverse colonialism" which can be exemplified by Dracula's arrival in London and the treatment Harker receives in his journey to Transylvania and his stay there. While literary studies regarding the analysis of *Dracula* are abundant, a focus on abjection specifically has not emerged. In various book chapters, it is Jerold E. Hogle who mentions the correlation between *Dracula* and abjection, and how these two can be academically connected; "Stoker's Counterfeit Gothic: *Dracula* and Theatricality at the Dawn of Simulation" (1998) "The Gothic Ghost of the Counterfeit and the Progress of Abjection" (2012) and the introduction chapter of the book *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction* (2002).

Dracula depicts a society where rigid rules and norms govern people's behaviour, speech, and outlook on life. In 1897 when Stoker published his novel, good etiquette and proper appearance were a prominent aspect of everyday life. There were different rules designed for women and men to follow, such as what kind of clothes and jewellery to wear, how and when to speak to a stranger for women; bowing, where to sit and next to whom, and even whether it is appropriate to smoke or drink, for men.

In such a setting, it seems quite difficult for one to express their personal desires and wishes, let alone their own fears and traumas explicitly. Thus, a character such as Count Dracula and his arrival at London – even his initial appearance in the narrative – is seen as a disruptive event, as he expresses behaviour, sexuality and mentality so transgressive that his exclusion from the society as well as the narrative itself becomes an urgent necessity.

At first glance, *Dracula* and *Frankenstein* may seem as two distinct novels which have limited amount of topics to be simultaneously discussed. Nevertheless, their origins can be traced back to a historic night in 1816, when Mary Shelley, and other famous figures such as Percy Bysshe Shelley, Lord Byron and John Polidori gathered in a house near Lake Geneva. In a style reminiscent of Boccaccio's *Decameron*, each author narrated stories they had in mind or would come up with on that day. From this assembly emerged Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, and John Polidori's *The Vampyre* (1819) which is believed to be the origin of Stoker's *Dracula*.

1.1. The Aims and Scope of the Study

This thesis is organized in five chapters. In the next chapter, the theoretical background of this thesis will be provided starting from an extensive history of Gothic fiction in Britain to Julia Kristeva's theory of abjection discussed in her long essay, *Powers of Horror*. While both *Dracula* (1897) and *Frankenstein* (1818) are Gothic novels and are written in the same century, the Gothic tradition the novels follow are distinct from one other. Therefore, in the second chapter of this thesis, the history of 18th century Gothic starting with such novels as *The Castle of Otranto* (1764), and *The Mysteries of Udolpho* (1794), to late 19th century Gothic novels such as *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886) by Robert Louis Stevenson, and *The Beetle* (1897) by Richard Marsh will be explored. Furthermore, as this thesis looks into abject monstrosity, a section will be provided for a small-scale exploration of monsters and monstrous beings in literature throughout history.

As mentioned above, the second chapter will also explore Julia Kristeva's theory of abjection in addition to other topics. With the publication of *PH*, abjection received

immense attention in literary criticism; however, as Kristeva herself notes, such investigation into abjection "picks up on a certain vacuum" (qtd. in Lechte& Magaroni 155). Thus, in addition to *Powers of Horror,* ideas from the two works *Desire in Language* (1969) and *Revolution in Poetic Language* (1976) – where Kristeva discusses her ideas about the "semiotic," and "maternal abjection" as well as the "abjection of the self" – will be useful in discussing abjection in detail. It is also important to mention that while discussing abjection or any work by Kristeva, the practice of psychoanalysis and theories related to this field cannot be ignored. Therefore, in the second chapter of this thesis not only Kristeva's own theories, but also ideas and works by such theoreticians as Jacques Lacan and Sigmund Freud on identity development will be discussed. In *RPL*– which is one of the essential works underlying the argument of this thesis – Kristeva lays the groundwork for her psychoanalytic theory of development. In her theorization, the patriarchal focus is shifted to the mother, and the mother is shown to have a great influence in the development of a subject. Furthermore, the mother's strong and authoritative presence Kristeva claims, is persistent throughout the subject's life and if it is not "abjected," the subject risks successful accession to the symbolic realm, as well as having a complete sense of unity and identity. In both *RPL* and *PH,* Kristeva argues that in a patriarchal society along with the mother, any abnormality, contradiction and disruption must be subsequently thrown off. As the mother's presence which is thus associated with chaos and unruliness is against the ideals of the symbolic realm, the mother becomes a figure to be avoided or to be purified in patriarchal societies. Kristeva mentions that the mother is necessary in a subject's development; however, this necessity is only completed with her exclusion and exile from the symbolic realm. While Kristeva herself does not explicitly take sides in her discussions on the "mother" and "motherhood in relation to the theory of abjection, it can be inferred that the image of the mother is presented in a negative perspective.

The third chapter will begin with the first focus of argumentation of this thesis; Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*. The focal point of this chapter will be Victor Frankenstein's journey into abjection, and the effects of this journey on the people around him as well as the society he lives in. Victor's own creation, the monster, or "the Creature"

as it will be named hereafter, is a concise "Other" in which the collective feelings of fear and desire, as well as the repressed thoughts and sexuality of Victor are disposed. Thus, when confronted by them through the Creature's abject monstrosity, Victor personally experiences a disruption in the boundaries between the self/Other, inside/outside, pure/impure, and so on, and begins to become *abject* himself. In addition to the "self-abjection" Victor goes through, the third chapter will also discuss "maternal abjection," in relation to the relationship between the Creature and Victor. It will be argued that the process of creating a being out of dead human and animal body parts is an attempt on Victor's side – which is unconsciously addressed by him in the novel – to reunite with his dead mother, and cover for the "inaugural loss" (*PH* 5) which Kristeva argues, is at foundation of a subject's own being.

Chapter four will focus on Bram Stoker's *Dracula*. Unlike in *Frankenstein*, the focal point of this chapter will not be on one single character, but it will follow the personal accounts of many characters in the novel, stylized by journal entries, letters, telegrams, and other technologies of the time which Stoker adopts in his novel. The interaction between Stoker's vampire Count – who will be named as "the Count" or "Count Dracula" hereafter – and the rest of the characters will be analysed in detail from the first appearance of the Count to his death in the end. Similar to *Frankenstein*, *Dracula* presents an "Other," whose presence cannot be contained in a single physical location, and whose "Otherness" is contagious for the rest of the characters, as well as the society. In this respect, Count Dracula threatens both his native country Transylvania, and the British society in which he "long[s] to go to go through the crowded streets of [your] mighty London, to be in the midst of the whirl and rush of humanity" (Stoker 18). While there are some characters who are literally turned into vampires, metaphorically, the threat of the vampire transforms the characters into the Other they so fear, and abject them.

In effect, the fourth chapter will additionally discuss abject femininity and maternal abjection. Through the characters of Lucy and Mina, Stoker addresses the issue of the "New Woman," which was a prevalent topic of discussion in 19th century British society. This can be observed especially during the process of Lucy's transformation

into a vampire, which depicts the stark difference between the former "sweet and adamant" human Lucy, and the "voluptuous and sensual" vampire version of her. In *Dracula*, Stoker presents a femininity and maternity corrupted by abject monstrosity, and the aftermath of such a corruption which is revealed to be punishment by death. When Lucy is transformed, she is reduced to an abject, Other version of herself, in which she cannot be recognized by the men around her and are called by such names as "the thing" or "callous devil". With the Count's aid, Lucy becomes a "more violent version of uncanniness" (*PH* 5) neither the others nor her own consciousness can recognize the abject being she has been transformed into. Similarly, Mina is shunned and scorned when she is attacked by the Count. She is stripped of her role of the motherly, virtuous figure and becomes "unclean," after being physically marked on the forehead with sacramental bread.

In chapter five, the conclusion of this study will be given. It will bring together the results of the analysis on *Frankenstein* and *Dracula* through the lens of Kristeva's psychoanalytic theories and her concept of abjection. The characters' personal journey of confronting abjection will be closely observed and analysed in relation to the maternal subjugation of the emerging "speaking subject," which Kristeva centers in her own theorization of psychoanalytic development. This exploration which has been carried out in five chapters, will show how the abject monsters present in the two narratives disrupt the "zenith of subjectivity,"[1] the sense of oneness a subject idealizes, and the social and personal boundaries, as well as the symbolic and semiotic realms. Thus, it is concluded that in *Frankenstein* and *Dracula*, it is necessity to *abject* the monsters, to throw them off from the narrative in order for the characters to keep those boundaries and realms safe and separate.

In *Frankenstein*, the readers are presented a dark conclusion. Due to the failure of abjecting the Creature, it is seen that Victor and those around him are forced to either confront abjection or become abject themselves. Both Victor and his family, along with his friends Clerval and Justine perishes in the hands of the Creature. The

[1] Kristeva, Julia. *Tales of Love*, translated by Leon S. Roudiez, New York: Columbia University Press, 1987, pp. 5

social/symbolic order they were settled in is also permanently destroyed as neither the Creature's presence nor were its actions concealable. In *Dracula*, as mentioned earlier, the result varies and it is seen that Stoker finishes the narrative with a complete unravelling of the events. Lucy when she becomes a vampire is subsequently killed; Mina is "purified" from the Count's influence when the latter dies and Harker regains his sense of identity and oneness when he kills the Count himself. The characters are bounded together with a secret only they share, and biologically more so with the birth of Quincy Harker – Mina and Jonathan's son – in whose veins the collective blood of the rest of the characters flow.

A key point which needs to be mentioned in Shelley's narrative, is the implied and/or ambiguous depiction of the Creature's death. The novel ends on an enigmatic note which suggests that the Creature leaves to kill itself after Victor's death, yet it is never openly mentioned. In *Dracula*, as mentioned earlier, the abject monsters are completely eliminated and can no longer pose a threat to the characters or to the society. In here, information about the two author's personal lives as well as the difference between genders can be addressed. While both authors come from a predominantly patriarchal society, their dealing with abjection varies. Mary Shelley who created *Frankenstein* under the obligation of appealing to a male audience – which in a way can be read as the female author's struggle to appeal to the society – struggled with the absence *and* the legacy her mother Mary Wollstonecraft left behind. She thus ends *Frankenstein* with the semiotic order overcoming the symbolic, and possibly lingering on with implication that the monster is alive. Bram Stoker similarly struggled with an authoritative mother who had become overprotective after his serious illness in childhood. Thus, in the character Dracula and throughout the depiction of the mother figure in the novel, traces of Stoker's personal life and the signs of the male perspective can be observed. In opposition to Shelley, Stoker ends his novel with the symbolic order keeping its hierarchal position intact. Furthermore, in *Dracula*, the female characters as well as those that become abject monsters, are not really given a voice to explain themselves. They are only there to be projected as devious, threateningly powerful beings who must be immediately killed. In

Frankenstein; however, the Creature is given an extensive amount of time to explain its own origin, its feelings and thoughts after coming to life.

CHAPTER 2

THE THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

2.1. The History of the Development of the Gothic in Britain

The term "Gothic" in our modern world has many connotations ranging from culture and literature to history, architecture and music. The original use of the word however, comes from a historical reference to a Germanic tribe that settled in Britain in 5th century A.D and contributed to the downfall of the Roman Empire. Their impact was described to be so destructive that in time, any other act or behaviour of violence came to be "frequently but improperly used as a general appellation of rude and warlike barbarism" (Gibbon 255). In architecture, Gothic refers to a medieval aesthetic, and a particular style of buildings and/or edifices which are distinctive by their sharply pointed spires, coloured glasses, ornate sculptures, and high ceiling corridors. This style appeared during the early 12th century, showing variations in different parts of Europe until the 16th century when the artistic ideals of the Renaissance were beginning to be established. In music, particularly during the 1970s and early 2000s, Gothic shows itself as a mixture of Rock/Metal genre, with the artists usually applying dark make-up and wearing dark coloured clothes. Through such groups as "The Cure," "The Damned and Specimen" and "Evanescence" Gothic was once again integrated into popular culture.

In visual arts such as video and filmmaking Gothic returns to earlier sources: the fiction of the 18th and 19th centuries. During the early 20th century, when movies or "moving pictures" were being produced for the first time, the inspiration was mostly sought from the "classic novels," *Frankenstein*, *Dracula*, *Dr. Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, and

so on. James Morgart traces this inspiration back to a 1922 German production, *Nosferatu*, and claims that the aesthetics of Gothic film was established after the appearance of it. In this silent black and white movie the audience follows the story of Thomas Hutter, who is summoned to an old mysterious castle by an equally mysterious persona, Count Orlok. *Nosferatu* visualizes the horrors authors used to create with words aided with eerie music, and with cramped, dark, and mysterious settings. With the advancements in technology, those motifs and props are replaced by CGI and Special Effects, most famously seen in the creation of such movies as Tim Burton's *Sleepy Hollow* (1999), Len Wiseman's *Underworld* (2003), and Guillermo del Toro's *Pan's Labyrinth* (2006).

Before delving into the world of Gothic literature, it is important to first consider the political, socio-economical and philosophical context of the 18th century, in which the first Gothic novel *The Castle of Otranto* (1796) was published. Dubbed as "The Enlightenment Age" this century is marked by the elevation of the human mind and the rejection of religious doctrines, unnatural phenomena, or things that cannot be explained by simple reason and/or observation. It is also an age when radical changes in politics, philosophy, economics and science occurred, which altered the fate of many countries. Especially during the latter half of the century, Britain sought to become a global power and extended its colonies throughout different continents. While this exponential growth certainly helped Britain in terms of resources and national wealth, on the other side, the country was also being overwhelmed with continuous political turmoil, and new understandings of freedom, government, and society with the French and American Revolutions. Inside, the monarchy was struggling with uprisings, most of which were causing the military to wane. All of these instances forced Britain to re-think their place in the ever-changing global scene, and their own identity as British citizens. It is in this context, Botting writes, "Gothic fiction can be said to blur rather than distinguish the boundaries that regulated social life, and interrogate, rather than restore, any imagined continuity between past and present, nature and culture, reason and passion, individuality and family and society" (Botting, *Gothic* 44).

In this regard, the birth of Gothic as a literary genre coincides with the important political and social changes in the 18th century. The term Gothic itself undergoes a change, from its initial reference to the historical Germanic tribe causing the downfall of the Roman Empire, to a concept which is "descriptive of anything medieval – in fact, of all things preceding about the middle of the seventeenth century" (Punter and Byron 7). Against the ideals of Classical Antiquity which swept the literary world, its obsession with stylized writing, and the didacticism of the early 18th century realist novels, Gothic fiction offers a narrative quite fragmented, characters and stories that are highly disturbing and grotesque, in the context of a barbaric/feudal past. In the preface to his "Gothic Story" *The Castle of Otranto* (1764), Horace Walpole – who is widely accepted as the precursor of the Gothic novel – explains his thoughts on the book and in a way, sums up the ideas of his age; "I have not written the book for the present age, which will endure nothing but cold common sense...I have given reigns to my imagination until I became on fire with visions and feelings which it excited" (Walpole 1767). As the importance of reason is replaced by the "visions and feelings" Walpole famously refers to, many early Gothic novels aimed to invoke in their readers a sense of *sublimity* "in which the mind is overwhelmed by, or swoons before, something greater than itself" (Punter and Byron 11). Edmund Burke, in *Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful* (1757) explains this sublimity in relation to an inevitable sense of terror;

> Whatever is fitted in any sort to excite the ideas of pain, and danger, that is to say, whatever is in any sort terrible, or is conversant about terrible subjects, or operates in a manner analogous to terror, is a source of the sublime; that is, it is productive of the strongest emotion which the mind is capable of feeling. (58-9)

In many of the early Gothic novels, the sublimity of the setting inside and outside plays an important role. Outside, the remote/rugged areas and great moors where the narrative usually takes place gives the reader a sense of loneliness and helplessness. Inside, the ruined castles, vast and empty mansions leaves its visitors insecure, in distress, and at a risk for danger. Nature, which was greatly depended upon by Enlightenment scholars as a source of knowledge and power, is also presented as a source of terror and an enemy, rather than a safe haven in which humans can take

solace. The dark and gloomy forests harbour mysteries unknown; night is a time where the villains can work best while darkness or a thick mist holds within their core, forces that are unnatural. As Burke notes, such motifs produce the horror effect in the desired way; "[I]n nature, dark, confused, uncertain images have a greater power on the fancy to form the grander passions, than those have which are more clear and determinate" (107). This is most vividly depicted in a scene in Ann Radcliffe's *The Mysteries of Udolpho* (1794) where the protagonist Emily reflects upon her surroundings on her way to Castle Udolpho;

> Emily had now a full view of Udolpho, with its gray walls, towers and terraces, high over topping the precipices and the dark woods, and glittering partially with the arms of the *condottieri*, as the sun's rays, streaming through an autumnal cloud, glanced upon a part of the edifice...She continued to gaze, through her tears, upon walls that, perhaps, confined Valancourt, and which now, as the cloud flouted away, were lighted up with sudden splendour...(284)

For the reader who lived in a world dominated by human reason, and which was slowly getting swept by liberalism and other political movements, these geographical locations are "beyond reason, law, and civilised authority, where there is no protection from terror or persecution" (Botting, *Gothic* 4). Especially for the Anglican British readers who began to populate the cities in the 18th century the physical distance of the setting plays a crucial role, separating them as the pure and civilized against the corrupted and barbaric Catholic Europe;

> It is within this context that Gothic invokes discourses of difference that distinguish "us" from "them," foreign from familiar, to create a domestic subject...Inspiring a mix of terror and delight, an attraction to exoticism and a simultaneous repulsion from difference, the Gothic representation of the foreign land figures in our ability to conceptualize Otherness. (Edwards 57)

The Gothic narratives of the 18th century is carried out by two central figures, and the power relationship between them. The villain, who is physically and/or economically powerful, who is mysterious and *dark* (in relation to both physical appearance and behaviour) tortures and harasses the female heroine; who in return is physically weak, young, inexperienced and prone to nervous breakdowns. The figures of aristocrats, monks, nuns, hysterics, criminals etc. are conveniently placed and used as physical embodiments of evil, who will be removed and conquered in the end. After their

removal, the order is re-established and the female is rewarded either with marriage or the long-awaited escape from her imprisonment.

Essentially an attempt to blend the "modern and the ancient romances" (Walpole 1764) Gothic as a literary genre has been subjected to changes. There are still recognizable features of the novels produced in this genre, as Ian Watt argues that Gothic works do not really concern themselves as much with character depth or depiction, but instead they focus more on the feelings invoked in the reader by placing them in a state of uncertainty and suspension. Similarly, Sir Walter Scott in discussing Horace Walpole argues that the author aims to "wind up the feelings of his readers till they become for a moment identified with those of a ruder age" (qtd. in Kilgour 7). However, in the 18th century, some critics such as Mary Wollstonecraft believed that Gothic posed a threat that makes the escape from moral/social and familial values possible;

> [T]he false expectations these wild scenes excite, tend to debauch the mind, and throw an insipid kind of uniformity over the moderate and rational prospects of life, consequently *adventures* are fought for and created, when duties are neglected, and content despised. (qtd. in Waters 93).

Rather than promoting morality and propriety, and depicting true representations of human life which many other realistic novels of the Enlightenment Age seems to do, Gothic cultivated and gave reign to passion, intense emotions, and superstitious beliefs. For Botting, the Gothic novel of the 18th century was a medium for its audience to distance themselves from the ideals of the age they lived in; "While it freed the writer from neo-classical conventions, it also imaginarily liberated readers from social constraints" (*Gothic* 43).

It is generally accepted that Gothic emerged as a literary genre with Horace Walpole entitling his work *The Castle of Otranto* (1764) as a "Gothic Story," and began to lose its popularity when Mary Shelley published her tale *Frankenstein* in 1818. Even though there was a subsequent decrease in the amount of books published in the Gothic tradition, the themes, motifs and the rhetoric of Gothic endured the coming of the 20th century. While in the earlier 18th century Gothic novels there is a return to the past and discussion of class issues, in the late 19th century, it can be observed that

Gothic arises from the present issues and unrest in the society, as well as from the concerns and problems that threaten the British Empire at the time. This century, beginning with the coronation of Queen Victoria in 1837 and lasting until 1901, was to be remembered and marked as The Victorian Age. No other period of time in history seems to witness such rapid advancements than the 19th century, where in every sphere from technology, industry and economy to medicine and politics, innovations of various kinds are observed. Especially towards the end of Queen Victoria's reign, the foundations of many modern branches of science and humanities emerged, with such scholars as Sigmund Freud introducing psychoanalysis, Charles Darwin publishing his controversial studies on human origin and evolution, and Cesare Lombroso establishing the study of criminology.

While this may seem like a prosperous era, the 19th century actually harboured a darker Britain where progression and regression coincided. While London flourished as the Imperial capital, it also began to populate faster than it could handle. Criminal activity as well as the number of criminals increased at an alarming speed, disease spread in the overly populated areas, prostitution became a common practice and the city was struggling with sanitation problems due to the issues of waste disposal and underdeveloped sewage system. And so, by the time Gothic re-emerged as a mode and genre, London and many other greatly populated cities themselves were becoming Gothic. The earlier signs of this phenomena were captured by many journalists such as Arthur Morrison, as he observed Brick Lane Street in East London:

> Black and noisome, the road sticky with slime, and palsied houses, rotten from chimney to cellar, leaning together, apparently by the mere coherence of their ingrained corruption. Dark, silent, uneasy shadows passing and crossing – human vermin in this reeking sink, like goblin exhalations from all that is noxious around. Women with sunken, black-rimmed eyes, whose pallid faces appear and vanish by the light of an occasional gas lamp, and look so like ill-covered skulls that we start at their stare.[2]

In this way, the traditional setting of remote landscapes, empty moors and vast, dark forests were beginning to be replaced by the equally remote and dark city slums where

[2] Morrison, Arthur. "Whitechapel," "The Palace Journal" April 24 1889, retrieved from: http://www.victorianweb.org/history/slums.html

"human vermin" lived. The streets which were covered in horse manure, coal residues and waste produced by factories; the notorious districts where disease and crime was widespread, were now sources of threat for the readers and characters alike. Unlike in the previous century where the reader was safe from whatever that caused horror, 19th century Gothic fiction placed its readers in a "familiar yet unfamiliar" setting in the heart of London, and even in the confinement of their own houses. Cornered both by real time events such as Jack the Ripper Murders and fictional terrors such as Count Dracula's coming to London, Victorians had nowhere to escape from the criminal or the *monster*.

Although shocking, tales of murder, revenge and bloodlust; monsters creeping in the corners, vengeful ghosts, escaped asylum patients, mad scientists and so on were immensely popular topics at the time, as "Penny Dreadfuls" – extensive stories published in cheap print paper – and long-winded serials such as "Varney the Vampire" appeared to the consummation of wide masses. Nicola Bown and other critics in *The Victorian Supernatural* explains this high interest in the paranormal by connecting it to the reality in which Victorians were living, suggesting that the fictional settings and the real ones paralleled each other greatly:

> It was not simply a matter of stories and storytelling, though, for the material world they inhabited often seemed somehow supernatural. Disembodied voices over the telephone, the superhuman speed of the railway, near instantaneous communication through telegraph wires: the collapsing of time and distance by modern technologies that were transforming daily life was often felt to be uncanny. (Bown et al.1)

In an age governed by empiricism and rationalism, it is inevitable that the stories that are written are linked to the developing world of science. Especially in the second half of the 19th century science was found in almost every sphere of daily life – in the newspapers, magazines, in literature, in shops and museums, and in exhibitions. It was during this time that the professionalization of modern sciences and their sub-categories appeared, as well as theories and new understandings of humanity. Kelly Hurley suggests that the ideas introduced at the time not only "demolished a comfortable anthropocentricism but they also problematized the relation between external appearances and internal reality" (56). Particularly, it was the theories of

evolution and degeneration, and various practises of psychology and criminology, which led to the idea that the humans were not the unique and perfect creatures who were on top of the evolutionary system. Instead, it was being discussed that humans were actually deviant and evil beings who could get destructive when freed from physical and/or social restrictions.

A concern not alien to 18th century Gothic novels, Victorians and Victorian Gothic writers were also aware of this fact, however, the distinction which marks Victorian Gothic as *Victorian*, is this preoccupation with the primitive/archaic forces that lies within human nature, and turns them into threats for the society, its moral codes and rules. Many Gothic stories, especially towards the end of the 19th century, held at their core the awareness of evil to be internal, rather than coming from or caused by other cultures or groups which were radicalized and externalized. The threat was now "sinuously curled around the very heart of the respectable middle-class norm" (Byron 150), instead of an outer source; an aristocratic villain, a deranged monk or a group of bandits. Thus, some of the most popular 19th century Gothic novels such as Bram Stoker's *Dracula*, Robert Louis Stevenson's *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, and Richard Marsh's *The Beetle*, were concerned with depicting these anxieties and fears, and how they were projected onto this one "Other," which was usually a monster or a monstrous figure. While in the 18th century these figures were made of spectres, monsters, corpses, skeletons, evil, monks or nuns, in the Victorian Age they were replaced and/or joined by familiar, every day figures such as scientists, criminals, asylum patients, middle class workers, fathers and husbands, etc. The narrative which was propelled by these characters, were often fragments of information given by various sources; testimonies, newspaper articles, diaries and other modern inventions of the time; phonograph diaries or photographs. Unlike the earlier Gothic novels which relied on manuscripts, ancient myths or stories delivered together from the perspective of the protagonist or an omniscient point of view, many Victorian Gothic novels depended on outside sources, multiple narrators and witnesses, accompanied by technological advances such as telegrams and voice records. In Richard Marsh's *The Beetle* for example, the story is told through a collection of testimonies by four characters, including a detective called Champnell, who is responsible for the final

collection of events. In Stevenson's *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, as the title suggests, a legal case is investigated by a small circle of men who work professionally in areas of law and medicine. Stevenson adds to his story the narrative of Dr. Lanyon, a lawyer called Mr. Utterson, and finally Henry Jekyll's "full statement" (Stevenson 119) of the case. Most famously in *Dracula*, Stoker includes relatively new methods of telling a story; telegrams, short hand writings – later deciphered by a character named Mina – magazine clippings, transcripts of phonograph diaries and so on.

Despite their differences, both 18th and 19th century Gothic texts come together on certain literary terms. Their aim, as aforementioned in the introduction, is to create ambiguous environments where the sense of reality and imagination is blurred, the stability of the mind is challenged, and where superstitious beliefs or paranormal beings such as ghosts, spirits, demons, and vampires are freely envisioned. For the audience who is generally used to reading neatly packed narratives and storylines directed by a moral compass, gothic texts offer quite the opposite:

> Ill-formed, obscure, ugly, gloomy, and utterly antipathetic to effects of love, admiration or gentle delight, gothic texts register revulsion, abhorrence, fear, disgust and terror...They were also considered anti-social in content and function, failing to encourage the acquisition of virtuous attitudes and corrupting readers' powers of discrimination with idle fantasies, seducing them from paths of filial obedience, respect, prudence, modest, and social duty. (Botting, *Gothic* 2)

The heroines and villains of these obscure tales, no matter what their social or economic status is, are placed in situations where laws of nature are suspended, and what may seem unreal may actually be a part of reality. Narratives employ this through limiting as much as possible the characters' and readers' knowledge. From the beginning of the story where the supernatural is introduced, to the ending which usually wraps up the events and reveals the source of horror, the reader is taken on a journey in which they are shocked and horrified yet curious to know, to learn, and perhaps to uncover the mystery themselves.

What is important in these narratives, Botting states, is not *how* or *why* the events happen, but the "production of affects, and emotions, often extreme and negative: fear,

anxiety, terror, horror, disgust and revulsion" (*Gothic* 6). Thus, from the first horror of Conrad's horrendous death in *The Castle of Otranto* to the terrifying transformation of Lucy into a vampire in *Dracula*, Gothic texts have continued to delight and horrify their readers and are doing so even in our century, where all the marvels of the universe are slowly being unravelled. In any era they emerge, Gothic novels are able to grasp their reader's attention either with modern concerns or with past anxieties. In the 21st century, Gothic returns with horrors familiar to us through different mediums such as cinema, art, music and theatre, and will continue to do so in the future with adaptations or transformations.

2.2 Monsters and Monstrous Beings in Gothic Fiction

Since ancient times and throughout centuries monsters have occupied the human mind. They have a special place in folklore, myths, oral tradition and have appeared abundantly in religious texts. Although their form and purpose has changed over the years, it can be said that monsters embody common concepts: our anxieties, fears, repressed feelings and urges. We are repulsed by them and shun them yet at the same time they are the very objects of curiosity and attraction. In Ancient Greek Mythology, monsters generally possessed animal forms, from the lion/goat/snake hybrid Chimera, to the nine headed serpent Hydra. These monsters appeared in famous epics such as Virgil's *Aeneid* and Homer's *Iliad*, as creatures to be fought and defeated. Similarly, in Old English and Medieval Literature, monsters emerged in animal shapes with some instances such as the Centaur, and the mermaid; both creatures with half human and half animal body parts. In time, as humanity evolved, monsters began to go through changes as well. They appeared in human form, having the normal human physiognomy yet possessing distinct supernatural qualities. Especially in late 19th century Gothic fiction, these monsters became complex characters with psychological depth in addition to their horrifying nature. Among them were Richard Marsh's sexless, half-God half-human hybrid Helene Vaughan, Bram Stoker's mysterious and powerful vampire Count Dracula, and Mary Shelly's Creature, who are depicted in various forms in different cinematic cultures.

To take the term back to its origin, the Oxford Online Dictionary defines a monster as "a large, ugly, and frightening imaginary creature," "a congenitally malformed or mutant animal or plant" or in its derivative form, "an inhumanly cruel or wicked person" ("Monster"). When etymologically traced, this word can first be found in the Latin language as *monstrum*, meaning "something to be shown, something that serves to demonstrate, (Latin, *monstrare*: to demonstrate) and to warn (Latin, *monere*: to warn)"[3]. This last connotation mainly refers to the monsters in Classical Age towards the Renaissance, as examples of divine punishment or bad omens which warn about upcoming trouble. Such was the case with *Beowulf*'s Grendel, a giant who was said to be cursed due to his descending from the lineage of the Biblical figure Cain. In the 16th and 17th century, giant sea monsters and creatures such as werewolves and ogres were depicted in world maps in destinations which sailors needed to avoid, and to discourage the competitions by other countries during the Age of Discovery. Monsters in this period were also associated with Christianity and religious beliefs. In Medieval books called the "Bestiaries" which were a collection of drawings and detailed information about animals, fantastic creatures such as sirens were included to prove the moral lesson that sailors, who indulged themselves in worldly pleasures, would be lured by the siren's songs and eventually lose their lives.

In the 18th century, monsters and monstrosity were explored under the light of scientific discoveries; they were very much part of reality instead of simply being confined to fiction;

> The monster assumed a scientized version of earlier forms in its use for both display and education, as the emphasis in eighteenth-century medical and scientific study was on the principle of instruction from aberration rather than from normality. Scientific monsters appeared in many forms: preserved specimens, anatomical models, casts, wax figures, drawings and skeletons as well as living beings. (Byron and Townshend 368)

However, it is by the latter half of the 19th century that a "predominantly secularised version of 'monstrosity'" (Smith 87) began to appear in fictional and non-fictional works. The term "monster" and the concept of the "Other" were popular terminology

[3] qtd. in Punter and Byron, *The Gothic*, pp. 263.

used by one group to label another person or group with apparent cultural, social, or physical differences than theirs. In her article *From Frankenstein's Monster to Lester Ballard*, Ashley Lancaster provides a clear definition of what the Other(s) actually stand(s) for: "Those people who fail where other people flourish typically become stigmatized as the Other in a society, an outsider who does not conform to that society's ideal image" (132). In the British society during the latter half of the 19th century, this "ideal" difference was usually disturbed by physical appearance, or resistance to abide by the strict moral codes of the society. There were many people who were "displayed" in freak shows, circuses, and "monster museums," to "demonstrate the culturally drawn boundaries between categories of normal and abnormal and thus confirm the self-satisfaction of those close to the norm" (Craton 35).

In fiction, particularly in Gothic narratives, the physical differences and anomalies were often transferred to the monsters or monstrous creatures such as vampires, shapeshifters, ghosts and even criminals. While these fictional monsters created a sense of dread and anxiety, the readers were nevertheless compelled to know more and more about them. In this regard, it is important to point at the dual nature of monstrosity in Gothic texts, and the feelings it causes in its readers. For Cohen, the monster is that "uncertain cultural body in which is condensed an intriguing simultaneity or doubleness" (ix). It attracts and repulses at the same time. We are attracted because a monster can commit any act (especially of sexual nature) without being condemned, that is, under the protection of being a monster, they can transgress the rigid social/psychological and sexual boundaries. We are repulsed, because this poses a real threat, that monsters could destroy those very boundaries which are thought to keep the identity and the society stable, pure and safe:

> Through the body of the monster fantasies of aggression, domination, and inversion are allowed safe expression in a clearly delimited and permanently liminal space. Escapist delight gives way to horror only when the monster threatens to overstep these boundaries, to destroy or deconstruct the thin walls of category and culture. (Cohen 17)

When combined with Kristeva's abject, Cohen's words give way to a deeper analysis of the monster or the Other. It is what humans dread the most, he suggests, the possibility of personally transgressing those boundaries that keep the identity safe. With the appearance of the abject monster, one is confronted both by a grotesque corporeality, and by the repressed feelings and urges concealed deep within the human psyche.

In many of the Gothic novels, especially towards the end of the 19th century, the two roles ascribed to monsters are played out excellently. They are there to point at what is abnormal; they establish difference *by means of difference* (Trueba 22); they scare us, but help us indulge in the "joys of being frightened," (Cohen 17), and finally, monsters demonstrate the repercussions of consciously transgressing the physical/psychological perimeters: the loss of oneness and the sense of identity.

2.3 Julia Kristeva's *Powers of Horror* and "The Abject"

Following the publication of *RPL*, Kristeva sets out to produce three major works, which will define her strategy of engaging with the "semiotic/symbolic threshold formative of signification" (Keltner 38). *Powers of Horror* (1980), *Tales of Love* (1983), and *Black Sun* (1987) respectively deal with the concepts of abjection, love, and melancholia, all of which exhibit for Kristeva "both permanent and historical crises of meaning and subjectivity" (Keltner 38). The theoretical framework which this thesis depends on is the earliest work in this trilogy; however, for the complete analysis of the argument presented in these pages, other works by Kristeva will also be made use of.

In *PH*, Kristeva introduces her concept called "the abject". Many of the critics who read her work, precariously tried to systematize what the concept refers to or what it means in general. However, as Kristeva emphasizes herself on many occasions, abjection is "above all ambiguity" (*PH* 9) and it "beseeches and pulverizes" the subject, leading them to a place "where meaning collapses" (*PH* 2). The abject can be everything that threatens the unifying signification of humankind, everything that can lead to the collapse of meaning, and thus "what disturbs identity, system, order" (*PH*

4). Although at first glance this can be analysed as a form of nihilism, Kristeva shows that abjection is a necessity in the formation of subjectivity. Given her background in psychoanalysis, it is natural for Kristeva to make such a connection, yet what makes abjection distinct is the fact that while it constructs the subject's identity, it can also be the reason why it collapses. For Kristeva, it is what generates and negates the subject at the same time (*RPL* 28).

For the most part, Kristeva seems to connect the sense of abjection to a "specific threshold experience specific to modern societies conditioned by a general crisis of meaning" (Keltner 72); however, she does not spare the past experiences of abjection, and analyses them through the concept of sin, confession, Biblical codes and "rite[s] of defilement" (*PH* 17). Analysing the modern social experiences of abjection, Kristeva proposes that modern literature – she examines the works of such authors as Marcel Proust, James Joyce, and Louis-Ferdinand Céline – is the "privileged signifier" (*PH* 208) of abjection, which offers us the possibility of "speaking that horror" (Becker-Leckrone 20). By way of creating their own language through literature, "[t]he writer, fascinated by the abject, imagines its logic, projects himself into it, introjects it, and as a consequence perverts language – style and content" (*PH* 16).

In the first chapter of *PH*, "Approaching Abjection," Kristeva sets to define abjection through opposing images of fear/desire, possible/impossible, repulsion/fascination, and "I" versus "not I" (*PH* 1). This final distinction is explained through the relationship between the *subject* and *object*, which lies at the foundation of abjection. Unlike the humanistic and rationalist notion which suggests that the subject emerges as a whole through a sturdy connection with the object, in Kristeva's view, the subject and the object do not support, but rather, oppose each other. The subject, as well as the object are problematic and the former develops in response to an "inaugural loss that laid the foundation of its own being" (*PH* 5). For Kristeva the object confronts, therefore stands opposite to the '*I;*" however through its opposition, the object also draws the subject towards "a desire for meaning," and so is "homologous" to it (*PH* 2). The abject, on the other hand, "is radically excluded" and draws the subject

towards the place where "meaning collapses" (*PH* 2). Thus, "[t]he abject, has only one quality of the object-that of being opposed to *I*" (*PH* 1). When the conventional subject/object relationship is disrupted as such, Kristeva states that the first crisis of subjectivity occurs and abjection comes into play. The latter, in this process, disrupts the borders which are thus far thought to securely separate the subject and the object. In *RPL*, and *PH* likewise, this initial experience of abjection is connected to the mother's presence (whereas in Lacan this would be tied with the Father or the phallus); "The abject confronts us, on the other hand, and this time within our personal archaeology, with our earliest attempts to release the hold of maternal entity even before ex-isting outside of her, thanks to the autonomy of language" (*PH* 13). According to Kristeva, this instance is highly necessary for a subject's maturation, and occurs during the early days of psychoanalytic development, which will be further discussed in this section.

Before moving on to the triad of subject-object-abject, it is important to briefly discuss Kristeva's psychoanalytic perspective on subject formation. Owing much to Freud and Lacan in developing her ideas, Kristeva reaches "further back to narrate an emphatically more primordial, extra-linguistic, and conflictual story of the subject" (Becker-Leckrone 27). While Lacan puts emphasis on the Mirror Stage where "the *I* is precipitated in a primordial form, before it is objectified in the dialectic of identification with the other, and before language restores to it…its function as subject" (qtd. In Becker-Leckrone 27)[4], Kristeva attributes the emergence of self to an earlier stage before the infant comes across the image of herself in front of the mirror. To account for this early signification of the subject, in *RPL* Kristeva introduces her enigmatic concept, "the semiotic." The semiotic is an "asymbolic" realm that is "also not reducible to Lacan's categories of the imaginary or the real – which precedes and exceeds the workings of the mirror stage" (Becker-Leckrone 28), and so is pre-language. In this realm, the symbiotic relationship the mother has with the infant, the heavy interdependence of the two where the mother takes care of, and accounts for every need of the infant; their shared laughter, crying and intimacy

[4] Lacan, Jacques. "The Mirror-Phase as Formative of the Function of the I," translated by Jean Roussel, *New Left Review*, vol. 51, 1968, pp. 72. Web. 8 Feb. 2019.

establishes a "place or space of significant activity" (Covino 19) which Kristeva calls the *semiotic chora*. The chora for Kristeva is

> not yet a position that represents something for someone (i.e., it is not a sign); nor is it a position that represents someone for another position (i.e., it is not yet a signifier either); it is, however, generated in order to attain to this signifying position. (*RPL* 26)

For Kristeva, the chora is explained in close relation to the development of the abject; "[T]he semiotic chora is no more than the place where the subject is both generated and negated, the place where his unity succumbs before the process of charges and stages that produce him" (*RPL* 28). In this intimate world, before the articulation of the linguistic sign "as the absence of an object and as the distinction between real and symbolic" (*RPL* 26) Kristeva proposes that the first instance of abjection is experienced.

To return to the earlier discussion on development of subjectivity, it is now relevant to explain Kristeva's precise argument. Firstly, it can be derived that Kristeva situates the subject's formation at an earlier stage before the entrance of language, before Lacan's Symbolic stage. In a "narcissistic crisis" (*PH* 14) the infant is driven by an impulse to expel the Mother, to separate itself "in the immemorial violence with which a body becomes separated from another body in order to be" (*PH* 10). As the mother for Kristeva holds a strong authority before "the law of the father" steps in, the infant's separation from the mother is a "violent, clumsy breaking away" (*PH* 13). However, as the mother exerts a power over the subject throughout the course of its life, the latter is under "the constant risk of falling back under the sway of a power as securing as it is stifling" (13). In this regard, the mother, "with all her elements of the self that threaten or violate codes of behaviour and discursive expression" (Covino 21) must be abjected. Abjection thus becomes a twofold concept which represents the infant's "initial confrontation with an ambiguous maternal space that is *both the condition of and a threat* to the *infans'* own being" (Keltner 46; emphasis added). It is deeply engraved into the human psyche, something one will continuously experience in its life, it is "an inescapable boomerang, a vortex of summons and repulsion [that] places the one haunted by it literally beside himself" (*PH* 1). Similarly, in Freud's

theorization of "the uncanny," one feels threatened by feelings that are repressed and hidden deep in the unconscious. For Freud the uncanny is not something new or experienced once in a subject's life but it is "something familiar and old - established in the mind that has been estranged only by the process of repression" (47). In that sense, abjection could be linked to the uncanny; however, for Kristeva abjection is "[e]ssentially different from 'uncanniness,' more violent, too, [abjection] is elaborated through a failure to recognize its kin; nothing is familiar, not even the shadow of a memory" (*PH* 5).

On the individual level, the first experience of abjection takes place during the infantile years. Throughout the life of a subject, experience(s) of abjection pursues, and emerges in the crucial moments, during the "most intimate and most serious apocalypses" (*PH* 208). It is as Kristeva emphasizes, what radically displaces the subject from its proper place, yet at the same time what is necessary for an individual's psychoanalytic development. On the societal level, Kristeva examines abjection through the history of Christianity and Judaism, and identifies a set of codes, or codifications that lay the foundation of the abject. These religious, moral and ideological codes are simultaneously what liberates and represses the abject (*PH* 209), and work through certain cultural prohibitions, taboos, and religious rituals. Historically, in the primitive cultures, the religious codifications of abjection have shown for Kristeva the struggle to ward off evil, and safely separate the borders between inside/outside, society/subject. Beardsworth, in her analysis of Kristeva suggests that what these religious codifications actually accomplish is, "*causing it to exist* through an act of exclusion that shifts the abject from the border of the subject" (119).

The primary act(s) of exclusion Kristeva identifies, are the "rites of purification" against filth and defilement. They are only "one of the possible foundings of abjection bordering the frail identity of the speaking being" (*PH* 67). The danger of filth, uncleanliness and disorderliness is always present as a threat to both an individual and to the collective consciousness of society. Developing her ideas of defilement in relation to Mary Douglas' ideas in *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of*

Pollution and Taboo (1966) Kristeva proposes that filth "applies only to what relates to a boundary and, more particularly, represents the object jettisoned out of that boundary, its other side, a margin" (*PH* 69). From the margin(s), emanates bodily wastes; spit, milk, blood, excrement, urine, sweat etc. all of which for Douglas, and subsequently for Kristeva posit a "potency of pollution" (*PH* 69) which like the abject, threatens the social and symbolic orderliness: "Or, to put it another way, the danger of filth represents for the subject the risk to which the very symbolic order is permanently exposed, to the extent that it is a device of discriminations, of differences" (*PH* 69). The bodily wastes the subject produces, or rather expels, render the body obscure, equivocal, and thus unstable on the properly defined boundaries of the symbolic and social order. Thus, abjection cannot be removed from an individual's experience or from a society's, when physically our bodies are the source of internal and external pollution. By way of such acts or rituals of purification, societies repeatedly attempt to ward off the abject;

> The body's inside...shows up in order to compensate for the collapse of the border between inside and outside. It is as if the skin, a fragile container, no longer guaranteed the integrity of one's "own and clean self" but, scraped or transparent, invisible or taut, gave way before the dejection of its content. (*PH* 53)

According to Kristeva, filth and defilement is subjected to these rites of purification with derivations in different religions. As such, abjection too "assumes specific shapes and different codings according to the various 'symbolic system'" (*PH* 68). Religion, in Kristeva's view, "assumes the task of warding off that danger" (*PH* 64) and through the imposition of pure/impure, and through the purification rites the subject is provided a grounds to ward off the abject. In *PH*, these rituals are described in the following way:

> It is as if dividing lines were built up between society and a certain nature, as well as within the social aggregate, on the basis of the simple logic of *excluding filth*, which, promoted to the ritual level of *defilement*, founded the "self and clean" of each social group if not each subject. The purification rite appears then as that essential ridge, which, prohibiting the filthy object, extracts it from the secular order and lines it at once with a sacred facet. Because it is excluded as a possible object, asserted to be non-object of desire, abominated as ab-ject, as abjection, filth becomes defilement and founds on

> the henceforth released side of the "self and clean" the order that is thus only (and there, always already) sacred. (*PH* 65)

In her discussion of filth, Kristeva argues that objects of pollution are not always signalling at an internal or external decay. "[N]either tears nor sperm" (*PH* 71) for example, are subjected to purification rites, and among those that *are* subjected to them, there are privileged ones. Kristeva thus identifies two types of polluting objects, the first one of which, *excremental*, "stand[s] for the danger to identity that comes from without: the ego threatened by the non-ego, society threatened by its outside, life by death" (*PH* 71). It is what essentially "sets up" the border between *inside and outside* (Lechte 163). The second, *menstrual blood* "stands for the danger issuing from within the identity (social or sexual); it threatens the relationship between the sexes within a social aggregate and, through internalization, the identity of each sex in the face of sexual difference" (*PH* 71). Through a psychoanalytic approach, Kristeva suggests that these two defilements in particular "stem from the maternal and/or feminine, of which the maternal is the real support" (*PH* 71). This hints at a previous argument mentioned in *RPL*; the authority of the maternal, or the semiotic. In effect, defilement is closely connected with the maternal; "[D]efilement is the translinguistic spoor of the most archaic boundaries of the self's clean and proper body. In that sense if it is a jettisoned object, it is so from the mother" (*PH* 73). For Kristeva, the archaic, maternal authority thus has a correlation with purification rites, and the primal mapping of a subject's body:

> Through frustrations and prohibitions, this authority shapes the body into a territory having areas, orifices, points and lines, surfaces and hollows, where the archaic power of mastery and neglect, of the differentiation of proper-clean and improper-dirty, possible and impossible is impressed and exerted. It is a 'binary logic' a primal mapping of the body that I call semiotic to say that, while being the precondition of language, it is dependent upon meaning, but in a way that is not that of linguistic signs nor of the symbolic order they found. Maternal authority is the trustee of that mapping of the self's clean and proper body: it is distinguished from paternal laws" (*PH* 72)

The emphasis Kristeva puts on maternal authority here, points at an essential difference which marks the semiotic authority as different from the authority of the symbolic. Defilement and the rituals surrounding it, are what separate the subject from

the mother (and thus abjects her) and helps propel itself to the proper/clean, separate realm of the symbolic:

> [T]he rites surrounding defilement, particularly those involving excremential and menstrual variants, shift the border (in the psychoanalytic meaning relating to borderline patients) that separates the body's territory from the signifying chain; they illustrate the boundary between semiotic authority and symbolic law. (*PH* 73)

The clash between the two authorities in relation to the purification rites, signals an important indication. In the societies where paternal law takes constant hold and the purification rites seem to be on the front, maternal authority is greatly repressed. By way of contrast, when there is an "instability in the function that stabilizes the language/body opposition, semiotic authority shows up," and so "[p]urification rituals manifest the effort and failure of symbolic, paternal law to fully regulate the members of the society" (Beardsworth 128). This, for Kristeva, stems from an archaic fear, the fear of the mother's generative power (*PH* 77). It is thus "not surprising" Kristeva says, "to see pollution rituals proliferating in societies where patrilineal power is poorly secured, as if the latter sought, by means of purification, a support against excessive matrilineality" (*PH* 77).

According to Kristeva, the epitome of abjection is experienced during the encounter with the corpse, the cadaver. It is the ultimate defilement, what pollutes and renders the boundary between life and death obscure, depriving the subject of a proper separation from what it expels; "[T]he corpse, the most sickening of wastes, is a border that has encroached upon everything. It is no longer I who expel, "I" is expelled" (*PH* 4). The confrontation with the corpse is a paramount event for Kristeva, as it openly shows abjection resisting the borders set to keep the subject distinct from the object;

> In that compelling, raw, insolent thing in the morgue's full sunlight, in that thing that no longer matches and therefore no longer signifies anything, I behold the breaking down of a world that has erased its borders...The corpse, seen without God and outside of science, is the utmost of abjection. It is death infecting life. Abject. It is something rejected from which one does not part, from which one does not protect oneself as from an object. Imaginary uncanniness and real threat, it beckons to us and ends up engulfing us. (*PH* 4)

Abjection takes hold, dizzies and sickens the subject with the corpse that "no longer signifies anything" (*PH* 4). Kristeva believes "a flat encephalograph" (*PH* 3) instead, could be a signifier for death and thus could protect the subject from a violent confrontation with the corpse. Nevertheless, corpses are still crucial to subjectivity as they "*show* me what I permanently thrust aside in order to live," "as in true theater, without makeup or masks" (*PH* 3). Even though the corpse – especially when it has sentimental value for a person – is what we dread to see, it is still attractive to us as in the sense that the abject is what repulses, and attracts at the same time. We are intrigued yet repulsed, just as in a horror movie in which one cannot look away, but is horrified from what is unfolding in the scene.

As filth and defilement are subjected to purification rituals, so does the corpse. In dealing with what poses as threat to the symbolic order and coming face to face with the abject, Goodnow proposes that there are three components constituting the rituals surrounding the corpse. The first one is identifying and confirming if one is dead; "a search for the pulse, a mirror at the mouth...from one lay person's decision to judgement by a recognized authority (shaman, chief, midwife, physician)" (48), and in some cases, making sure they remain dead; "Vampires, for instance, require silver bullets, or burials at the crossroads with a stake through the heart" (48). The second component may vary from one society to another. The body may be cremated in some religions, while in other belief systems it may be mummified, placed in a box or buried with valuables. The last component Goodnow identifies is related to the location where the dead will remain; "a funeral pyre, a tree, a box in the ground, the depths of the sea" (48). What is crucial in identifying these components are the short, controlled moments of contact with the abject. In the end, the symbolic law still dictates that the dead will remain as such, and will be cast away from the world of the living. For Kristeva, this necessity comes from a religious background;

> A decaying body, lifeless, completely turned into dejection, blurred between the inanimate and the inorganic, a transitional swarming, inseparable lining of a human nature whose life is undistinguishable from the symbolic-the corpse represents fundamental pollution. A body without soul, a non-body, disquieting matter, it is to be excluded from God's territory as it is from his speech. Without always being impure, the corpse is "accursed of God"

> (Deuteronomy 21:23): it must not be displayed but immediately buried so as not to pollute the divine earth. (*PH* 109)

The rituals surrounding the corpse, and the concept of death, reminds us once again how an individual or a society confronts what is abject. Whatever the case may be, the abject must be removed immediately and *jettisoned*, to the other side of the border where the impure, the unclean and disorder rest. While this may seem to result in the emergence of a healthy and conscious individual and society, Kristeva is quick to mention that abjection is a "universal phenomenon; one encounters it as soon as the symbolic and/ or social dimension of man is constituted, and this throughout the course of civilization" (*PH* 68).

In this way, the process of confronting the abject and shunning it away from the self can be likened to a vicious cycle which engulfs an individual from the beginning of their life, until they themselves become the very paradigm of waste/defilement: a corpse. What should not be missed in this discussion is that it is not always a state of uncleanliness or pollution which triggers abjection, but the general threat it poses for the subject, and the society. Kristeva thus mentions that "lack of cleanliness or health" (*PH* 4) are not the immediate causes of abjection but the ambiguous nature they hold against the rational and pure subject.

On the individual or social level, the horrifying face of the abject for Kristeva can show its face in "[t]he traitor, the liar, the criminal with a good conscience, the shameless rapist, the killer who claims he is a savior" (*PH* 4). Moreover, what amplifies the threat of the abject is "premeditated crime, cunning murder, hypocritical revenge," (*PH* 4) as they point at the instability of the social/symbolic system that the subject is in. Any crime committed with or without a conscience is abject – since it shows the fragility of the law, and a fracture in the prevailing system/order. Thus, abjection is in close relation to "perversion...because it neither gives up nor assumes a prohibition, a rule, or law; but turns them aside, misleads, corrupts; uses them, takes advantage of them, the better to deny them" (*PH* 15). There is one distinction Kristeva makes however: it is the "amoralist, the rebel against the law" and those who commit "liberating, suicidal crime" (*PH* 4). These, Kristeva believes are not abject in nature, for the true image of the abject is "immoral, sinister, scheming, and shady: a terror

that dissembles, a hatred that smiles, a passion that uses the body for barter instead of inflaming it, a debtor who sells you up, a friend who stabs you" (*PH* 4).

For Kristeva, the one "spokesperson" of abjection, the medium which "represents the ultimate coding of our crises, of our most intimate and most serious apocalypses" (*PH* 208) is literature. Although she mentions different forms of art, none other than literature – especially modern literature – she inspects such authors as Dostoyevsky, Lautreamont, Proust, Artaud, Kafka, Céline etc. – holds such a power in "unveiling the abject" as "[l]iterature has always been the most explicit realization of the signifying subject's condition' (*RPL* 82). In the final chapters of *PH*, Kristeva examines this power of great modern literature, or the work of avant-garde authors in relation to religion. She suggests that religions, in the world of the 20th century have lost their power to lead masses, and exert prohibitions due to the fact that people are "too aware of their techniques to yield to them" (*PH* 133). What, or who then would take on the burden of speaking the abject, representing it? Kristeva's answer lies in the modern writer, and the work they produce;

> [T]he aesthetic task...amounts to retracing the fragile limits of the speaking being...Through that experience, which is nevertheless managed by the Other, "subject" and "object" push each other away, confront each other...at the boundary of what is assimilable, thinkable: abject. Great modern literature unfolds over that terrain: Dostoyevsky, Lautreamont, Proust, Artaud, Kafka, Céline. (*PH* 18)

Moreover, "[t]he writer, fascinated by the abject, imagines its logic, projects himself into it, introjects it, and as a consequence perverts language – style and content' (*PH* 16). For critics like Beardsworth, what this perversion of language actually signifies is "to bring out the impossibility, that is to say, the 'power play' the 'necessary and absurd seeming' of religion, morality, and law as systems of representation" (142). In Kristeva's view, the confrontation with the abject and purifying it is a process which religion and literature hold in common; "The various means of purifying the abject- the various catharses- make up the history of religions, and end up with that catharsis par excellence called art...the artistic experience, which is rooted in the abject it utters...appears as the essential component of religiosity" (*PH* 17). However, "when all is said and done," when the collapse of all meaning come about, literature will be

the sole survivor of this apocalypse as it is "destined to survive the collapse of the historical forms of religions" (17).

In a span of more than two hundred pages and eleven chapters, Kristeva aims to explain her concept of abjection. In addition to her inventive vocabulary, complex clauses and idioms, colourful and abstract imagery, Kristeva's explanation of abjection works "largely by declaring what it is not" (Becker-Leckrone 36). Her initial description in the very first paragraph of the book shows how abjection is "above all ambiguity," and resists proper definition, yet it is always present and accompanies the subject throughout its life. It does not spare anyone, not even infants, man or woman, or the collective consciousness of a society. Abjection for Kristeva, is what constructs and deconstructs a subject; through the moral, religious, social codes of a society and the individual's relationship with them.

In general, abjection can refer to a moment of "extreme subjectivity," where the subject experiences "a crisis in which the borders of self and other radically break down" (Becker-Leckrone 151). The first moment a subject experiences this crisis is in the initial separation as an infant from the Mother, in a stage before the entrance of the symbolic law. Kristeva differs in this argument from Lacan's ideas on psychoanalytic development. She suggests that the infant does not need the Symbolic law or the regulation of language to properly carry itself into a social system/order. One of Kristeva's crucial arguments at this point, is the importance she puts on what she calls the "semiotic," the realm of the mother. When the subject does get to the stage – that is when a subject successfully abjects the mother – the sense of abjection does not stop following them, as "from its place of banishment, the abject does not stop challenging its master" (*PH* 2). The manifestations of abjection can appear in any moment of crisis, during moments of extreme horror, loathing of food or lack of morality and purity. It is highly personal, as much as it is experienced on a collective level in different societies and on different levels.

CHAPTER 3

FRANKENSTEIN

The aim of this chapter is to study Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818) through a focus on the protagonist Victor Frankenstein and his monstrous creation. In *Frankenstein*, Mary Shelley presents us what can be deemed abject in a material form; a creature made and animated by parts of various human corpses. In the process of creating this monster and the aftermath of its coming to life, the novel shows us how Victor gradually loses his sense of identity, his position in the symbolic order and how he falls victim to the temptations of abjection. Furthermore, the Creature's gross materiality along with Victor's treatment of it, is shown to be a yearning for and ultimate rejection of the mother. This is what Kristeva places at the centre of her concept of *abjection*, as the subject's first experience of it and something which is necessary for their development; "Matricide is our vital necessity, the sine qua non condition of our individuation" (*BL* 27-28). In this regard, this chapter will also explore "monstrous" maternity, and the abjection of it as represented by Victor and the Creature.

Frankenstein is a work of fiction which "defies a single interpretation" (Johnson viii.) and explores many topics ranging from science, society, the formation of human nature and psyche, to femininity, masculinity and sexuality. With a narrative structure resembling Chinese boxes, *Frankenstein* presents us "multiple layers of hearsay testimony;" (Gamer 101) Victor Frankenstein's, the Creature's, and a sailor's, who is named Walton. Through their accounts we witness as readers, how Victor is first tempted by the abject, then drawn into it and finally, reaches a state in which he cannot

be distinguished from the monster he has created. Mary Shelley provides us with a retrospective and detailed account of Victor's psychological development which greatly contributes to the main argument this thesis aims to pursue. His early life where he mentions his close relationship with Elizabeth, who is "there to subdue [him] to a semblance of her own gentleness" (31), and his mother whose existence Victor perceives "as part of [their] own" (35); almost foreshadows, and gives us hints about his troublesome journey to abjection, and to the ultimate creation of the monster which Hogle sees as "a desire to reunite with his dead mother and somehow engender artificial life from her and his biological decay" (*Introduction* 5). This heavy dependence on the mother and a mother like figure which Victor signals through his early recounting of his childhood, brings him close to the realm of abjection, and thus to the realm of the "archaic mother" (*PH* 77).

In following Victor's journey from a stable, unified symbolic identity to a fragmented Kristevean "speaking subject," it is important to trace his steps before, during and after he completes his creature. Therefore, the first part of this analysis will follow the events before the creation, when the sailor captain Walton begins his narrative after a stranger drifts towards his ship on a large block of ice, and decides to disclose his story to him. The sailors and the captain himself are all captivated by this stranger, although the latter's state is something resembling "wildness and even madness" (Shelley 21). Moreover, he is in a poor health condition, in a "decaying frame" (22) and on the verge of death. However, after Walton aids the stranger – who reveals himself to be Victor Frankenstein – he is restored to health and begins his narration starting from his childhood, until his eventual "ruin" (32). From Victor's narration, we learn that he was a child who never "trembled at a tale of superstition, or to have feared the apparition of a spirit (41). At a young age, he was not scared of darkness, and visited the churchyard often to see people being buried and body parts being gruesomely handled. Furthermore, Victor explains that he was always "capable of more intense application, and was more deeply smitten with the thirst of knowledge" (29) than her cousin Elizabeth, whose "saintly soul...shone like a shrine-dedicated lamp in our home" (31). Instead of pursuing scientific knowledge and aspiration, Elizabeth indulged herself in such affairs as "the creations of the poets; and in the

majestic and wondrous scenes which surrounded our Swiss home" (30). Within the first chapter of the story Shelley shows how masculine and feminine natures are separated, and how science and the pursuit of knowledge strongly defines them. However, what Shelley is concerned with, as Johnson puts it, is not the separation of these two spheres, but "the removal of any feminine element" from the scientific process of obtaining knowledge ("Introduction" x).

In this respect, Victor is sent to university in Ingolstadt to pursue a career in science. He meets a new professor, Mr. Waldman in the university and gets encouraged to study the works of medieval scholars such as Cornelius Agrippa, Albertus Magnus and Paracelsus. Unlike Victor's father who labels their work as "sad trash" (Shelley 31), and the other professors who quickly displaced them as "useless names" (37), Mr. Waldman seems to enjoy them and approves Victor's enthusiasm. For Botting, this instance is a display of the "romanticisation of science" on Shelley's side, which in the end will lead to the "torrential overcoming of boundaries and the vision of a new species;" ("Frankenstein, Werther and the Monster of Love" 12) an endeavour Victor will soon take upon himself:

> As he went on I felt as if my soul was grappling with a palpable enemy; one by one the various keys were touched which formed the mechanism of my being: chord after chord was sounded, and soon my mind was filled with one thought, one conception, one purpose...I will pioneer a new way, explore unknown powers, and unfold to the world the deepest mysteries of creation. (Shelley 38)

Similar to the Biblical story of the creation of Eve and Adam, Victor seems to be in a scientific frenzy and takes upon himself the burden of creation. He even goes as far to say that he will be a "father," (43) and a "new species would bless [him] as its creator and source; many happy and excellent natures would owe their being to [him]" (43). The above account by Victor is intriguing since it suggests transgressive behaviour and an attempt to disrupt the boundaries between life and death, moral and immoral, creator and creation; all of which are binaries firmly established in the era Shelley writes in. Victor reveals that although he finds it impossible to renew life "where death had apparently devoted the body to corruption" (43) he is still pursued and urged forward by "a resistless, and almost frantic, impulse" (43). This pursuit is

so destructive that it causes Victor to cut off all his interaction with the outer world, confine him to a solitary apartment, and make him lose "all soul or sensation" (43). He is slowly being enticed by his *abject quest*, as Kristeva states it is what happens to abjection's so many "fascinated victims" (*PH* 9). Those who are engulfed by it, are both attracted and repulsed by abjection at the same time; "One does not know it, one does not desire it, one joys in it [*on enjouit*]. Violently and painfully. A passion." (*PH* 9).

In this way, Victor is driven by a "frantic impulse" which he often questions himself yet does not seem to hold the power to oppress or get rid of; "[O]ften did my human nature turn with loathing from my occupation, whilst, still urged on by an eagerness which perpetually increased...I could not tear my thoughts from my employment, loathsome in itself, but which had taken an irresistible hold of my imagination" (Shelley 43-44). The last statement here is especially of importance as it tells us a great deal of the thought process Victor is going through. At this point, Victor seems to acknowledge a separation between his "human nature," and a side which he does not name yet – or cannot in this matter – that opposes the creation of the monster. He also recognizes the impulse, or desire he is driven by towards his monstrous creation which will not be satiated until "the great object, which swallowed up every habit of [his] nature, should be completed" (44).

After long, arduous experimentation, Victor reveals that he successfully created and animated the monster, or in its other names; the "dreaded spectre" (48), "a blot on the earth" (93), an "ogre" (109), a "demonical corpse "(46), and an "abortion" (169). These last two names are crucial in linking Kristeva's abjection, particularly maternal abjection with the creation of the monster. In discussing the doctoral thesis of Louis-Ferdinand Céline – whose work is central in her analysis of abjection and who she describes as "fascinating, mysterious, intimately nocturnal, and liberating" (*PH* 133) – Kristeva mentions Céline's interest in the studies of Semmelweis, a Hungarian doctor during the 18th century. According to Semmelweis, puerperal fever in woman after childbirth, may result from contamination of the female genitalia by a corpse,

when doctors do not wash their hands after interacting with the latter. This, Kristeva reads as,

> a fever where what bears life passes over to the side of the dead body. Distracting moment when opposites (life/death, feminine/masculine) join in order to constitute what is probably more than a defense fantasy against the persecuting power of the mother: a panic hallucination of the inside's destruction, of an interiorization of death following the abolishment of limits and differences. (*PH* 159-160).

In effect, when Victor finishes his creature he experiences a fever similar to a woman giving birth and going through afterbirth infections such as the puerperal fever. Victor "gives birth" to a monster, and catches a "slow fever" (Shelley 45) which confines him to bed. He traverses life, and enters the realm of the dead, of abjection, to bring about what will be neither, a grotesque embodiment of Kristeva's abject: the Creature. The Creature in this regard, is appropriately called an "abortion," (169) and a "demonical corpse," (46) as it is neither dead nor alive. In Kristeva's terms, Victor faces the creature in a "panic hallucination" (*PH* 159) and begins to feel more than ever, the effects of abjection, and his identity being violently shaken to its foundations:

> But my enthusiasm was checked by my anxiety, and I appeared rather like one doomed by slavery to toil in the mines, or any other unwholesome trade, than an artist occupied by his favourite employment. Every night I was oppressed by a slow fever, and I became nervous to a most painful degree; the fall of a leaf startled me, and I shunned my fellow-creatures as if I had been guilty of a crime. (Shelley 45)

For Kristeva, a subject experiences, or feels the *desire* to experience abjection at an early stage in their life. The first instance of abjection occurs during the infantile years, when there is a heavy dependence on the mother, and a symbiotic relationship between the infant and the mother. Developing her ideas on Lacan's psychoanalytic development, Kristeva locates abjection in a place which she conceptualizes as "the semiotic," or "the semiotic chora," which precedes the Symbolic stage, and therefore, precedes language. In *RPL* Kristeva explains it as such: "[T]he semiotic chora is no more than the place where the subject is both generated and negated, the place where his unity succumbs before the process of charges and stages that produce him" (28). In order for the infant to pass this stage and successfully move onto the realm of the

Father or the Symbolic, the mother, ultimately must be abjected. In a "narcissistic crisis" (*PH* 14) the infant is driven by an impulse to expel the Mother, to separate itself "in the immemorial violence with which a body becomes separated from another body in order to be" (*PH* 10). Such is the violence Victor experiences when he works to assemble his creature. In this sense, Victor's creation and the process he goes through before and after it can be explained as his identity being "generated, and negated," into a final, abject identity. While Victor strives to reunite with his mother and achieve successful abjection of her as Hogle suggests, what he will eventually face however, is not a successful re-entry to the patriarchal, symbolic realm, but rather a "violent, clumsy breaking away" (*PH* 13) from it.

Thus, the abjection in *Frankenstein* reaches its peak when Victor narrates the Creature coming to life. Instead of relief and scientific satiation he hoped he would achieve after his creation, Victor is left with feelings of horror and disgust. When he gazes into his creature's eyes and receives its gaze back, his horror is amplified and causes him to hastily leave the room and abandon the Creature;

> How can I describe my emotions at this catastrophe, or how delineate the wretch whom with such infinite pains and care had I endeavoured to form...For this I had deprived myself of rest and health. I had desired it with an ardour that far exceeded moderation; but now that I had finished, the beauty of the dream vanished, and breathless horror and disgust filled my heart. Unable to endure the aspect of the being I had created, I rushed out of the room, and continued a long time traversing my bedchamber, unable to compose my mind to sleep. (Shelley 45)

The Creature's grotesque appearance furthers Victor's disgust and loathing towards it. The scientific and natural boundaries having already been violated, Victor faces this deadly transgression, and responds as if he has seen the result *for the first time*:

> His limbs were in proportion, and I had selected his features as beautiful. Beautiful! Great God! His yellow skin scarcely covered the work of muscles and arteries beneath; his hair was of a lustrous black and flowing; his teeth of a pearly whiteness; but 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.

The moment the Creature is alive, it sets up its own "Otherness". It is not a "seamless and unified organic whole, but a jagged collection of pieces: muscles, arteries, pearly teeth, straight black lips, yellow skin and watery eyes," (Chu 2010) everything that would separate it from a normal human being. The Creature's abject status is displayed by these "artifical" body parts; its "watery eyes" that suggested disease, its "yellow skin" which did not hide the palpitation of the arteries beneath, and its "straight black lips" that give a sign of lack of blood or heart failure. Nevertheless, the Creature is still a site of attraction with its "lustrous black and flowing" hair and "teeth of pearly whiteness". Shelley's "hideous progeny" ("Author's Introduction" 5) in this sense, not only constructs its own "made-upness" but also its own liminal status between life and death. It is upon this sight that one "becomes separated within [themselves] due to the attendant horror at the distinction between life and death" (Diederich 22).

Ultimately a corpse brought back to life, the Creature in Kristevean terms is "death infecting life," it is "the utmost of abjection" (*PH* 166). When one confronts a corpse, they realize they are "at the border of [their] condition as a living being. [The] body extricates itself, as being alive, from that border" (*PH* 166). And so when the Creature confronts him, Victor experiences abjection in its most corporeal form. He is then reduced to an immobile state, unable to use language to specify his "breathless horror," (Shelley 45) and once he leaves the room he falls asleep, only to be woken up by the Creature gazing at him again; "I started from my sleep with horror; a cold dew covered my forehead, my teeth chattered, and every limb became convulsed" (Shelley 46).

In this scene, Shelley gives us an insight into Victor's subconscious as he falls asleep. In a dream, Victor sees Elizabeth and for a moment he seems to be relieved. He rushes to hug her yet when he pulls away to look at her face, Victor is horrified to see Elizabeth gradually turning into a "worm-ridden image" of his mother; "[H]er features appeared to change, and I thought that I held the corpse of my dead mother in my arms; a shroud enveloped her form, and I saw the grave-worms crawling in the folds of the flannel" (Shelley 46). This momentous scene anticipates for many critics the

works of Sigmund Freud, his practice of psychoanalysis, and most importantly for this study, Victor's confrontation with the abject as well as the abject mother. Through Victor's dream, Shelley shows us that instead of returning to the "securing power" (*PH* 13) of the mother Victor felt as a child – and as an adult – what is confronted in the end is the "archaic mother," "with all her elements of the self that threaten or violate codes of behaviour and discursive expression" (Covino 21). Hogle, in his analysis of Kristeva's "speaking subject," states that this confrontation with the mother is what lies in the core of our being;

> What we "throw off," she suggests, is all that is "in-between...ambiguous...co-mposite" in our beings, the fundamental inconsistencies that prevent us from declaring a coherent and independent identity to ourselves and others [PH 4]. The most primordial version of this "in-between" is the multiplicity we viscerally remember from the moment of birth, at which we were both inside and outside of the mother and thus both alive and not yet in existence (in that sense dead). It is this "immemorial violence" that lies at the base of our beings and is one basis of the primal chaos calling us back, yet it is that morass from which we always feel we must "become separated in order to be" a definable person. ("Introduction" 7)

The dream scene is analysed in detail by many critics such as Diane Hoeveler, who states that Victor's dream represents a "'moment of desire' in the novel, with its conflation of the sexualized Elizabeth ('desire') and the dead mother ('lack')" (51). The word "lack" here gives a reference to Kristeva's "inaugural loss" (*PH* 5) which she locates at the foundation of subjectivity. For Kristeva, when the subject tries to identify with "something on the outside" it gets confronted by an impossibility, and realize that "abjection constitutes its very *being*, that it *is* none other than abject" (*PH* 5). In this regard, when Victor creates the monster in the hopes that one day he might transfer this knowledge to another attempt and revive his mother, he faces the impossibility posed by Kristeva, and realizes that in the place of desire and recognition, there lies the abject instead.

Another reading of the dream scene is by Fred Botting, who in the chapter "Frankenstein, Werther and the Monster of Love" states that Victor's dream signifies a moment where

> death, decay, and sexual difference turn eroticism into continual catastrophe, fragmenting being, separating subject from object rather than enabling their unification. Frankenstein notes how his world has turned upside down. The inversion of poles from life to death, union to separation reopens the gap and arouses the subject's sense of absolute loss. Mimicking the convulsions that brought the creature to life, Frankenstein's throes of despair constitute an unavowed recognition of his own monstrosity. (159)

In the aftermath of the Creature's birth, the loss of self-control and unity in Victor shows itself through a parallelism between the Creature's physical appearance and Victor's. Similar to the rapid palpitation of the transparent veins, Victor feels an increased awareness of his own heart and arteries, he moves with difficulty and staggers under the weight of exhaustion. His countless attempts to identify with "something on the outside" (*PH* 5) finally receives an answer, although an unwanted one. Progressively, Victor heads to his own abjection:

> Sometimes my pulse beat so quickly and hardly that I felt the palpitation of every artery; at others, I nearly sank to the ground through languor and extreme weakness. Mingled with this horror, I felt the bitterness of disappointment; dreams that have been my food and pleasant rest for so long a space were now became a hell to me; and the change was so rapid, the overthrow so complete! (46)

When Victor re-enters his apartment with his friend Clerval, – whom he met on his way outside as he flees from the monster – and looks around for the Creature, he is scared, "as children are accustomed to do when they expect a spectre to stand in waiting for them on the other side" (Shelley 48). Upon realizing that the Creature has left, Victor falls into an episode of frenzy, overjoyed as well that his friend did not witness his dreaded creation. Although the Creature is absent and Victor seems to be relieved, he still cannot fully get rid of the sense of abjection, which Kristeva describes as a series of bodily sensations; gagging, spasms in the stomach, the belly, tears, increased heartbeat, sweat, etc. (3):

> I was unable to contain myself. It was not joy only that possessed me; I felt my flesh tingle with excess of sensitiveness, and my pulse beat rapidly. I was unable to remain for a single instant in the same place; I jumped over the chairs, clapped my hands, and laughed aloud…. when he [Clerval] observed me more attentively he saw a wildness in my eyes for which he could not account; and my loud, unrestrained, heartless laughter, frightened and astonished him. (48)

This account by Victor shows critical signs of how abject monstrosity has begun to disrupt him altogether. His friend Clerval, observes a "wildness" in Victor's behaviour, as the latter turns into a completely different person; he laughs loudly, in a frantic, unhinged manner. Similar to the monster which horrified its beholders, Victor scares his friend and causes confusion in him. Furthermore, Victor's voluminous laughter in this scene anticipates Kristeva's concept of the "apocalyptic laughter" which she identifies in literature and in Céline's avant-garde style as a form of abjection. For Kristeva, Céline does not distance himself from what he writes to judge or condemn, unlike such writers as Dante, Rabelais and Balzac (*PH* 205) who greatly satirized politics, politicians and the social interactions between people. Instead, Céline comes directly from where horror is, and speaks out on horror "from within" (205). When confronted by abjection, Kristeva states Céline has no place to turn to than succumb to laughter; "So his laughter bursts out, facing abjection, and always originating at the same source, of which Freud had caught a glimpse: the gushing forth of the unconscious, the repressed, suppressed pleasure, be it sex or death" (205-6).

Laughter, which is generally associated with happiness, and experiencing joy, in Victor's case and Kristeva's reading becomes a sort of defence mechanism through which the subject confronts the abject. In *Sacrificed Lives*, Martha J. Reineke speaks of laughter as "a primary symptom of rupture or breakdown in signification" (60). She discusses that not only piercing, joyous laughter displays a linkage between the body, the subject, and a "material outside" (60) but also it offers "preliminary lessons in understanding the development of an economy of signification and emerging subjectivity" (60). Other scholars such as Erika Zimmerman Damer in *In the Flesh* explains that laughter, especially of the apocalyptic kind, occurs when a subject is overwhelmed by ambiguity and is left on the threshold between two extreme feelings, horror and fascination: "What she calls 'apocalyptic laughter' or uncomfortable, horrified mirth, arises in literature as a reaction to the emergence of horror and fascination that bespeaks the incompleteness of the speaking being" (Damer 206). "How can the speaking being cope with such a contradiction?" John Lechte asks in discussing Kristeva's apocalyptic laughter. The answer by Kristeva, he states, lies

"not by mere repression, but through a kind of laughter (the expenditure of affect): an *apocalyptic* laughter, given that we are faced with abjection" (Lechte, *Julia Kristeva* 167).

Therefore, when Victor finds his apartment empty he is surprised, relieved, yet at the same time terrified as to what the Creature's absence may cause. Nevertheless, he soon forgets about everything that has occurred and begins to regain his former composure; his "spirits were high" and he "bounded along with feelings of unbridled joy and hilarity" (Shelley 56). However, these feelings will soon be overthrown, as Victor receives the news from his family that his younger brother William has passed away – in reality, he has been brutally murdered. Not knowing the murderer or the cause of the murder in the first place, Victor travels back home, in fear, feeling "nameless evils" lurking around him, hindering him from acting or thinking rationally. Unable to appreciate the sublime imagery which made him calm and reserved in the previous instances, Victor gazes upon the dark mountains and laments: "The picture appeared a vast and dim scene of evil, and I foresaw obscurely that I was destined to become the most wretched of human beings" (59). In the following pages, the "nameless evils" Victor fears, literally haunt him in the form of a figure illuminated by a lightning, similar to the one Victor has been fascinated by in his childhood. "The object" (60) he speaks of the figure, has a "gigantic stature, and the deformity of its aspect, more hideous than belonging to humanity" (60). This makes Victor painfully aware of the fact that it was the Creature who has come back to literally haunt him. After weighing down the previous events and the Creature's sudden appearance, Victor connects the murder of his brother with the Creature. The timing and the murder it committed, anticipates Kristeva's notion that the abject is "immoral, sinister, scheming, and shady: a terror that dissembles, a hatred that smiles, a passion that uses the body for barter instead of inflaming it" (*PH* 4). Furthermore, the Creature's sudden appearance also shows that there is no escape from abjection, it is not something that is experienced once in a lifetime or something to be gradually overcome. But rather, abjection

> lies outside, beyond the set, and does not seem to agree to the latter's rules of the game. And yet, from its place of banishment, the abject does not cease

> challenging its master. Without a sign (for him), it beseeches a discharge, a convulsion, a crying out. (*PH* 2)

The speechless manner which Victor has been driven to in the previous instances where he faces abjection – particularly the Creature – once again gets a hold of him, and renders him inarticulate, motionless, and powerless to think and act quickly. Victor is not only inept linguistically, but also in terms of ethics and virtuousness, he resigns from his symbolic position. He is unable to come forth and explain that the Creature is responsible for the murder, and that as the creator, he also takes part in the crime. He cannot pursue the murderer of his brother, or help those around him that are affected by the crime. Harold Bloom, in reading the downfall Victor embarks on after the Creature comes alive, states that

> From that point onward, Victor Frankenstein's physical and mental well-being are disrupted and become increasingly unstable as he becomes steadily tormented and sickened by what he has wrought. More importantly, however, is his belief and abject fear that he must never disclose what he has done. Thus, he is forever enjoined from speaking the truth and, consequently, can never again act in an ethical manner. As a result of his experiment and the many transgressions it implies, including a usurping of God's authority, Victor Frankenstein forfeits his integrity. (21)

What Bloom reads as a decline in Victor's ethical values, is embodied by his stance in Justine's case and her consecutive execution. At the time Victor returns to Geneva, Justine Moritz is being tried for the murder of William Frankenstein, the son of the family she selflessly devoted herself to for many years. Even though most of the people in the community, and Victor's family believes her to be innocent, their belief gets shaken by the appearance of a pendant which William used to wear, in Justine's pocket. Moreover, a market-woman comes forth to give the testimony that she saw Justine near the place where the body was found, asked her what she was doing in that place but Justine only returned an unintelligible answer. During the trial and when a final decision is sentenced against her, Victor remains silent, and does not say anything for fear that his words may not be taken seriously: "My tale was not one to announce publicly; its astounding horror would be looked upon as madness by the vulgar" (63). He even goes as far to witness silently and solemnly the despair of his family members, acknowledging, although not openly, that he is the true murderer of

this *abject* crime; "Thus spoke my prophetic soul, as, torn by remorse, horror, and despair I behold those I loved spend vain sorrow upon the graves of William and Justine, the first hapless victims to my unhallowed arts" (70).

In *PH*, Kristeva states that crime posits as an important aspect of abjection. She states that any act, behaviour, or "[w]hat does not respect borders, positions, rules, [...] [t]he traitor, the liar, the criminal with a good conscience, the shameless rapist, the killer who claims he is a savior" are agents of abjection as they show "the fragility of the law" (4). Furthermore, Kristeva observes that crime which is "premeditated," "cunning" and "hypocritical" is even more abject as they "heighten the display of such fragility" (4). In this way the true crime, reveals Shelley through the account of the Creature, is simultaneously an act of silence, and an act of revenge;

> The thought was madness; it stirred the fiend within me –not I, but she, shall suffer; the murder I have committed...I had learned now to work mischief. I bent over her and placed the portrait securely in one of the folds of her dress. (Shelley 110)

As the Creature reveals the dual crimes he committed, the similarities between him and his creator become more and more apparent. While Victor may not be a murderer in the sense of actually ending the life of a person, he is included and is responsible for the Creature's actions by not doing anything and remaining silent. After Justine's execution, Victor begins to wander "like an evil spirit" (70), solitary, and away from society. In a way, he punishes himself, shunning people away as "all sound of joy or complacency was torture to [him]; solitude was [his] only consolation – deep, dark, deathlike solitude" (70). However, as the abject does not stop challenging its master, the Creature does not stop following his creator. During Victor's solitary journey through the Genevan forests, the Creature appears and forces him to listen to its side of the events. In this scene it is interesting to witness Victor's account of the sublime imagery change dramatically as he gets close to the Creature;

> I resolved to ascend to the summit of Montanvert...It is a scene terrifically desolate. In a thousand spots the traces of the winter avalanche may be perceived, where trees lie broken and strewed on the ground some entirely destroyed, others bent, leaning upon the jutting rocks of the mountain, or transversely upon other trees. (75)

In this kind of a setting Victor encounters the Creature once again. His recently gained composure is disrupted as "a mist came over [his] eyes, and [he] felt a faintness" (76). The mist which blocks Victor's vision, and through which the Creature later on emerges, parallels an early account by Walton during Victor's last moments – when he sees him standing on a thinning block of ice, after a heavy mist clears away. This instance can be read as Victor having already embraced his abjection through the Creature, and just like it, he emerges out of a heavy mist "in so wretched a condition," and with an expression of "wildness and even madness" (21).

Through an interval of more than thirty pages, the Creature tells his story from the moment he wakes up in Victor's laboratory, until he sits down with him in that moment. Almost resembling a confession séance, the Creature in the end reveals his true desire: for Victor to create a counterpart, a female "companion" of the same species, who must have the "same defects" as it (111). Upon hearing this request, Victor seems astounded, unable to simply refuse or even utter a reply; "I was bewildered, perplexed, and unable to arrange my ideas sufficiently to understand the full extent of his proposition" (111). However, enticed by the Creature's great abilities of persuasion and its rich rhetoric, Victor listens to its demand and decides to comply with it; "I consent to your demand, on your solemn oath to quit Europe for ever, and every other place in the neighbourhood of man, as soon as I shall deliver into your hands a female who will accompany you in your exile" (113).

As Victor works on his new creature, he becomes more and more disturbed. He is constantly being watched by the monster and thus cannot stop or think about fleeing. At this point, the roles of the creature and creator seem to be reversed as Victor obeys the Creature's demand without much of a fight. The Creature's first comparison of Victor to God and itself to Adam (77) is now turned upside down to the Creature being the "master" and Victor as the "slave" (128). Victor is now controlled by an a*bject* ruler, with his impulses there to direct him instead of his reason; "[T]hrough the whole period during which I was the slave of my creature, I allowed myself to be governed by the impulses of the moment" (118). The story approaches its second climactic moment after the creature's birth: Victor's creation of the female monster. It is

important to mention at this point Victor's incredibly disrupted state of mind; his full dabbling into the realm of abjection, and his speech which comes to resemble that of the Creature's. Victor not only puts a distance between himself and the society – only retaining an attachment with the Creature – but also he admits that his selfish endeavours so far have pushed him to the margins of the norm, thus to the close proximity of abjection where he cannot turn back; "I saw an insurmountable barrier placed between me and my fellow-men; this barrier was sealed with the blood of William and Justine," (121) "For an instant I dared to shake off my chains, and look around me with a free and lofty spirit; but the iron had eaten into my flesh, and I sank again, trembling and hopeless, into my miserable self" (123).

Frankenstein begins by depicting Victor as a unified and Symbolic subject but as he further delves into the world of abjection and gets into close contact with the abject monster, he loses his self-awareness and patriarchal status. From being the prosperous young scholar who was studying diligently in a university, having middle-class origins and good economic background, Victor "degenerates," and becomes a person he himself cannot recognize; "What has become of me? I know not; I lost sensations and chains and darkness were the only objects that pressed upon me" (151). Due to fear and being labelled as a "madman" he cannot save his friends or the people around him; he does not listen to the Creature's threats and acts according to his own, and he begins to lie and act in secrecy to get what he wants. This new "immoral, sinister, scheming" (*PH* 4) and abject version of Victor can be observed in his incredibly indifferent and unemotional speech towards the events around him. While during the first moments of William, Clerval and Justine's deaths he is guilt-stricken and remorseful, towards the end of the story he begins to call them his "victims" and that he killed them; "Clerval, my friend and dearest companion, had fallen a victim to me and the monster of my creation," (Shelley 141) "I am the cause of this — I murdered her. William, Justine and Henry – they all died by my hands" (142). This manner of speech is similarly used by the Creature in the end when it sees Victor is dead; "That is also my victim!" (166).

Similarly, Victor adopts the speech of the Creature, and uses the words which the Creature has uttered to define itself. He uses the word "wretch" for himself when before he would use it for the Creature, and then he too becomes a "creature," (151) just like the one he created. Therefore, similar to the Creature, he fears that people "would each and all, abhor [him], and hunt [him] from the world" (141). It is also interesting to note how both the Creature and Victor experience a demotion from their previous statuses. The Creature initially speaks of himself as Victor's creation, his Biblical "Adam," (77) but later on he becomes "the fallen angel" whom Victor deprives of happiness and love. Victor, likewise, is demoted from being a God and the father of a new species to Adam being driven away from heaven; "[B]ut the apple was already eaten, and the angel's arm bared to drive me from all hope" (144). The attachment between the Creature and Victor becomes stronger as Victor tries to separate himself from it desperately. Ultimately, the monstrous abjection Victor goes through is something he cannot escape; "[L]ike an inescapable boomerang, a vortex of summons and repulsion places the one haunted by it literally beside himself" (*PH* 1).

In the hopes that the Creature will leave him alone and stop terrorizing the society, Victor begins the creation of the female monster. During the first experiment when he created the Creature, Victor was in doubt, he failed and tried many times but in the second one he does not falter, his "eyes were shut to the horror of [his] proceedings" as he sets about his creation "in cold blood" (Shelley 126). However, unlike in his first creation Victor begins to think about the consequences of making a female creature, and wonders what will happen if the female creature will not like her chosen pair; "She also might turn in disgust from him...she might quit him, and he be again alone" (127). There is another concern for Victor, a more alarming one than the first – with the female creature's appearance, there is the possibility that "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" (127). More than the fact that the female creature will be a "thinking and reasoning animal" (127) Victor fears that it will be a *mother*, a bearer of an offspring that threatens the existence of humankind altogether. It can be argued that Victor's reluctance to create a female creature who

bears the possibility to "become ten times more malignant than her mate," (127) and could produce "a race of devils," ultimately shows his inability to face the power of the maternal. Through the half completed creature, Victor peeks at the unruly, primal nature of maternity, and his own identity being called back into it like a vortex. As a result, he becomes frantic and begins to tear up the body he has assembled back into pieces;

> I thought with a sensation of madness on my promise of creating another like to him, and trembling with passion, tore to pieces the thing on which I was engaged. The wretch saw me destroy the creature on whose future existence he depended for happiness, and with a howl of devilish despair and revenge, withdrew. (127)

The destroying of the unfinished female creature, is a critical scene read in detail by many critics. Margaret Homans, in *Bearing the Word*, argues that the inability of Victor to produce a female creature is a deliberate exposure on Shelley's part, of the Romantic male's rejecting anything related to the mother, and to females in general;

> [T]he impossibility of Frankenstein giving it a female demon, an object of its own desire, aligns the demon with women...But if the demon is really a feminine object of desire, why is it a he?...By making the demon masculine, Shelley suggests that romantic desire seeks to do away, not only with the mother, but also with all females so as to live finally in a world of mirrors that reflect a comforting illusion of the male self's independent wholeness. (106)

For Hogle, Victor's destructive behaviour depicts his self-abjection, and most importantly his abjection of the mother; "It is woman whom he has avoided most in his onanistic creation because it is the ultimate uncontrollability of the life-giving female that most crystallizes all of his many fears and abjections" (10). In this sense, what Victor experiences during the creation of the female monster can be recognized as an innate fear, one that Kristeva suggests results from the "fear of the archaic mother" due to her "generative power" (*PH* 77).

When the Creature gets a violent rejection of his wish from Victor, it bursts into anger and threatens Victor that he will not leave him alone for the rest of his life, especially on the most important day for him; "[Y]our hours will pass in dread and misery, and soon the bolt will fall which must ravish from you your happiness forever...remember, I shall be with you on your wedding night" (Shelley 128-9). As clear as this sounds,

Victor does not pay attention to the Creature's words, or cares to follow it after it sets sail to attack his family. Instead, Victor goes back to his laboratory, subsequently falls asleep on the grass, and then resolves to get rid of the body parts that are left of the female creature; "The remains of the half-finished creature, whom I had destroyed, lay scattered on the floor, and I almost felt as if I had mangled the living flesh of a human being" (130). Although Victor rationalizes his decision to destroy the creature in this scene, passion and sexual lust as well as fear and a desire to control female sexuality can still be identified. This fear, Mellor (1988) suggests, "is endemic to a patriarchal construction of gender. Uninhibited female sexual experience threatens the very foundation of patriarchal power" (7). Thus, gathering the body parts Victor heads to the middle of a lake and throws off everything, after which he feels a sense of refreshment as if "a film had been taken from before [his] eyes, and that [he,] for the first time, saw clearly" (Shelley 131).

Believing that the Creature's threat is completely gone and he is finally free, Victor sets out for his home; however, he gets stopped by a group of villagers who are searching for a murderer on the news of a young man's death. After sadly confirming that it is his friend Henry Clerval's corpse, Victor falls back into a state of despair and begins to go through convulsions and high fever. When faced with a corpse – one that he is responsible for – Victor confronts the gruesome consequences of his actions. In other words, his desires and passions are so destructive that they have resulted not only in his own self-abjection, but have caused those around him to become abject as well. In this regard, the resemblance between the Creature and Victor, as the first death – his friend Clerval's – Victor caused slowly transforms him, becomes more explicit. The narration of the Creature's own "birth," and Victor's symbolic "re-birth" into an abject identity after his friend's death strongly parallel each other; "Before, dark and opaque bodies had surrounded me, impervious to my touch or sight; but now I found that I could wander on at liberty," (79) "As the images floated before me became more distinct, I grew feverish; a darkness pressed around me; no one was near me who soothed me with the gentle voice of love; no dear hand supported me" (136). In these two quotations, it can be observed that Shelley is trying to create the sense of a mother's womb; an enclosed space where only the child and the mother retain a

connection. While in this relationship the mother may seem to have the upper hand, Kristeva suggests that pregnancy is an unconscious process during which the mother gives up her agency and is not in full control;

> Within the body, growing as a graft, indomitable, there is an other. And no one is present, within that simultaneously dual and alien space, to signify what is going on. 'It happens, but I'm not there.' 'I cannot realize it, but it goes on' Motherhood's impossible syllogism. (*DL* 237)

Furthermore, like abjection, pregnancy is "a borderline phenomenon, blurring yet producing one identity after another," (Gross 95) and so, in *Frankenstein*'s case abject monstrosity produces one identity on the one hand, and reconfigures another. Both the Creature and Victor in this sense, can be said to become *new* subjects who are born without a mother. The necessity to negate the female, the mother from the process of identifying origins, further blurs the distinctions between creation/creator, mother-father/son, and I/Other. Victor and his creation both give up their autonomy and self-presence at this point, and begin to survive in an inter-dependent relationship. The Other lives literally because of the "I," the "I" lives as the Other's target of desire. One cannot be eliminated without the other losing its life as well; "Yet you my creator, detest and spurn me, thy creature, to whom thou art bound by ties only dissoluble by the annihilation of one of us" (77).

Following Clerval's death, Victor not only loses his ability to control the events around him, but also he cannot verbally reason with the Creature anymore after his destruction of the female monster. He weakens physically and mentally, and begins to resemble something non-human; "I was a shattered wreck – *the shadow of a human being*. My strength was gone. I was a mere skeleton; and fever night and day preyed upon my wasted frame" (Shelley 140, emphasis added). At this point in the story, although his father, his little brother and Elizabeth remain alive, Victor does not actively converse with them. His only *object of desire*, to name it, is the Creature and through him, Victor begins to define himself. He is a "shadow of a human being," someone or something that is only a "mockery" (140) of humankind. This kind of extreme subjectivity leads to the collapse of all borders, absorbing the "subject and object in a terrifyingly reversible relation where ideal unity cedes to nothingness"

(Botting "Frankenstein, Werther and the Monster of Love" 157). For Kristeva, the collapse of these borders *by abjection,* is what underlines the subject's identity, its essential composition;

> If it be true that the abject simultaneously beseeches and pulverizes the subject, one can understand that it is experienced at the peak of its strength when that subject, weary of fruitless attempts to identify with something on the outside, finds the impossible within; when it finds that the impossible constitutes its very being, that it is none other than abject. The abjection of self would be the culminating form of that experience of the subject to which it is revealed that all its objects are based merely on the inaugural loss that laid the foundations of its own being. There is nothing like the abjection of self to show that all abjection is in fact recognition of the want on which any being, meaning, language, or desire is founded. (*PH* 5)

For Victor then, it can be said that his desire simultaneously constructed and destroyed his unity through the abject monstrosity of the Creature. Instead of the mastery he hoped he would achieve after the creation of the monster and his Romantic passions realized, Victor found his unity threatened and separated into something he can no longer recognize; "Not me. Not that. But not nothing, either. A 'something' that I do not recognize as a thing" (*PH* 2). When the subject is thus driven to the margins of its own subjectivity, it is "liberated" though "not in a unifying fusion with a determinable object or ideal, but in its sense of absolute loss, its plunge into an overwhelming torrent of negativity" (Botting, "Frankenstein, Werther and the Monster of Love" 176).

In addition to "the shadow of a human being" he became, Victor also calls himself a "skeleton," which could be symbolic of him being reduced to the human being's most essential component underneath all the flesh and organs, just like the Creature who he created as the most basic representation of the human body; "[B]ut my [the Creature] form is a filthy type of yours, more horrid even from the very resemblance" (Shelley 100). Accordingly, Victor believes that as the Creature's true target, he is the only one that can face up to it, and who can "put an end to the existence of the monstrous image...with the mockery of a soul still more monstrous" (140). Believing that the Creature will kill him and so will die itself, Victor prepares the arrangements for his marriage with Elizabeth. Against the Creature's previous warnings, and Elizabeth's

foreshadowing – "Something whispers to me not to depend too much on the prospect that is opened to us" (147) – Victor goes forward with the ceremony and gets married. However, in a twist of events, the Creature does not attack him but goes after Elizabeth, and kills her in a horrific manner in order to taunt Victor;

> She was there, lifeless and inanimate, thrown across the bed, her head hanging down, and her pale and distorted features half covered by her hair. Everywhere I turn I see the same figure – her bloodless arms and relaxed form flung by the murderer on its bridal bier. Could I behold this and live? [...] For a moment only did I lose recollection; I fell senseless on the ground. (149)

The death of Elizabeth and thus the death of the only remaining female in the story signifies for some critics, Victor's final disruption of maternity and motherhood. By "giving birth" without having the anatomy or the assistance of a female, Victor succumbs to his male, Romantic ego and confirms that he is set to transgress the boundaries of family, identity, gender, and so on. For Homans, Elizabeth's death prominently signifies in Kristevan terms, the infant's fight with the mother to abject her;

> Victor has gone to great lengths to produce a child without Elizabeth's assistance, and in the dream's language, to circumvent her, to make her unnecessary, is to kill her, and to kill mother altogether. Frankenstein's creation, then, depends on and then perpetuates the death of the mother and of motherhood. The demon's final, and greatest crime is in fact its murder of Elizabeth, which is, however, only the logical extension of its existence as the reification of Frankenstein's desire to escape the mother. (103)

Victor is now deprived of every human connection and affection. His father after the horrific events has passed away as well, leaving Victor solemnly mourning in front of his tomb along with the others' in the cemetery; "The deep grief which this scene had at first excited quickly gave way to rage and despair. They were dead, and I lived; their murderer also lived, and to destroy him I must drag out my weary existence" (Shelley 154). As the only possible solution to get rid of the Creature, Victor finally decides to take action and pursue it in seeking revenge. However, as he voices his grief, the Creature in a mocking manner bursts into a "loud and fiendish laugh" (154). This scene parallels Victor's previous loud laughter, the one he released when the

Creature emptied his laboratory. Echoing its former words, the Creature shows that it is now the *master*, and Victor is the *slave*. The Creature is the one releasing a voluminous laughter, while Victor is left speechless, expressing himself only through rage and despair. Thus, in full control, the Creature drags Victor in a chase along the icy regions of Northern Europe, through desolate forests and frozen nature, in an attempt to tire him and make him resent his decisions. It is in this moment that Victor's and Walton's narratives interwoven. In the beginning chapters of the book Walton begins his narrative with Victor boarding the ship, and Victor begins telling his own story when he enters the ship after being rescued.

When he finishes his narrative, Victor admits to a relegation of his earlier position, from that of "the God" (77) to the "fallen angel" (155). From being the "idol" (28) of his parents, a young man with a bright and successful future, to a state of "wretchedness" (160), and to being a "creature" (151); "I was cursed by some devil, and carried about with me my eternal hell" (155). His creature as well goes through a similar degradation; "Remember I am thy creature; I ought to be thy Adam, but I am rather the fallen angel, whom thou drivest from joy for no misdeed" (77).

With irreversible actions, Victor has caused the demise of his family, those he loved and finally, his own death. In the end he becomes fully confined to bed, unable to move or speak. However, upon hearing that Walton is set back to England, he struggles to get up and continue his pursuit of the Creature. This endeavour makes him sicker and renders him completely speechless, as Walton records; "His voice became fainter as he spoke; and at length, exhausted by his effort, he sunk into silence. About half an hour afterwards he attempted to speak but was unable; he pressed my hand feebly, and his eyes closed for ever" (166). His mental and physical state collapsed, Victor passes away without a word. Neither having agency nor completely denied power over his creature, Victor willingly succumbs to the Creature's abjection, and becomes abjection's ultimate embodiment: a corpse.

CHAPTER 4

DRACULA

Dracula, is written in the form of an "epistolary novel" which begins with Jonathan Harker's journal entry dating 3rd of May. As a young solicitor who has just earned his license, Jonathan is sent to Transylvania to meet a count named Dracula, who needs legal assistance in order to purchase land and estate in London. In the first few pages of Jonathan's account, Eastern Europe which would be exotic to the reader of Stoker's time is described in great detail, almost as if Harker is intending to write a "travelogue". In awe, he writes about "snowy peaks" and "mighty rifts," and of the "glorious colours" (Stoker 8) which bring to the front the sublime imagery of the scene. However, as he moves further East, Harker notices a change in the overall atmosphere around him. Even though he visited the British National Museum previously and researched about Transylvania, he is still baffled and most importantly feels nervous that there are "no maps of the country," (3) which would direct him in "one of the wildest and least known portions of Europe" (3). He also complains about how the trains never seem to go with the schedule; "[S]hould have arrived at 6:46, but train was an hour late," (3) "[A]fter rushing to the station at 7.30 I had to sit in the carriage more than an hour... It seems to me that the further East you go the more unpunctual are the trains. What ought they to be in China?" (4). In "The Occidental Tourist" Stephen D. Arata suggests that this attitude of Harker is typical of a Victorian individual who is exploring "the unknown". In order to make sense of the world around him, Harker begins to "go native" and assumes "the Orientalist perspective that allows him to 'make sense' of his experiences there" (Arata 636). And once he

passes the Danube River, he acknowledges that he is "leaving the West and entering the East" (Stoker 3) to approach the first point which marks Europe as Oriental.

The country Stoker portrays through the observations of Harker, is one that cannot be accessed through direct transportation. It is virtually unexplored as it rests between Romania, Moldovia, and Bukovina, in a "'Mittel Land' between reality and illusion, a land neither wholly material and locatable nor defined by the strict negations of these terms" (Rogers xi). This brings Harker closer to the site of *abjection*, where time and space become irrelevant concepts and blend with each other. Already, Harker is a "stranger in a strange land" (Stoker 19) with no one to guide him, and with "every known superstition in the world [is] gathered into the horseshoe of the Carpathians," (3) but soon enough, these superstitions will be what saves Harker from the horrors in Castle Dracula.

As Harker travels closer and closer to the castle, he is warned and confronted by ominous signs. The local people who hear Harker's destination begin to cross themselves, utter such words as "*Ordog* – Satan, *pokol* – hell, *stregoica* – witch, *vrolok* and *vkloslak* –" (7), offer Harker a crucifix, and even go down to their knees as one woman does to stop him. Nevertheless, with a sense of "high duty," Harker dispels all of these and continues his journey. Since there is no direct transportation to the Count's Castle, the carriage he is instructed to take, delivers him to a meeting point where a servant of the Count will welcome him. The servant however, is none other than Dracula himself as Harker notes in his journal later on;

> [A] tall man, with a long brown beard and a great black hat, which seemed to hide his face from us. I could only see the gleam of a pair of very bright eyes, which seemed red in the lamplight…As he spoke he smiled, and the lamplight fell on a hard-looking mouth, with very red lips and sharp-looking teeth, as white as ivory. (10)

Harker's initial feelings towards this figure is of confusion, while other passengers seem to gasp in horror and begin to put out two fingers and cross themselves; "I felt a little strangely, and not a little frightened" (11). Although up to this point Harker has dismissed the superstitions and gossip that has been revolving around him, when he notices that the time is close to midnight, he receives a shock. He has been told that

on Saint George's Day, "all the evil things in the world will have full sway" (4). When the clock does strike midnight, and Harker is getting close to Dracula's castle, the setting appropriately begins to change;

> This was all so strange and uncanny that a dreadful fear came upon me, and I was afraid to speak or move. The time seemed interminable as we swept on our way, now in almost complete darkness, for the rolling clouds obscured the moon (13).

Upon arriving at the scene, Harker is welcomed by a "vast and ruined castle, from whose tall black windows came no ray of light, and whose broken battlements showed a jagged line against the moonlight sky" (13). The castle is such a sight for Harker that it leaves him speechless, making him fear that it could altogether engulf him; "[T]hrough these frowning walls and dark window openings it was not likely that my voice could penetrate" (14). The "frowning walls" which hover above Harker almost ominously warn him, that the castle can neither be penetrated from the outside or inside. It is as though he is entering the realm of the maternal, to the womb of the mother where "no one is present, within that simultaneously dual and alien space, to signify what is going on" (*DL* 237).

Once inside, Harker finds warmth and lighting inside the castle; however, the Count's physical presence reverses this effect. In a Lombrosian approach – which Mina will directly quote in her journal later on – Harker describes the Count's physical appearance:

> His face was a strong – a very strong – aquiline, with high bridge of the thin nose and peculiarly arched nostrils; with lofty doomed forehead, and hair growing scantily round the temples, but profusely elsewhere. His eyebrows were very massive, almost meeting over the nose...The mouth, so cruel-looking, with peculiarly sharp white teeth; these protruded over the lips, whose remarkable ruddiness showed astonishing vitality in a man of his years. (17)

Furthermore, the Count's visibly white and "deathly pale" (34) skin, his "rather coarse, broad" hands with hairs in the centre of the palm, gives away his monstrous appearance, at the sight of which Harker cannot help but shiver. In *Powers of Horror*, Kristeva mentions that the skin is an important organ which contains and/or conceals pollution within the body, and therefore can be a signifier of abjection. When the skin

cannot properly keep inside the "defiling elements"– such as urine, blood, and excrement – it then begins to give away its own dejection; "It is as if the skin, a fragile container, no longer guaranteed the integrity of one's 'own and clean self' but, scraped or transparent, invisible or taut, gave way before the dejection of its contents" (53). Therefore, no matter how "human" the Count appears, his abjection is still detectable, although disregarded by Harker.

The initial curiosity he showed towards the Lombrosian Count however, upon close encounter turns into a feeling of disgust: "As the Count leaned over me and his hand touched me, I could not repress a shudder. It may have been that his breath was rank but a horrible feeling of nausea came over me" (Stoker 17). The Count, through Harker's observation, is understood to be someone who defies the norm; he is alone, despised, and feared by the people, he is aristocratic yet "coarse" and "cruel-looking;" (17) he even resembles animals in his brute strength and with a "hard-looking mouth, with very red lips and sharp-looking teeth" (10). Soon Harker begins to feel more and more uneasy with the Count as he notices that he is never seen in person in the mornings, and at night he does not eat with him. Moreover, Harker realizes that besides him and the Count, there is no one else in the castle. While his general speech is polite and humble, when he is asked about history and national matters the Count gets passionate and inflamed. No matter how tired he is, the Count also does not let Harker rest until he finishes discussing whatever topic they have in hand. This mannerism and the general attitude of the local people which Harker finds different from that of the English, is acknowledged by Dracula himself who makes clear that in his premises, and in *his* country, he has the ultimate power; "We are in Transylvania; and Transylvania is not England. Our ways are not your ways, and there shall be to you many strange things" (19).

The increasing tension between the Count and Harker finally reaches its climax in a scene when Harker is shaving in front of a mirror. Since the Count does not show a reflection, Harker does not see him and with the shock he cuts himself. Craft argues that the lack of mirrors in the castle and the Count showing no reflection in any surface shows that the monster, although clearly cast aside next to the human, is in fact not

much different from him; "Dracula need cast no reflection because his presence, already established in Harker's image, would be simply redundant; the monster, indeed, is no one 'except myself'" (127). A scene which is surprisingly very rarely discussed by critics, Harker's shaving scene marks the first appearance of blood. When a thin stream rushes down from Harker's neck, the Count makes a move for his throat as "his eyes blazed with a sort of demoniac fury" (Stoker 23), and grasps him with great strength. For a moment the Count seems ready to pounce on Harker; however, he only warns him to be careful and throws the mirror out of the window. Although this act of violence clearly displays the Count's dangerous nature, Harker does not seem to read the obvious signs, and reminisces on the mirror which is shattered and destroyed. While for Harker the mirror's breaking into pieces is more important than the apparent, life threatening danger, for literary analysis this scene is quite crucial. It is not only the first instance where blood is mentioned, but also it poses the first threat towards identity and the boundaries between the self and the Other. Clearly in this scene, the Count transgresses those boundaries which Harker believes to be stable, he attacks him in a manner which suggests both animalistic hunger and sexual lust. Furthermore, the skin, which is thought to hold together and conceal the "polluting elements" of the body such as blood, is pierced and defiled by the Count, causing Harker to confront his own abjection briefly.

For Kristeva, blood is one of the bodily fluids that plays a greater role in defining and disturbing a person's subjectivity than other such substances. It is along with urine, sperm and excrement, a signifier of abjection, when a "body's inside…shows up in order to compensate for the collapse of the border between inside and outside" (*PH* 53). It is also what defiles the "proper self," (*PH* 85) a substance which is difficult to deal with. In addition, Kristeva notes that blood, especially menstrual blood as a 'polluting object' "stands for the danger issuing from within the identity (social or sexual); it threatens the relationship between the sexes within a social aggregate and, through internalization, the identity of each sex in the face of sexual difference" (*PH* 71). The shedding of blood can also be read as a breach of physical and social boundaries, a dangerous transgression for someone like Harker. Thus, like all the other bodily fluids which are subjected to "rites of purification" blood must as well be either

eliminated or completely ignored, it must be made "symbolic and reassuring, forced to stand in for something other than the scarlet hydraulics of our inner selves" (Spitzer-Hanks 42). In attempting this, Harker diverts his focus and in a way *represses* the eroticism that has arisen between him and the count, as Halberstam notes; "Blood circulates through vampiric sexuality as a substitute or metaphor for other bodily fluids (milk, semen); the leap between bad blood and perverse sexuality…is not hard to make" (345). In this regard, blood will be a returning motif in Stoker's narrative both physically and psychologically. It is a prominent signifier of abjection, a substance which unites the monstrous, with humankind:

> In *Dracula* blood does not remain thrust aside, instead forming a thematic bridge between characters and events and symbolizing abjection in both its psychological and social facets. Blood overrules tenuous self-control; it tempts, trickles, it is a "border that has encroached upon everything." [Kristeva 1980:3] Dripping from Harker's chin blood signals both his and his host's increasing loss of control, coherence, and purity, and it also marks his body as an object of incipient oral consumption. (Spitzer-Hanks 42)

After resigning into the Count's dominant power, Harker finds solace and comfort in the crucifix that the old lady gave him when he set off from Bistriz; "It is odd that a thing which I have been taught to regard with disfavour and as idolatrous should in a time of loneliness and trouble be of help" (Stoker 25). Now helpless in a country which he does not know, and in a castle in which he is alone with a threatening figure, Harker's last resort seems to be the superstitions and beliefs which he tried to disregard thus far. Startled by his own shadow, he sleeps in the mornings when the Count is not present, and with the crucifix hanging near his head. In this anxious state Harker walks around the castle, hoping to find solace in the beautiful nature he could see through the small window frames. For a moment, he does seem to be in tranquillity, yet this state of mind will once again be disturbed by the Count who appears to "crawl" down the outer walls of the castle:

> But my very feelings changed to repulsion and terror when I saw the whole man slowly emerge from the window and begin to crawl down the castle wall over that dreadful abyss, *face down* with his cloak spreading out around him like great wings...I thought it was some trick of the moonlight, some weird effect of the shadow; but I kept looking, and it could be no delusion...just as a lizard moves along a wall. (30)

Horrified, Harker leaves the window sill immediately and begins to run away to the remoter parts of the caste which the Count warned him off; "What manner of man is this, or what manner of *creature* is it in the semblance of man? I feel the dread of this horrible place...and there is no escape for me" (30, emphasis added). However, similar to a child who takes pleasure in disobeying their parents, Harker enters the restricted side of the castle and into a room "where of old ladies had sat and sung and lived sweet lives" (32). Little does he know that his pleasurable defiance would result in a nightmarish punishment. Instead of the fair ladies of a golden age, Harker finds himself surrounded by three vampiric women:

> I was not alone...In the moonlight opposite me were three young women, ladies by their dress and manner. I thought at the time that I must be dreaming when I saw them, for, though the moonlight was behind them they threw no shadow on the floor. Two were dark, and had high aquiline noses, like the Count...The other was fair, as fair as can be, with great, wavy masses of golden hair and eyes like pale sapphires. *I seemed somehow to know her face and to know it in connection with some dreamy fear...There was something about them that made me uneasy, some longing and at the same time some deadly fear*, I felt in my heart a wicked, burning desire that they would kiss me with those red lips...They whispered together, and then they all three laughed – such a silvery, musical laugh, but as hard as though the sound never could have come through the softness of human lips. (33, emphasis added)

Conversing between themselves while Jonathan watches them "under [his] eyelashes" (Stoker 33), the vampire ladies discuss which one of them should go first. The two dark ladies give the priority to the fair one, saying the latter has "the right to begin" (33). While at first she seems hesitant and almost shy, the blonde haired vampire finally gives in. Brianna Murch in "Beyond Maidens" suggests that this choice of the "light/golden" haired lady as opposed to the "dark" ones' going first, is a deliberate attempt on Stoker's side to blend what is pure and impure, through the abject corporeality of the vampire; "The fair one...looks the most virginal, yet clearly this is some ceremonious seduction, as if that which is most pure is best suited to lead to corruption" (5). Furthermore, Harker's helpless passivity bears a striking resemblance to the helplessness of the "damsel in distress" who awaits her doomed fate. In this sense, the three vampiric women can also be said to reverse the common gender roles by assuming masculine confidence and leaving Harker with feminine passivity. Their

monstrous features such as the sharp, white teeth are also symbolic of this reversal, and of the penetration that is usually ascribed to the male. Thus, clamped around Harker, a young and strong male who has "kisses for [them] all" (Stoker 33), the fair lady leans down, and cautiously aims for his throat. Soon enough the tension reaches its peak, much like the one between the Count and Harker:

> I could feel the movement of her breath upon me. Sweet it was in one sense, honey-sweet, and sent the same tingling through the nerves as her voice, but with a bitter underlying the sweet, a bitter offensiveness, as one smells in blood...There was a deliberate voluptuousness which was both thrilling and repulsive, and as she arched her back she actually licked her lips like an animal, till I could see in the moonlight the moisture shining on the scarlet lips and on the red tongue as it lapped the white sharp teeth...Then the skin of my throat began to tingle as one's flesh does when the hand that is to tickle it approaches nearer – nearer...I closed my eyes in a languorous ecstasy and waited – waited with a beating heart. (33-34).

Neither this scene goes unnoticed in the eyes of its Victorian readers, nor is it left out by *Dracula* and Stoker's critics. Portraying altogether; issues of gender, vampirism, animal imagery, monstrous corporeality and sexuality, as well as abject maternity, the first recording of the "weird sisters," (Stoker 42) certainly makes an impact on their reader. Craft reads this scene as a willing transgression of gender and sexuality norms which the vampire animates in Harker. It is a subjugated desire, when achieved, would strip Harker off his masculine characteristics and transfer him to the realm of abjection; "Immobilized by the competing imperatives of 'wicked desire' and 'deadly fear' Harker awaits an erotic fulfilment that entails both the dissolution of boundaries of the self and the thorough subversion of conventional Victorian gender codes" (108). Furthermore, symbolizing oral desire, the vampire's mouth is a site which can lure both male and female victims. The result of this "delicious penetration" (109) however, is eventually the disruption of integrity, the sense of identity and being;

> With its soft flesh barred by hard bone, its red crossed by white, this moth compels opposites and contrasts into a frightening unity, and it asks some disturbing questions. Are we male or female? Do we have penetrators or orifices? And if both, what does that mean? (109).

Similarly, Spitzer-Hanks argues that Harker has transgressed those boundaries which used to define him. He is not the same person as when he stepped into Transylvania,

and to the Count's castle, but a man who eagerly waits to be corrupted by the monstrous:

> Lying supine as three voluptuous women prepare to penetrate him is not only erotic, it is feminine...It is as if the copresence of Otherness has finally overcome Harker's psychological defences as it previously undermined his social distance; no longer the bounded, ego-driven subject intent on commerce and dismissive of picturesque beliefs, Harker is now awash in abjection. (10)

Harker's subjugation by the female vampires additionally brings into light his "abject longing for the womb, and for maternal protection and sustenance" (Spitzer-Hanks 10). The face he remembers "in connection with some dreamy fear" (Stoker 33) while the vampire women attack him, "is that of the mother" (Roth 119) whose power is "as securing yet so stifling" (*PH* 13). Similarly, in *The Spectral Mother* Sprengnether suggests that the mother's presence "becomes that which is longed for yet cannot be appropriated, a representative of both home and not home, and hence, in Freud's terms, the site of the uncanny" (9). While the narrative allows the female vampires to exude an aura which compels Harker to be drawn into, the monstrous and the mother in the end, still present danger and thus must be thrown off. As such, the awaited penetration is interrupted by the Count and his dispelling of the three vampires; "How dare you touch him, any of you? How dare you cast eyes on him when I had forbidden it?" (Stoker 34). One of the most direct moments of homosexuality in the story, Dracula's interference in this scene, can be read as a signifier of his ambiguous sexuality. He is seen to be aroused by men as much as women, whether it is physical hunger or sexual lust, or both; "Yes I too can love; you yourselves can tell it from the past. Is it not so?" (Stoker 34).

As with many scenes involving the vampire, this scene is also read by another point of view; Dracula's maternal nature. Similar to a mother who is worried about her child, Dracula speaks "[l]ike a parent speaking to a child...warns Harker not to venture out of his room at night" (Foster 490) and when Harker *is* in danger, he rushes to rescue him. The disobedience Harker shows towards the Count by seeking solace in the vampire women's room, is also read as "a clear figuration of the desire to recede into enveloping maternal communion," (Spitzer-Hanks 12) into the tempting world of

the abject mother. Yet, as the narrative suggests, what Harker finds in that room is not the securing and loving arms of the mother, but the twisted, monstrous image of her.

As the narrative unfolds from the beginning of his journey to this climactic moment in the story, Harker progressively loses his self-control, his identity, and his position in the symbolic order. He is slowly being abjected by the Count and those around him, to a point where he himself can recognize the change. When at the beginning he was travelling around the country with the confidence of a Western imperialist – easily disregarding the locals' ominous speech and the "idolatrous" (Stoker 25) symbols such as the crucifix – and ignored the Count's unconventional behaviour, during his prolonged visit of the castle, Harker is seen to be startled by his own shadow, find solace in religion, and allow "wild desire" (44) to guide him. In the Count's castle where no law or military power can protect him, and where abjection rules to disturb "identity, system, order," and "does not respect borders, positions, rules," Harker is a prisoner.

In *Dracula*, the Count's transgressive nature can be held within the narrative neither by personal nor by geographical boundaries. He will not only abject those close to him, but carry his monstrosity outside of the physical borders of his country. However, the true horror does not result from the destruction of the body by the attack of the vampire, but from the Count's "appropriation and transformation" of it (Arata 630). Thus, recognizing the danger he is in and the skills that are needed to avoid it, Harker resolves to *act* like the Count and climbs down the walls of the castle; "Where his body has gone why may not another body go? I have seen him myself crawl from his window; why should not I imitate him, and go in by his window?" (Stoker 40). Similarly, in *Frankenstein*, Victor first rejects and then struggles to get rid of the Creature but realizing the impossibility of the task he soon begins to act like it, becoming indistinguishable from the Creature in the end of the novel. This can be observed especially in the language Victor uses; as he becomes more involved with the Creature and feels the influence of the semiotic realm stronger. He begins to use the Creature's words to define himself; Victor becomes a "creature" (Shelley 151) as well, and he lives in "wretchedness" (142) just like his Creature. Furthermore, after

the death of his friends and family, Victor calls them his "victims," a word the Creature previously used to describe them.

In this way, Harker too becomes abject like the Count and begins to crawl and move around in secrecy like an animal. This act proves more frightful than he could imagine, as he comes across the Count in a coffin, lying down with his eyes open though seeming to be asleep;

> There in one of the great boxes…on a pile of newly dug earth, lay the Count! He was either dead or asleep, I could not say which – for the eyes were open and stony, but without the glassiness of death…I saw the dead eyes, and in them, dead though they were, such a look of hate, though unconscious of me or my presence, that I fled from the place. (Stoker 41-42)

The unconscious gaze he receives from the Count can be understood as a "projection of Harker's hatred for the Count who imprisons *him*, rendering him passive and helpless" (Almond 224). Just like the child who is pressured and overwhelmed by their parents, Harker feels and quite literally lives under oppression, eager to be free of that stifling power. To achieve this, he "goes native" again, and crawls down the wall like the Count on a second attempt. This time, the confusion and hatred he felt before, turns into abject disgust:

> There lay the Count, but looking as if his youth had been half-renewed… the whole awful creature were simply gorged with blood; he lay there like a filthy leech, exhausted with his repletion. I shuddered as I bent over to touch him, and every sense in me revolted at the contact…. There was a mocking smile on the bloated face which seemed to drive me mad. This was the being I was helping to transfer to London, where, perhaps for centuries to come, he might, amongst its teeming millions, satiate his lust for blood, and create a new and ever-widening circle of semi-demons to batten on the helpless. (44-45)

The symbolism depicted by Count Dracula in this scene points at the ultimate abjection and the defilement of the clean/pure body, showing that the boundaries of the body and self are already surpassed. As a recurring element of disgust and horror, blood takes up a crucial space in Stoker's narrative and similarly in Kristeva's concept of abjection. It is one of the many types of pollution which "represents for the subject the risk to which the very symbolic order is permanently exposed, to the extent that it is a device of discriminations, of differences" (*PH* 69). A sign of uncleanliness, death

and decay, blood signifies that the subject has lost, or in the process of losing, their unity and subjectivity;

> The body's inside, in that case, shows up in order to compensate for the collapse of the border between inside and outside...Urine, blood, sperm, excrement then show up in order to reassure a subject that is lacking its "own and clean self". (*PH* 53)

The blood which in reality "bestows" life onto Dracula and Harker both, a core bodily fluid that must be obtained in one case and sustained in the other, causes repugnance in Harker and brings him closer to his abjection. Furthermore, the shock and repulsion he feels towards the "gorged" Count could be read as a covert fear of colonization of the English Empire, as well as the individual self. With a full mouth and bloated cheeks, the sign of having drained the blood of many and preserving it for later use "to create a new and ever-widening circle of semi-demons," (Stoker 45) the Count certainly embodies the imminent danger that is about to strike England;

> The Count endangers Britain's integrity as a nation at the same time that he imperils the personal integrity of individual citizens...Indeed, the Count can threaten the integrity of the nation precisely because of the nature of his threat to personal integrity. His attacks involve more than an assault on the isolated self, the subversion and loss of one's individual identity…Dracula imperils not simply his victims' personal identities, but also their cultural, political, and racial selves. (Arata 629-30)

Thus, under such a great threat Harker feels that he cannot just stand by, and by whatever means he must "rid the world of such a monster" (Stoker 45). With a sudden gush of feelings, he takes in his hand a heavy shovel, and strikes a blow on the Count's face. The end result however, turns out to be more horrible than he imagines; "[T]he head turned, and the eyes fell full upon me, with all their blaze of basilisk horror. The sight seemed to paralyse me...The last glimpse I had was of the bloated face, bloodstained and fixed with a grin of malice" (45). Even after this gruesome encounter, Harker does manage to get the key which would help him escape the Count's room. His narrative reaches an end with him running in the castle frantically, in a final attempt to be free before falling prey to the vampire women. Until the moment he is heard from again in Mina's journal in Budapest, the events which took

place in the castle – how Harker got away, travelled to Budapest, and what happened to the vampire women – are lost.

In a letter dated 24th of August to Lucy Westenra – Mina's childhood friend, – Mina writes that she has finally met with Harker, after an interval of almost a month. Through Mina's account, her letters to Lucy and her journal entries, we see that Harker returned from Transylvania as a very changed man, physically and psychologically. He is deranged, "raving" instead of speaking, in denial of the reality around him and physically "thin and pale and weak-looking" (Stoker 87). Harker's initial "embodiment of imperial masculine fullness" (Spitzer-Hanks 14) turns into someone *resembling* Harker; which can be regarded as his abject form. In such a state he needs to depend on Mina for survival, just like a baby does on their mother. For Mina, the change is so startling that Harker is portrayed as someone who is a *lower* version of himself;

> All the resolution has gone out of his dear eyes, and that quiet dignity which I told you was in his face has vanished. He is only a wreck of himself, and he does not remember anything that has happened to him for a long time past. (87)

Harker's physical and psychological decay Mina notes there continues when they travel to England. We learn through her account that Harker might have had "brain fever" (Stoker 88) he "cannot think of time yet," "mixes up not only the month, but the year" (89) he cannot be alone; needs to be accompanied at all times, and has to hold onto something when walking. And with the death of Mr. Hawkins, the solicitor Harker worked under and saw as a great, fatherly figure, his condition gets worse. Fearful that "another attack might harm him," (142) Mina takes Harker to a walk in the park, yet the peaceful scenery is quickly dispelled as he catches the sight of the Count in London. Seeing the man and "having a good view of him" (Stoker 143) Mina jots down her impression; "He was very pale, and his eyes seemed bulging out…. His face was not a good face; it was hard, and cruel, and sensual" (143). Upon noticing Harker's terrified expression, Mina takes him away and helps him sit down on a bench, where he quickly forgets about the event and falls asleep on her shoulder. Mina's quick acting, which saves Harker from being projected to more fear and

abjection, undoubtedly reminds one of the instincts of a mother shielding her child from possible danger:

> Having gone through his own abjection Jonathan remains dependent on a maternal figure, his wife Mina, who in social terms has taken the un-wifely position of protecting her hand, and in psychological terms can be read as only another, though less frightening, figure of maternal communion. (Spitzer-Hanks 47)

While the Count does not seem to target Harker when he sees him in London, his attention does fall on another figure, Lucy. Even before the Count's arrival in England, Lucy experiences strange phenomena; her old habit of sleep walking returns, she is weak and anaemic looking by day, and restless and agitated by night. Even the setting of London goes under a transformation with Dracula's arrival, and turns into a city worthy of the old Gothic imagination;

> [T]he whole aspect of nature at once became convulsed...The wind roared like thunder...masses of wet clouds which swept by in ghostly fashion, so dank and damp and cold that it needed but little effort of imagination to think that the spirits of those lost at sea were touching their living brethren with the clammy hands of death... (65)

As the tension gets higher and Lucy's sleepwalking gets worse, Mina records the night when what they both fear happens. Lucy, after trying every night in her sleepwalking state to get out of the room, finally does manage to do it and heads for St. Mary's Church where she and Mina visit regularly. In a night with a "bright full moon, with heavy black, driving clouds," (76) Lucy sits alone in the garden of the church, with "something, long and black, bending over the half-reclining white figure" (77). This is the Count attacking Lucy and drinking her blood, which Mina runs to stop, but is too late as there are already "two little red points like pin-pricks" on her neck and "a drop of blood" on her nightdress (78) when she reaches her.

From this point on, the narrative shifts between Mina's journal entries, Dr. Seward's notes – one of Lucy's suitors along with Arthur Godalming and Quincey Morris – and his letters to Dr. Van Helsing. The last character, Stoker's addition to the vampire tradition and a character who found its place in popular culture, is a versatile figure who acts as a doctor, a chemist, a priest, and a guardian. As Lucy becomes gravely ill

after the strange night in the church's courtyard, Van Helsing is called for help by Dr. Seward. With each passing day, Lucy "seems to be growing weaker," (80) her aspiration becomes difficult as she cries "silently between long, painful struggles for breath," (81) and she looks "pale and wan-looking" (82). This unusual state of Lucy worries and intrigues Dr. Seward, who cannot detect the cause behind her illness. He even conducts a blood test for Lucy, though finding that she is, instead, very healthy. What Seward overlooks in this case is brought to surface by Van Helsing who in a solemn attitude states that "[t]here are mysteries which men can only guess at which age by age they may solve only in part" (171). With his fatherly power and dominance that rivals Dracula's, he "stands as the protector of the patriarchal intuitions he so emphatically represents...His largest purpose is to reinstate the dualities that Dracula would muddle and confuse" (Craft 117). Soon enough, Van Helsing will be a forefront figure which leads the Crew of Light to final victory.

Van Helsing's first trial in this way, begins with the demonic transformation of Lucy. From being the sweet and fair girl, Lucy changes into a figure of "voluptuous wantonness" (Stoker 175). Her mutation into the vampiric form is unavoidable; however, as not even three blood transfusions by Dr. Seward, Arthur – her fiancé – Van Helsing and finally the American Quincy Morris could replace and bring her back to health. The "strong young manhood" (101) of either men succeed in restoring Lucy, as she is already defiled by monstrosity and abjection. Just like Dracula, her survival now depends on an abject fluid, blood; "She wants blood and blood she must have or die" (101). On her deathbed, Lucy gains temporary vigour and begins to charm and seductively call for Arthur, similar to the way the vampire ladies did to Harker;

> In a sort of sleepwaking, vague, unconscious way she opened her eyes...and said in a soft, voluptuous voice, such as I [Dr. Seward] had never heard from her lips, 'Arthur! Oh, my love, I am so glad you have come! Kiss me! (133)

As Arthur eagerly bends down to give her a kiss, Van Helsing forcibly pushes him away and flings him across the room. In this scene, Van Helsing acts like a "lion at bay," (134) a strong, patriarchal figure protecting his children from the dangers of the vampire, and most importantly, from the sexually active female.

With the Count's aid, Lucy seems to express her sexuality more openly than she did before. She uses a "diabolically sweet" (176) tone of voice to attract her fiancé, approaches him with a "languorous and voluptuous grace" (176) and directly asks for a kiss, all of which are behaviours an *ideal* Victorian woman never show. Stoker indicates with Lucy's case, what will happen to a woman who wishes to transgress the boundaries established by social order as Boyd suggests; [B]ecause the female vampires represent the New Woman through their rampant sexuality, the patriarchy seeks to destroy them. Certainly, neither Lucy nor the vampire wives make it through the novel without being finally laid to rest" (2).

Even with the "blood of four strong men" (Stoker 126) flowing in her veins, Lucy dies and is subsequently placed in a vault. What is strange in this case as Dr. Seward notes is that after her death, Lucy looks more flourishing and healthy than when she was alive: "There lay Lucy, seemingly just as we had seen her the night before her funeral. She was, if possible, more radiantly beautiful than ever...The lips were red, nay redder than before; and on the cheeks was a delicate bloom" (166). Her death does not end Lucy's part in the narrative however, as shortly after the funeral ends, newspapers begin to report that there has been a "bloofer lady" (147) – child way of saying 'beautiful' – who lures children to dark alleys at night, after which they return looking sick and pale. This is caused by Van Helsing soon reveals, Lucy in her vampire form. Although at first it is difficult for Dr. Seward to believe such a thing, that vampires exist and Lucy could be one of them, when he reads Harker's diary and sees Lucy wandering around at night and returning to her coffin during the day, he begins to accept the reality of the situation. To prove his argument, Van Helsing persuades Dr. Seward and Arthur to watch over Lucy at night in the cemetery. Together, they spot:

> [A] dark-haired woman, dressed in the cerements of the grave...bent down over what we saw to be a fair-haired child. There was a pause and a sharp little cry, such as a child gives in sleep...we recognized the features of Lucy Westenra...but yet how changed. The sweetness was turned to adamantine, heartless cruelty, and the purity to voluptuous wantonness...on Lucy's face we could see that the lips were crimson with fresh blood, and that the stream had trickled over her chin and stained the purity of her lawn death-robe. (175)

When Lucy notices the trio, she doesn't recognize them, and even feels threatened by them, as wild animals do when confronted by hunters:

> As she looked, her eyes blazed with unholy light, and the face became wreathed with a voluptuous smile...With a careless motion, she flung to the ground, callous as a devil, the child that up to now she had clutched strenuously to her breast, growling over it as a dog growls over a bone (175).

Lucy's vampirized form produces such intense feelings in the usually calm and gentle Dr. Seward that he bluntly admits he would enjoy her death; "I call the thing that was before us Lucy...At that moment the remnant of my love passed into hate and loathing; had she then to be killed, I could have done it with savage delight" (175). Lucy, who is now neither alive nor dead, who defies purity and chastity, and who boldly expresses her sexuality, is a threat for Dr. Seward, along with the rest of the men. Her fiancé Arthur however, seems to be enticed by Lucy; "[H]e seemed under a spell; moving his hands from his face, he opened wide his arms" (176). Before Lucy could reach him, Van Helsing stops her once again; "[H]e sprang forward and held between them his little golden crucifix. She recoiled from it, and, with a suddenly distorted face...dashed past him" (176).

Rejecting her natural role as the docile wife and loving mother, Lucy's blatant advancements towards men, and her confident sexual advancements are thus rejected and found abhorrent by the men around her. Incidentally, her inverted treatment of the children, whom she needs to nurture, adds more to her monstrous and abject maternity. Similar to the vampire women who clamped on an infant the Count brought to the castle, Lucy preys on little children and becomes a "bloodthirsty predator who brings about death orally and who reverses the natural role of the mother by feeding off her young victims" (Boudreau 3). What is interesting in this scene is that, the children Lucy feeds on do not die, or turn into vampires like Dracula's victims. Instead, they do survive and seem to willingly go to Lucy. The newspapers report that the children who are bit by this "bloofer lady" ask their parents and nurses if they can play with her again. There are also reports that children have invented a game in which they imitated Lucy coming and taking them away; "This is the more natural as the favourite game of the little ones at present is luring each other away by wiles" (Stoker 147).

This depicts a new form of mothering, a vampiric one or "maternity turned monstrous, one that feeds on children rather than feeding them" (Almond 227). Dennis Foster in "The Little Children can be Bitten" observes that unlike the adults who cannot admit that they feel an attraction for the vampire Lucy, children do not feel obligated to hide their feelings and in fact they

> are drawn to this motherly, erotically charged woman, giving themselves to her while they also identify with her...Lucy's vampiric relations with the children expose the link between the oral and the erotic in the era of childhood and the mutual haunting of mother and child. (488)

Like Dracula, who "knows what he wants and moves relentlessly towards it," (Foster 489) Lucy aims for what she craves. However, Stoker's narrative shows that all transgressive desires such as Lucy's, must be ultimately repressed or eliminated. To achieve this, Van Helsing persuades Dr. Seward and Arthur through a long and elaborate speech that Lucy must be destroyed:

> But if she die in truth, then all cease...when this now Un-Dead be made to rest as true dead, then the soul of the poor lady whom we love shall again be free. Instead of working wickedness by night and growing more debased in the assimilation of it by day, she shall take her place with the other Angels. So that, my friend, it will be a blessed hand for her that shall strike the blow that sets her free. (Stoker 178-179)

The sense of religious high duty Van Helsing ascribes for this task, makes it all the more appealing for the rest of the men. While in the hopes that they are doing God's work but feeling almost sexual arousal from murder, the three men wait and clamp on Lucy's coffin as she sleeps peacefully. In a "gruesome and erotically-charged staking" (Murch 9) Arthur drives a stake through Lucy's heart, while Van Helsing reads from the Bible, and Dr. Seward watches the scene in *delight*;

> The Thing in the coffin writhed; and a hideous, blood-curdling screech came from the opened red lips. The body shook and quivered and twisted in wild contortions...But Arthur never faltered. He looked like a figure of Thor as his untrembling arm rose and fell, driving deeper and deeper the mercy-bearing stake, whilst the blood from the pierced heart welled and spurted up around it. His face was set, and high duty seemed to shine through it; the sight of it gave us courage, so that our voices seemed to ring through the little vault. And then the writing and quivering of the body became less, and the teeth ceased to

> champ, and the face to quiver. Finally it lay still. The terrible task was over. (179-180).

Lucy, who once freely expressed her wish to marry more than one man, when given the masculine power by Dracula, lives an overt sexuality. This proves to be her death sentence, as she is quickly "hammer[ed] into submission" (Murch 9) by the men around her. In Craft's view, the "murderous phallicism" this scene demonstrates, is Lucy's deserved punishment for her "transgression of Van Helsing's gender code" (122). In *Dracula*, it can be observed that women who become abject and thus transgress the boundaries which codify the symbolic realm are immediately singled out as threat, similar to the women who do not conform to the roles assigned to them as wives or mothers. They cannot find a place in the dominant patriarchal, symbolic realm and therefore must be either driven back to the semiotic realm, abjected, or must be eliminated completely. However, it is shown that women like Mina who have a "man's brain" (Stoker 283) who serve as a protective and loving motherly figure will be shown to live on and assist the men in their fight against the Count.

During the period of interval where Dr. Seward, Arthur and Van Helsing pursued Lucy, Harker was absent from the narrative. However, when Mina shows her the copied letters of Dr. Seward and Van Helsing and informs him of what happened, Harker begins to comprehend the reality around him;

> It seems to have made a new man of me. It was the doubt as to the reality of the whole thing that knocked me over. I felt impotent, and in the dark, and distrustful. But, now that I *know*, I am not afraid, even of the Count. (Stoker 156)

Equipped with the shield of knowledge and reason, Harker quickly dismisses the Count's influence on him. After Lucy's death, he joins the three men and accepts, like them, Mina as the replacement of a maternal figure. Mina helps the "Crew of Light" by copying and deciphering letters of correspondence by the Count and the clerks in London, and provides them "motherly" comfort from the horrors the Count produce. She not only nurtures Harker, but also tends to a weakened Arthur;

> With a sob he laid his head on my shoulder and cried like a wearied child, whilst he shook with emotion. We women have something of the mother in us that makes us rise above smaller matters when the mother spirit is invoked. I

> felt this big sorrowing man's head resting on me, as though it were that of a baby that someday may lie on my bosom, and I stroked his hair as though he were my own child. (191)

Mina's pure "motherly-spirit" however, does not stop the Count from targeting her. In fact, it makes it more appropriate for Dracula to go after Mina, as he himself confirms in a threatening speech directed towards the Crew of Light; "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" (255). While the men are on the search for him, Mina is left alone in the house as Van Helsing claims that she is "our star and our hope" (201). Mina fears that the men will not ask for her help again if she appears "as a drag or a hindrance to their work," (201) and thus believes it will be better for her to stay back. This proves to be a fatal decision as the Count invades the house and attacks Mina. What's more, the attack takes place when Harker is present, though rendered immobile by the Count's hypnotism. Just like in the castle, Harker is driven back to a "female-like" suppression, "his face flushed and breathing heavily as though in a stupor" (234) while the Count attacks Mina;

> Kneeling on the near edge of the bed facing outwards was the white-clad figure of his wife. By her side stood a tall, thin man, clad in black. His face was turned from us, but the instant we saw we all recognized the Count, in every way, even to the scar on his forehead. With his left hand he held both Mrs. Harker's hands, keeping them away with her arms at full tension. His right hand gripped her by the back of the neck, forcing her face down on his bosom. Her white nightdress was smeared with blood, and a thin stream trickled down the man's bare chest which was shown by his torn-open dress. The attitude of the two had a terrible resemblance to a child forcing a kitten's nose into a saucer of milk to compel it to drink. (234)

For the narrative, this is such a remarkable scene that it is presented twice, first by Dr. Seward's account, and then by Mina's own experience of it;

> With that he pulled open his shirt, and with his long sharp nails opened a vein in his breast. When the blood began to spurt out, he took my hands in one of his, holding them tight, and with the other seized my neck and pressed my mouth to the wound, so that I must either suffocate or swallow some to the... Oh, my God! My God! What have I done? What have I done to deserve such a fate, I who have tried to walk in meekness and righteousness all my days.

> God pity me! Look down on a poor soul in worse than mortal peril. And in mercy pity those to whom she is dear!" (239)

Through the grandeur of Stoker's narration, another layer is added to the Count's ambivalent sexuality. When on the one hand he is sexually active and attacks women, on the other, *she* "nurses" or "suckles" children, and provides them with *her* bodily fluid as a mother. The Count's blood in this scene "becomes reminiscent of the "lifeblood" that the mother provides in the act of breastfeeding" (Howsam 45). Similarly, Craft argues that the "Vampire's baptism of blood" (Stoker 269) on Mina also points at an "interfusion of masculine and feminine functions";

> We are at the Count's breast, encouraged once again to substitute white for red, as blood becomes milk...Such fluidity of substitution and displacement entails a confusion of Dracula's sexual identity, or an interfusion of masculine and feminine functions, as Dracula here becomes a lurid mother offering not a breast but an open and bleeding wound. (125)

The relationship between this mother and daughter is further complicated when Mina in a way, confesses that she did not feel like objecting or stopping the Count; "I was bewildered, and strangely though, I did not want to hinder him. I suppose it is a part of the terrible curse that this happens when his touch is on his victim" (Stoker 239). Mina's inability in this case hints at a regression into the "desirable and terrifying, nourishing and murderous, fascinating and abject inside of the maternal body" (*PH* 54). When all throughout the narrative she was depicted as the protective and loving mother, with the entrance of the abject monstrous, her role is reversed and replaced with an infant's. Furthermore, the blood stains on her white night dress, suggests that Mina's previous purity has been defiled; "Unclean, unclean! I must touch him or kiss him no more" (236). Having been attacked by the vampire, Mina acknowledges her own abjection and defilement and separates herself from the rest of the crew. She is now liminal like the vampire, freely floating between the "aristocratic ideal of the ornamental woman and the liberated figure of the 'New Woman'" (Spitzer-Hanks 18). Along with Harker, she is reduced to animal imagery and turned into a "kitten" (234) who is forced to drink milk from a bowl, she becomes someone *less* than herself, a woman whose "goodness and purity and faith was outcast from God;" (257)

> I know that all that brave earnest men can do for a poor weak woman, whose soul perhaps is lost ...you will do. But you must remember that I am not as you are. There is a poison in my blood, in my soul, which may destroy me; which must destroy me, unless some relief come to us. (275)

With Lucy killed, Mina and Harker are the only ones left under the influence of the vampire. Both of them 'impure,' "neither Mina nor Jonathan can lay claim to coherent identity until the vampiric threat is laid to rest" (Spitzer-Hanks 17). This is achieved through a less traditional method in the narrative – than compiling data through journals and newspaper entries – through Mina's newly achieved "vampiric" abilities. As she drank from the Count's blood, her mind is connected to his, and in this way she can psychically see where he is going or hear the sounds around him. "This merging," Almond observes, "is the most primitive and frightening level of anxiety expressed in this story, representing an annihilation of the self, of the sense of agency, cohesion and autonomy" (228).

While the connection between Mina and the Count sounds promising, the "horrid poison" (Stoker 268) worsens her mental and physical condition by each second. She begins to grow fangs, her general, loving attitude changes into a gloomy and ominous one. However, as they are under constant threat of being engulfed by abjection, the crew must now push Mina and themselves into a long and dreary pursuit of the Count. Using Mina's new abilities, Van Helsing hypnotises her and through her, they learn where the Count is headed. Still, as much as Mina can spy on him, the Count can also see and hear Mina's whereabouts. For this reason, the men decide not to disclose their plans anywhere near Mina, and only discuss them discreetly.

In the final chapters, the crew follows the Count back to Transylvania to his castle. As they get close to the castle, there comes a sudden and dramatic change in Harker. His previous, strong resolution to find and kill the Count leaves its place to fear and doubt, and his physical and mental state suddenly begins to deteriorate. And when Van Helsing proposes that they bring Mina along to the castle, Harker finally loses his self-control:

> He became almost speechless for a minute, and then he went on: 'Do you know what the place is? Have you seen that awful den of hellish infamy...every speck

> of dust that whirls in the wind a devouring monster in embryo? Have you felt the Vampire's lips upon your throat?' Here he turned to me, and as his eyes lit on my forehead, he threw up his arms with a cry: 'Oh my God, what have we done to have this terror upon us!' and he sank down on the sofa in a collapse of misery. (Stoker 296)

Until the moment the Crew reaches the Count's castle and find the coffins, Harker is muted in the narrative. He is only observed to be in a state of frenzy, which seems to accentuate as the threat of the vampire gets close. As readers, we are carried to the climactic moment of the Count's death through Mina's and Van Helsing's accounts, not by Harker's, as Van Helsing takes on the responsibility of killing the female vampires.

Similar to the situation Harker was in with the female vampires, Van Helsing feels mesmerized and attracted by them. He witnesses their "voluptuous beauty" (308) which nevertheless gives him shivers, makes him weak and even falter from his purpose. And just like Harker, upon the sight of the vampire Van Helsing briefly gives up his patriarchal masculinity; "She was so far to look on, so radiantly beautiful, so exquisitely voluptuous, that the very instinct of man in me, which calls some of my sex to love and to protect one of hers, made my head whirl with new emotion" (308). However beautiful and fair they may seem, and however much Van Helsing dreads it, the narrative shows that these women must be eliminated. Thus, with a stake that pierces through their hearts, the three vampires are killed and laid to rest by Van Helsing. Leaving no reminiscent behind, they turn into dust and float away as Van Helsing observes; "[H]ardly had my knife severed the head of each, before the whole body began to melt away and crumble into its native dust'" (309). On the following day after the female vampires are killed, the Crew along with Mina gets together to strike the final blow to the threat of the vampire. Harker this time takes the lead, and lifts the coffin of the Count, which Mina records later in her journal;

> He was deathly pale, just like a waxen image, and the red eyes glared with the horrible vindictive look which I knew too well. As I looked, the eyes saw the sinking sun, and the look of hate in them turned to triumph. But, on the instant, came the sweep and flash of Jonathan's great knife...before our very eyes, and almost in drawing of a breath, the whole body crumbled into dust and passed from our sight. (314)

Just as it started with his narrative, *Dracula* ends with a final note by Harker. He and Mina now have a son, who was born on the day the Count died. Seven years later they return to Transylvania, and to the castle to see that "[e]very trace of all that had been was blotted out. The castle stood as before, reared high above a waste of desolation" (315). Even though Stoker finalizes the narrative with the dissipation of the vampire and restoration of order, abjection continues to haunt from the margins. Both the characters and the society they live in are "tainted" by the presence of the vampire, of abjection, which "stands as a residue that cannot be washed off" (Spitzer-Hanks 18). The boy's birth in the end, most vividly signals at this as Halberstam suggests:

> Monster in fact, merges with man by the novel's end and the boy reincarnates the dead American, Quincey Morris, and the dead vampire, Dracula, as if to ensure that from now on, Englishness will become, rather than a purity of heritage and linage or a symbol for national power, nothing more than a lost moment in Gothic history. (Halberstam 106).

In opposition to *Frankenstein* where there was one abject monster – the Creature – in *Dracula*, there are more than one monster to be analysed: the Count, Lucy, and the vampire women. Each of these "foul things" (Stoker 32) are presented through their transgressive corporeality which threatens and subverts the traditional roles ascribed to females and mothers, as well as males in the Victorian era. Throughout *Dracula*, the abject monsters continuously threaten the rest of the characters with returning to the realm of the mother: the semiotic. This also entails their identity dissolving, or succumbing to abjection and losing their unified, symbolic position. The characters who confront abjection in this sense – Harker, Mina, Lucy, Dr. Seward, Arthur Godalming and Quincey Morris – can be observed to weaken under this threat, until eventually the monsters are "thrown off" and the order is restored. Especially Harker in this process, nearly becomes abject himself under the influence of the Count and the female vampires. His voice is greatly oppressed after his encounter with the Count and rarely heard until towards the end when the Count is dying.

The results of the imbalance between the semiotic and symbolic realms caused by the abject monsters, can be observed in female and male characters uniquely. Similar to Lucy, Mina is pulled out of the symbolic realm from her position of the pure, loving

mother and driven to the semiotic to take on the role of the female seductress, who tempts the men around her (Van Helsing). The male characters in this respect – Van Helsing, Dr. Seward, Arthur Godalming, Quincey Morris and Harker – become temporarily affected by abject monstrosity; they are either feminized and oppressed like Harker and Arthur or immobilized and forced to act immorally in order to fight with the abject monsters. However, in the end they – Mina, with the help of the rest of the characters – are able to overcome abjection, and keep the symbolic order as well as their own positions in it, intact.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Under the light of Kristeva's literary theories, this thesis has focused on monstrosity and abjection in two different Gothic novels: *Frankenstein* (1818) by Mary Shelley and *Dracula* (1897) by Bram Stoker. In both novels, it has been observed that an abject other loaded with unconscious fears, desires, impulses and those fundamental contradictions of the human psyche, is included in the narrative to depict the instability between the "symbolic order" and what Kristeva names as "the other side of the border" (*PH* 3). Both Shelley's "patched-up" monster and Stoker's immortal count are abject beings who disrupt the norms, rules and order, under which the rest of the characters live. Their abject presence and uncontainable liminality bring the "semiotic" and "symbolic" orders together, causing the two to dangerously mingle. While Kristeva argues that the traces of the semiotic order can be found in the symbolic, her attitude signals at the necessity of the two orders to stand separate. She also hints at this by stating that if one order is to overcome the other, the subject goes under the risk of falling into an identity crisis. For the subject to successfully come out of the confusion between these two orders, the abject monster(s) must be "thrown off," and cast away from the symbolic order. In this way, it can be understood that the semiotic order must also be overcome. According to Kristeva, any encounter with what is abject threatens the "I," with a regression to the chaotic maternal realm, and with loss of identity, unity and finally with self-annihilation. Thus, when equipped with the generative powers of the "archaic mother," the monsters in *Frankenstein* and *Dracula* show what the characters risk when they don't successfully abject the monsters: their very own being and the collapse of the symbolic order.

Both *Dracula* and *Frankenstein* are works which were written close to the end of an era and the beginning of a new one. *Dracula* is published in 1897, when Victorian realism were coming to an end along with the interest in Gothic fiction; *Frankenstein* was written at a time when the enthusiasm created by Radcliffe and Walpole was burning down and "formal realism" was on the rise. It has been observed that both novels involve individuals who are torn between their inner passions and outside reality, and a society which pre-conditions human behaviour, and interaction under strictly divided spheres: "domestic," and "public". In this condition, Stoker's vampire Count and Victor's monstrous creature emerge and set off to terrorize those around them. Their horror is rooted in their in-betwixt nature; oscillating between life/death, maternal/paternal, and human/animal. Such a condition, Hogle (1998) asserts, "echoes the most primal, and thus abject-ed, state in *Powers of Horror*: the moment of birth where the emerging infant is half-inside and half-outside the mother, partly dead and partly alive...in a liminal 'either/or' of which we retain dim somatic memories" (207). As this thesis has shown, even though in the end a rational subject may emerge, it always does so with a "pre-conscious longing and loathing for the 'root' heterogeneity so basic to it" (207).

Similar to *Dracula*, Shelley's *Frankenstein* begins with a depiction of a patriarchal symbolic hero, Victor, who has his respective place in a middle-class society, and on the way to form a family of his own. When his mother suddenly passes away; however, Victor's life undergoes a dramatic change and he is sent alone to university to pursue an education in science. In there, he begins to study anatomy and natural science, unconsciously following a "lack," which has been created by his mother after her death. This results in the creation of the monster, whom Victor subsequently rejects when it becomes alive. The Creature – much like abjection – does not stop pursuing and challenging Victor, and so in the end "both characters reach an equal degree of alienation and self-torture and indeed become indistinguishable as they purse each other across the frozen polar wastes" (Johnson 16).

As the pursuit drags on and the Creature's threats become more literal – with Clerval's and William's deaths – Victor begins to experience "self-abjection." He appears to be

going through both a moral and physical degradation, he is unable to be recognized not only by his friends and family, but also by himself. Only retaining an attachment to the abject Creature, Victor falls into an identity crisis where he cannot define himself as a rational subject anymore, and cannot fully embrace his abject transformation propelled by the Creature's presence. Thus, he can only identify himself through a monstrosity similar to the Creature's: "I considered the being whom I had cast among mankind...nearly in the light of my own vampire, my own spirit let loose from the grave, and forced to destroy all that was dear to me" (Shelley 60).

The literary analysis and symbolism surrounding the Creature is exhaustive, yet, what many of the critics studying *Frankenstein* seem to agree on is the representation of the feminine and the maternal through the monstrous presence of the Creature. This becomes more evident when Victor rejects the Creature's request to form a female monster, and violently destroys the half-finished thing. Victor's inability to face the maternal yet his deep longing for it resonates in his failed attempts to make terms with the Creature, which in the end traps him in abjection and drives him to his eventual death. The recurring image of the mother in Frankenstein is analysed by some critics such as Marie Mulvey-Roberts (2000), Ellen Moers (1995), and Marc A. Rubenstein (1976) as Shelley's personal attempt to reunite with her mother Mary Wollstonecraft, whose death Shelley had believed herself to be responsible for. Even with basic knowledge about Shelley's life – her mother's death upon her birth, and her own two children dying at infancy – one can sense a connection between a "lost motherhood" and the search for it. Moers suggests, *Frankenstein* is Shelley's feelings of "revulsion against newborn life, and the drama of guilt, dread, and flight surrounding birth and its consequences" (81).

In *Dracula*, the dark and mysterious Count, his three voluptuous vampiric daughters, as well as those characters that he turns into vampires, all cause the rest of the characters to experience abjection at close range, and face their "ultimate dissolution into primal chaos as they approach this feminized nadir that is both the ultimate Other and the basically groundless ground of the self" (Hogle, "Introduction" 11). Not only Harker experiences the terrors in Castle Dracula, but also the rest of the characters are

driven to the margins of the norm in which they live, due to the liminal and transgressive nature of the vampire. Dr. Seward is initially depicted as a righteous, hard-working doctor who is devoted to his patients in the asylum but towards the end, he is seen to enjoy the joint killing and decapitation of Lucy as she sleeps in her coffin. Arthur, Lucy's fiancé, is stopped twice before he can answer Lucy's "voluptuous" calling for physical affection. He even shows rage when Van Helsing tears him away from her. Towards the end of the story, even Van Helsing is seen to falter in front of the beautiful vampire women, and admit himself to be a "bigamist" after seeing Lucy in her luscious, vampiric form. Towards the end of the narrative, even though they repeatedly emphasize themselves to be doing God's work, the "Crew of Light" along with Harker begin to resemble those monsters they so despise and want to kill. While their experience of it is not as intense as Harker's, their abjection can still be observed as Stoker provides detailed journal entries of the characters, as well as different viewpoints of the same events.

As mentioned above, in *Dracula*, Harker is the one who experiences abjection in close proximity in the Count's castle. As readers we witness through Harker's meticulous journal entries how he slowly loses his Western imperialist supremacy, and how he is gradually feminized, suppressed, and stripped of autonomy by the abject monsters he tries to ignore desperately. What this leads to are sudden and painful oscillations between the semiotic and the symbolic realms, which eventually render Harker "insane," and leave him in a state of mental and physical decay. Hence, when in England Mina begins to take care of a weakened Harker, who does not comprehend the reality around him until Mina is the one to relay him the Count's actions in London. In order to recapture his status of a whole, unified, and rationally fixed subject, Harker – as well as the rest of the characters – resolves to "throw off" what disturbs "identity, system, order...borders, positions, rules" (*PH* 4). More importantly in this equation, there is the ambiguous Count who disrupts gender roles, and substitutes the Mother who is threateningly powerful yet intimately secure at the same time.

In this regard, this study has identified the following assumption that *Frankenstein* and *Dracula* respectively show (a) failure of abjecting what disturbs the system, the order and the personal/social boundaries; self- annihilation, and (b) the aftermath of successful abjection of the monsters; reinstatement of the symbolic order. It has also been observed that when the abject monsters representing Kristeva's understanding of the maternal are not similarly abjected, "then aggression turns toward the self or, if an identity with the mother is unbroken, the self will be 'killed' in the process of the elimination of the maternal" (Bronfen 135). In other words, according to Kristeva's theories, in both *Frankenstein* and *Dracula*, the mother becomes a figure who cannot survive in the patriarchal symbolic order unless she is purified and reduced to her basic qualities; docile, pure and sweet protective.

In Stoker's text, the identification with the mother is not as strong as in Shelley's, yet, it is evident that there is the need to eliminate abjection and the mother, along with the perversion of her image which arises with the inclusion of the vampire. The moment Lucy returns as a vampire and preys upon the children – instead of the usual maternal duty she needs to follow and take care of them – she becomes a threat in the eyes of the Crew. Similarly, when Mina is attacked by the Count, her role of the caring mother is usurped, she becomes "unclean," and even marked on the head when Van Helsing touches her forehead with sacramental bread. The image of the holy, pure and loving mother is further violated when the Count "suckles" Mina by cutting a slit on his chest and forcing her to drink his blood. Thus, the necessity to eliminate the abject monsters become stronger in *Dracula*, as it threatens but also assures the subject with presence of the mother.

In conclusion, in the two Gothic novels *Frankenstein* and *Dracula*, this study has identified the necessity to "throw off" what is abnormal, disruptive and inconsistent; and what impedes a subject to develop properly and find its place in the established social/symbolic order. This argument has been explored in the light of Kristeva's concept of the "abject," and her theorization of the figure of the mother and the maternal. In this regard, *Frankenstein*, shows the results of failure in eliminating what is abject; the collapse of the symbolic order – as induced by the abject monster – the

subject's self-annihilation along with the abjection of those around it. *Dracula* on the other hand, depicts the successful elimination of personal anomalies brought to surface by abject monsters, the restoration of gender-roles, the borders between life and death, as well as human and animal. The disruption of the symbolic order can be seen in the aforementioned focus on the mother, and the shift of focus from the subject itself to the one that defies that order. Furthermore, the balance between pure and impure – which can be said to underlie the basic structures of the symbolic order – is also disturbed, as the characters are objectified, defiled, and literally "marked" by the abject monstrosity they confront.

The discussions carried out in this study can be further developed by means of a feminist literary criticism where the response to abjection and the final outcome of the two novels are discussed in relation to authors' gender difference. It is interesting to note that in *Dracula*, the symbolic order is eventually restored and the monsters are defeated, but in Shelley's *Frankenstein*, not only the semiotic overcomes the symbolic, but also the Creature's death is not explicitly narrated and thus remains an ambiguous issue. Both authors' biographies can also be included in the analysis at this point, as Stoker is mentioned to have struggled with an authoritative and over-protective mother during his childhood and Shelley had to grow up without one. In this respect, *Frankenstein* and *Dracula* can be read as the two authors' personal journeys of dealing with abjection, and particularly with the figure of the mother in their own way.

Another interesting point of study can be an analysis of the dramatisations and contrasting film adaptations of these two novels. While *Dracula* was later on adapted to theatre by Stoker himself, *Frankenstein* received dramatisation as early as 1823, and by an author other than Shelley herself. Furthermore, there are two different texts of *Frankenstein* with what can be read as minor alterations; an 1818 publication of the story which Percy Bysshe Shelley is rumoured to add changes and make adjustments himself, and a later 1831 – on which this thesis is based – where Shelley omitted and change some parts such as Elizabeth being a stranger who is adopted instead of her being Victor's cousin (Jansson" "Introduction xxv). In conclusion, it

can be said that the two Gothic novels now regarded as “classics,” have been extensively discussed in modern literary criticism, and thus there may be limited arguments to offer. However, what this thesis aimed to show in a way, was the fact that there is never an end to question a novel, and sometimes the same questions may even lead to different answers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Almond, Barbara R. "Monstrous Infants and Vampyric Mothers in Bram Stoker's Dracula." *The Internation Journal of Psychoanalysis,* vol. 88, no.1, 2007, pp. 219-235. Web. 19 Mar. 2019.

Arata, Stephen D. "The Occidental Tourist: 'Dracula' and the Anxiety of Reverse Colonization." *Victorian Studies,* vol. 33, no. 4, 1990, pp. 621-645. Web. 21 Mar. 2019.

Astle, Richard. "Dracula as Totemic Monster: Lacan, Freud, Oedipus and History." *The University of Wisconsin Press Journals,* vol. 8, no. 4, 1979, pp. 98-105. Web. 4 Jan. 2019.

Beardsworth, Sarah. *Julia Kristeva Psychoanalysis and Modernity*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2004.

Becker-Leckrone, Megan. *Julia Kristeva and Literary Theory*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Belford, Barbara. *Bram Stoker: A biography of the author of Dracula*. New York: Random House, 1996.

Botting, Fred. *Gothic*. Oxon: Routledge, 2014.

—. *Making monstrous: Frankenstein, Criticism, Theory*. New York: Manchester University Press, 1991.

—. “Frankenstein, Werther, and the Monster of Love.” *News from Nowhere: Theory and Politics of Romanticism.* edited by Tony Pinkney, Keith Hanley, and Fred Botting, Keele: Keele University Press, 1995. pp. 157-87

Boudreau, Brigitte. “Mother Dearest, Mother Deadliest: Object Relations Theory and the Trope of Failed Motherhood in *Dracula*.” *Journal of Dracula Studies,* no. 11, 2009, pp. 1-8. Web. 17 Feb. 2019.

Bown, Nicola, et al. *The Victorian Supernatural*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Boyd, Kathryn. “Making Sense of Mina: Stoker's Vampirization of the Victorian Woman in Dracula.” English Honors Theses. Trinity University, 2004. Web. 11 June 2019.

Bronfen, Elizabeth. *Over Her Dead Body: Death, Femininity, and the Aesthetic*. New York: Manchester University Press, 1992.

Burke, Edmund. *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*. USA: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Carter, Margaret L., editor. *Dracula: The Vampire and the Critics*. London: UMI Research Press, 1988.

Céline, Louis-Ferdinand. *The Life and Work of Semmelweiss: A Fictional Biography*, Doctoral Dissertation. Web. 21 Feb. 2019.

Chu, Seo-Young. *Do Metaphors Dream of Literal Sleep?A Science-Fictional Theory of Representation*. USA: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome. *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*. London: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

Copati, Guilherme and Adelaine La Guardia. “The Unbelonging: Abject Female Identities in Gothic Fiction.” *Interfaces Brazil/Canada,* vol. 13, no. 2, 2013, pp. 201-222. Web. 29 May 2019

Cottom, Daniel. “Frankenstein and the Monster of Representation.” *SubStance,* vol. 9, no. 3, 1980, pp. 60-71. Web. 11 Apr. 2019

Covino, Deborah Caslav. *Amending the Abject Body: Aesthetic Nakeovers in Medicine and Culture*. New York: State University of New York Press, 2004.

Craft, Christopher. “‘Kiss me with those Red Lips’: Gender and Inversion in Bram Stoker's Dracula.” *Representations*, no. 8, 1984, pp. 107-133. Web. 17 Apr.2019.

Craton, Lillian. *The Victorian Freak Show: The Significance of Disability and Physical Difference in 19th century fiction*. New York: Cambria Press, 2009.

Creed, Barbara. *The Monstrous-feminine: Film, Feminism, Psychoanalysis*. New York: Routledge, 1993.

—. “Horror and the Monstrous-Feminine: An Imaginary Abjection.” *Screen*, vol. 27, no. 1, 1986, pp. 44–71.

Damer, Erika Zimmerman. *In the Flesh: Embodied Identities in Roman Elegy*. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2018.

Duschinsky, Robbie. “Abjection and self-identity: Towards a Revised Account of Purity and Impurity.” *The Sociological Review*, vol. 61, no. 4, 2013, pp. 709-727. Web. 15 Apr. 2019.

Edwards, Justin D. "British Gothic nationhood, 1760–1830." *The Gothic World*. edited by Glennis Byron and Dale Townshend, New York: Routledge, 2014. pp. 51-61.

Foster, Dennis. "'The little children can be bitten': A Hunger for Dracula." *Dracula: Case Studies in Contemporary Criticism.* edited by John Paul Riquelme, New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2002, pp. 483-99.

Gamer, Michael. "Gothic fictions and Romantic writing in Britain." *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction,* edited by Jerold E. Hogle, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. pp. 85-104.

Gibbon, Edward. *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, edited by David Womersley, London: Penguin Classics, 2001.

Goodnow, Katherine. *Kristeva in focus: From Theory to Film Analysis*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2010.

Gross, Elizabeth. "The Body of Signification." *Abjection, Melancholia, and Love: The Work of Julia Kristeva*. edited by John Fletcher and Andrew Benjamin, Oxon: Routledge, 2012. pp. 80-103.

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

Hoeveler, Diane. "*Frankenstein,* Feminism, and Literary Theory." *The Cambridge Companion to Mary Shelley,* edited by Esther Schor, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. pp. 45-62

Hogle, Jerold E. "Introduction: The Gothic in Western culture." *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction,* edited by Jerold E. Hogle, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002. pp. 1-20.

—. “Stoker's Counterfeit Gothic: Dracula and Theatricality at the Dawn of Simulation.” *Bram Stoker: History, Psychoanalysis, and the Gothic*. edited by William Hughes and Andrew Smith, New York: Palgrave, 1998. pp. 205-224.

—. “The Gothic Ghost of the Counterfeit and the Progress of Abjection.” *A New Companion to Gothic*. edited by David Punter, Haboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012. pp. 496-509.

—. “Theorizing the Gothic.” *Teaching The Gothic*, edited by Anna Powell and Andrew Smith. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006. pp. 29-47.

Homans, Margaret.*Bearing the Word: Language and Female Experince in 19th Century Women's Writing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Howsam, Melissa Anne. *Reading Through Abjection*. MS Thesis, North Carolina State University, 2003. Web. 11 Feb. 2019.

Hurley, Kelly. *The Gothic Body: Sexuality, Materialism, and Degeneration at the Fin de Siécle*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Imholte, Robin. “Abjection in Late Nineteenth Century British Literature.” MS Thesis, The Faculty of Humboldt State University, 2017. Web. 7 Feb 2019.

Jensen, Beth. “Ambiguous Struggle: Abjecting the M/other in ‘As I Ebb’d with the Ocean of Life’.” *Walt Whitman Quarterly Review*, no. 18, 2001, pp. 107-133. Web. 29 Apr. 2019.

Johnson, Barbara. “My Monster/My Self.” *A Life With Mary Shelley*, edited by Werner Hamacher, Standford: Standford University Press, 2014. pp. 15-26

Kavka, Misha. “The Gothic in Screen.” *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction*, edited by Jerold E. Hogle, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002. pp. 209-228.

Keltner, S.K. *Kristeva: Thresholds*. Polity Press: Cambridge, 2011.

Kilgour, Maggie. *The rise of the Gothic novel*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Kristeva, Julia. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. translated by Leon S. Roudiez, New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.

—. *Revolution in Poetic Language*. translated by Margaret Waller, New York: Columbia University Press, 1984

—. *Desire in Language*. translated by Margaret Waller, New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.

Kutzbach, Konstanze and Mueller Monika, editors. *The Abject of Desire: The Aestheticization of the Unaesthetic in Contemporary Literature and Culture*. Amsterdam: Rodopi B.V, 2007.

Lancaster, Ashley Craig. "From Frankenstein's Monster to Lester Ballard: The Evolving Gothic Monster." *The Midwest Quarterly*, vol. 49, no. 2, 2008, pp. 132-147. Web. 22 Mar. 2019.

Lechte, John. *Julia Kristeva*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

—. and Maria Margaroni. *Julia Kristeva: Live Theory*. London: Continuum, 2004.

Lopez, Maria J. "The Gothic, the Abject and the Monstrous: A Revision of National Identitiy in Virginia Woolf's *Between the Acts*." *English Studies*, vol. 97, no. 5, 2014, pp. 493-509. Web. 30 Jan. 2019.

Łowczanin, Agnieszka. "Convention, Repetition and Abjection: The Way of the Gothic." *Text Matters*, vol. 4, no. 4, 2014, pp. 184-183 Web. 29 Jan. 2019.

Mellor, Anne K. “Usurping the Female.” *Mary Shelley: Her Life, Her Fiction, Her Monsters*, edited by Anne K. Mellor, New York: Methuen, 1988. pp. 115-26.

Moers, Ellen. “Biographical Soundings: Of Mothers and Daughters.” *The Endurance of Frankenstein: Essays on Mary Shelley's Novel*, edited by George Levine and U. C. Knoeflmacher, London: University of California Press, 1976. pp. 77-87.

Mulvey-Roberts, Mary. “The Corpse in the Corpus: Frankenstein, Rewriting Wollstonecraft and the Abject.” *Mary Shelley's Fictions: From Frankenstein to Falkner,* edited by Michael Eberle-Sinatra, New York: Macmillan, 2000.

"Monster." Oxford Living Dictionaries, *Oxford. https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/monster*

Murch, Brianna. *Beyond Maidens, Minxes and Mothers: The Female Vampire and Gothic Other in Dracula, Hellsing, and Chibi Vampire.* 2013. Bemidji State University, MS Thesis. Web. 21 Apr. 2019.

Oliver, Kelly. *Reading Kristeva: Unraveling The Double-bind*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.

Payne, Michael. *Reading Theory:An Introduction to Lacan, Derrida, and Kristeva.* Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 1993.

Punter, David. *A Companion to the Gothic*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001.

—. and Glennis Byron. *The Gothic*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2004.

Radcliffe, Ann. *The Mysteries of Udolpho*. Ontario: In Paranthesis Publications, 2001.

Reineke, Martha J. *Sacrificed Lives: Kristeva on Women and Violence*. U.S.A: Indiana University Press, 1997.

Rogers, David. Introduction. *Dracula*. by Bram Stoker. London: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 2000.

Roth, Phyllis. "Suddenly Sexual Women in Bram Stoker's Dracula." *Literature and Psychology*, vol. 27, no.3, 1977, pp. 113-21.

Rubenstein, Marc A. "'My Accursed Origin': The Search for the Mother in 'Frankenstein'." *Studies in Romanticism*, vol. 15, no. 2, 1976, pp. 165-194.

Ryan, Faith. "Monstrous Femininity: The Female Abject in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* and John Milton's *Paradise Lost*" *The Albatross*, vol. 8, 2018, pp. 24-32.

Selden, Raman et.al. *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory.* Harlow: Pearson, 2005.

Schor, Esther. *The Cambridge Companion to Mary Shelley*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Scott, Sir Walter. *Lives of the Novelists*. Philedelphia: H.C. Carey & I. Lea, 1825. Web. 3 June 2019

Shildrick, Margrit. *Embodying the Monster: Encounters with the Vulnerable Self*. London: Sage Publications, 2002.

Sigmund, Freud. "The Uncanny." *Studies in Parapsychology*, edited by Philip Rieff, New York: Collier Books, 1963.

Jansson, Siv. Introduction. *Frankenstein.* by Mary Shelley. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1999.

Sowerby, Robin. "The Goths in History and Pre-Gothic Gothic." *A New Companion to the Gothic*, edited by David Punter,West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012. pp. 25-37.

Spitzer-Hanks, D.T. *As Through a Glass, Darkly: Abjection and Masculinity in Narrative.* 2010. University of Utrecht, MS Thesis. Web. 21 Feb. 2019.

Sprengnether, Madelon. *The Spectral Mother: Freud, Feminism and Psychoanalysis*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Townshend, Dale and Glennis Byron. *The Gothic World*. New York: Routledge, 2014.

Trueba, Rubén Ortiz. *The Monsters Within: Gothic Monstrosity in Dracula, Frankenstein, and Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde and its Role in the Nineteenth Century English Society.* 2015-16. University of Basque Country, MS Thesis. Web. 3 Feb. 2019.

Waters, Mary A. *British Women Writers of the Romantic Period: An Anthology of Their Literary Criticism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: TURKISH SUMMARY/TÜRKÇE ÖZET

İKİ GOTİK ROMANA İLİŞKİN YARATIKIMSI İĞRENÇLİK ÇALIŞMASI: *DRACULA* VE *FRANKENSTEIN*

Bu çalışma Mary Shelley'nin *Frankenstein* (1818) ve Bram Stoker'ın *Dracula* (1897) isimli eserlerini, içinde bulundurdukları iğrenç (abject) yaratıklar ve bu yaratıkların anlatıdaki toplumsal/sembolik düzendeki işlevi yönünden incelemektedir. Aynı zamanda, romanlardaki kahramanların özne analizinin, psikanalitik gelişim teorisi çerçevesinde incelenmesi amaçlanmaktadır. Bu konuların analizinde teorik çerçeve olarak Julia Kristeva'nın *Korkunun Güçleri* (*Powers of Horror*) (1980) isimli uzun denemesinde öne sürdüğü "iğrençlik" (abjection) kavramı kullanılacaktır. Kristeva'nın bu eserinin yanında, aynı zamanda *Şiirsel Dilde Devrim* (*Revolution in Poetic Language*) (1974), *Aşk Hikâyeleri* (*Tales of Love*) (1983) ve *Kara Güneş* (*Black Sun*) (1984) isimli eserlerinden de yararlanılacaktır. Kristeva bu eserlerinde genellikle özne gelişimi, psikanaliz ve özne-çevre arasındaki ilişkiye yer vermiştir. Bu bağlamda özellikle *Şiirsel Dilde Devrim* (*Revolution in Poetic Language*) (1974) isimli eseri öznenin bebeklikten itibaren psikolojik gelişimini ve bebeğin gelişimin ilk evrelerinde ve ilerleyen seviyelerde anneyle olan ilişkisini inceler. Kristeva bu noktada özne gelişimini baba üzerinden kuran ve babayı gelişimde temel etken olarak belirleyen birçok psikanalistin (öncelikli olarak Sigmund Freud ve Jacques Lacan) düşüncelerinden sapmaktadır. Dolayısıyla Kristeva'nın teorilerini herhangi bir gotik roman analizinde kullanmak, her ne kadar psikanaliz çerçevesinde olsa da tamamen farklı bir bakış açısından incelemek anlamına gelmektedir.

Geçmişten günümüze yapılan roman incelemeleri, çoğunlukla Marksist, emperyalist, romantik vs. teoriler kapsamında yapılmıştır. Özellikle 18. yüzyıl sonlarına doğru yazılan, gotik roman türünün ilk örneği olarak görülen romanlar Marksist teori çerçevesinde karakterlerin sınıf ve ekonomik farklılıkları temel alınarak incelenmiştir. Buna örnek olarak Ertuğrul Koç ve Neslihan Atcan Altan'a ait "Fear and Wish-fulfilling Flights of Fancy: Walpole's Nightmare of Class Conflict and the Restoration of Aristocracy in *The Castle of Otranto*" (2014) isimli makale öne sürülebilir. Her ne kadar politikadan uzak olarak görünseler de 18. yüzyıl sonu ve 19. yüzyıl başlarında yazılan gotik romanlar, karakterlerin sınıf ve ekonomik farklılıkları bakımından incelenmesi oldukça mümkün eserlerdir.

19. yüzyılın sonlarına gelindiğinde hem gotik türünün değişime ve gelişime uğradığı, hem de ileride yapılacak olan gotik roman incelemelerinin farklı teoriler çerçevesinde gerçekleştirildiği görülmüştür. 20. yüzyıl başlarında öne sürdüğü fikirler ve eserler sayesinde psikoloji biliminin kurucusu olarak görülen Sigmund Freud, bu anlamda gotik roman incelemelerinin teorik bakımdan yön değiştirmesine yol açmıştır. Sosyal çevre ve karakter arasındaki ilişkinin yanında, karakterlerin bilinçaltı, farkında olarak veya olmadan sahip oldukları his ve düşünceler de edebi incelemelerin kapsamına girmiştir. Ancak romanların (özellikle gotik türde) psikoloji ve psikanaliz kapsamında incelenmesi aynı yüzyılın ortasında, Maurice Richardson'ın 1959 yılında yazdığı "The Psycho-analysis of Ghost Stories" isimli makalesi ile başlamıştır. Richardson bu makalesinde *Dracula*'yı incelemiş ve romanın Freud'un teorileri çerçevesinde incelenmesinin uygun olduğunu ileri sürmüştür. Aynı zamanda romanda karakterlerin çoğunda bastırılmış cinsellik ve gizlilik duygularının da varolduğunu ve bunun *Dracula*'nın yazıldığı Kraliçe Victoria dönemi sosyal-ekonomik çevre şartlarında incelenebileceğini savunmuştur. Richardson'ın makalesini takip eden diğer birçok edebi incelemenin psikanalitik yöntemler çerçevesinde yapıldığı gözlemlenmiştir.

Bu bağlamda öncelikli olarak gotik geleneği ve psikoloji bilimi arasındaki ilişkinin kısaca açıklanması gerekmiştir. İçinde bulundurduğu karakterler, yaratıklar, insanüstü varlıklar vs., insanı ürperten, korku ve gerilime sebep olan iç ve dış çevre, olay örgüsü ve anlatının belirsizliği sebebiyle gotik romanlar, psikanaliz inceleme için uygun

kaynaklardır. *Dracula* ve *Frankenstein*'da gotik unsur ve çevrenin, içinde barındırdığı yaratıklar kadar anlatıya yön verdiği ve aynı zamanda "anomaliler" yani insanların bastırılmış duygu ve düşünceleri bir "Öteki"ne atfetmesi ile birlikte insan ruhunun hassaslığını ortaya çıkardığı gözlemlenmiştir. Gotik, hem bir edebi tür olarak hem de faydalanıldığı diğer sanat dallarında genel olarak bireyin bilinçaltına attığı veya bastırdığı korkuları, endişeleri, arzu ve istekleri ele alır. Tipik olarak Gotik türünde kategorize edilen bir romanda hem iç ve dış çevre, hem de romanın içinde bulunan "yaratık," "canavar" veya "Öteki" olarak adlandırılabilecek karakterler, kişinin bedensel ve zihinsel bütünlüğüne karşı bir tehdit oluşturmaktadır. Bir diğer ifadeyle Gotik romanda tasvir edilen yaratıklar, çoğu zaman dışarıdan göründükleri gibi sadece korku ve terör hissi uyandırmayı amaçlamazlar. Temsil ettikleri ve somutlaştırdıkları fikirler ve hisler, edebiyatta psikanalitik yaklaşımların temelini oluşturmaktadır. Dolayısıyla çoğu zaman gotik ve fantastik romanlarda yer alan bu yaratıklar, yapılan edebi incelemelerde ve anlatının kendi içerisinde de önem taşıyan karakterler olarak kabul edilmektedir.

Tam olarak ilk ortaya çıktıkları dönem belirli olmasa da, yaratıkların tasvir edildiği ilk kaynaklar Eski Yunan Edebiyatı'nda görülmektedir. İsa'dan Önce 750 yılında yazıldığı düşünülen İlyada Destanı ve İsa'dan Önce 29 ve 19 yılları arasında yazılmış olan Virgil'in *Aeneid* isimli eserleri, yazılı kaynaklarda yaratıkların yer aldıkları ilk eserler olarak ele alınabilir. Bu iki eserde farklı hayvanların farklı özelliklerinin bir araya getirilip oluşturulmasıyla ortaya çıkan yaratıklar, kahramanların yok etmesi gereken bir unsur olarak betimlenmiştir. Daha sonra İsa'dan Sonra 7. yüzyıldan itibaren Eski İngiliz Edebiyatı'nda hayvan ve insan karışımı Centaur ve denizkızı gibi yaratıklar türemiş, aynı zamanda denizcilerin birbirleriyle rekabet etmek için oluşturdukları haritalarda yer almışlardır. Ancak insanlık ilerledikçe ve köklü değişimlere maruz kaldıkça yaratıkların da kendi içlerinde sahip olduğu derinlik artmıştır. Özellikle 19. yüzyılın sonlarında bu yaratıklar, romanlarda tamamen insan şeklinde tasvir edilmiş, fakat insanüstü güçlere sahip oldukları veya isteğe bağlı olarak fiziksel değişim geçirebildikleri görülmüştür. Buna örnek olarak Robert Louis Stevenson'ın *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886) isimli eserinde yer alan çift karakterli fakat tek vücuda sahip Dr. Jekyll karakteri öne sürülebilir. Aynı zamanda Richard

Marsh'ın *The Beetle* (1897) isimli romanında yer alan cinsiyetsiz, yarı-tanrı ve yarı-insan karışımı Helen Vaughan da bu duruma örnek olarak gösterilebilir.

Yaratıklar ortaya çıktıkları ilk zamanlardan günümüze kadar farklı şekillerde ve farklı amaçlara sahip olarak tasvir edilmişlerdir. Ancak yukarıda da belirtildiği üzere, her daim ortak bir noktada buluştukları görülmüştür: onlarla karşılaşan herkese korku salmak ve farklılığın, farklı olmanın en çarpıcı ve en grotesk halini ortaya koymak. Yaratıklar bu vesileyle insanların çoğu zaman dile getiremediği ve karşılaşmaktan çekindikleri şeyleri açıkça sergiledikleri için dışlanmışlardır. Dini kaynaklarda "şeytan," "kötülük meleği" vs. gibi uzak durulması gerekilen varlıklar şeklinde veya edebi eserlerde yer alan Hydra, Chimera vs. gibi hayvanımsı yaratıklar şeklinde her zaman insanlığın karşısında yer almışlardır. Yaratıklar insanlara, insanların kendi içlerinde sakladıkları arzularına ve hislerine ayna olmuş, onlara gerçek tehlikenin dışarıda değil, aslında hemen yanı başlarında, hatta kendi benliklerinde olduğunu göstermiştir.

Bu bağlamda gotik romanlar ve psikanalizin, psikanaliz ve yaratıkların, hepsinin bir üçlü ilişki içerisinde Kristeva'nın ortaya attığı "iğrençlik" kavramı kapsamında incelenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Tezin birinci kısmı bu ilişkinin açıklanması ve Kristeva'nın teorilerinin ayrıca incelenmesi için ayrılmıştır. Bu tezde sunulan argümanın temel aldığı Kristeva'nın 1980 yılında yayımlanan *Korkunun Güçleri* isimli eseri, öznenin bastırdığı ve dışa vurmaktan kaçındığı düşünceleri iğrençlik kavramı üzerinden açıklamaya çalışmaktadır. Kristeva'ya göre iğrenç olarak adlandırılan her şey (bir durum, nesne, kişi ve bedensel sıvılar bunlara bir örnek olarak görülebilir) öznenin gelişiminde karşılaştığı ilk aşamadır. Bebeklik döneminde daha anneyle arasındaki bağ bozulmamış olan özne, ileriki aşamalara geçtiğinde bu bağdan kurtulmak, anneyi "iğrençleştirmek" zorundadır. Kristeva bu aşamada her ne kadar onlardan beslense de psikanalitik gelişim konusunda teorileri olan Sigmund Freud ve Jacques Lacan'dan ayrılmaktadır. Freud' a göre öznenin gelişiminde baba önemli bir rol oynar. Hükmedici bir doğaya sahip olan baba, öznenin (kadın ve erkek için bu etki farklıdır) büyüyüp gelişmesinde ve sosyal çevreye (öznenin bulunduğu mevcut sembolik düzen) ayak uydurmasında karşısına çıkan ilk etken olarak görülür. Lacan'

da da bu durum baba üzerinden incelenmektedir. Lacan' a göre özne (kadın veya erkek olması göz önünde bulundurulmadan) babanın müdahil edilmesinden önce ve sonra farklı evrelerden geçerek gelişimini tamamlar. Bunlara ek olarak Kristeva, özne gelişiminin Lacan'ın öne sürdüğü gibi ayna evresinde (babadan ve dolayısıyla dilden önce) ve daha sonra sembolik düzende baba tarafından yönetilmesi yerine, anne ve bebeğin birbirine bağımlı olduğu "semiyotik" isimli düzende başladığını savunur. Freud ve Lacan'ın farklı yönlerden ele aldığı veya hiç dâhil etmediği anne, Kristeva'ya göre öznenin gelişiminde önemli bir yere sahiptir. Bununla birlikte annenin, sembolik düzende de özne üzerinde bir etkisi olduğunu savunur. Özne Kristeva'ya göre bu semiyotik düzeni aşıp sembolik düzene geçse bile, annenin otoritesinden ve gücünden kurtulamaz. Semiyotik bir diğer ifadeyle öznenin tamamen anneye bağlı olduğu bebeklik döneminde, henüz dilin edinilmediği ve bebeğin sesler üzerinden, ritim ve tonlamaya bağlı iletişim kurduğu bir ortamdır.

Kristeva annenin özne üzerinde bebeklik döneminden yetişkinlik dönemine kadar otoriter ve baskın bir güç sahibi olduğunu savunur. Bu sebeple özne (veya grup/toplum seviyesinde özneler) kendisini bastıran, geri çeken ve sınırlarını tehdit eden her şeyi çıkarmak, iğrençleştirmek durumunda kalır. Bu sav, iğrençlik kavramının temelini oluşturmaktadır. Ancak, iğrençlik hissi ve özneye tehdit oluşturan şeyler, hiçbir zaman öznenin peşini bırakmaz ve hayat boyu onu tehdit etmeye devam eder. Kristeva *Şiirsel Dilde Devrim* (*Revolution in Poetic Language*) isimli bir diğer eserinde, semiyotik düzenin annenin iğrençleştirilmesiyle birlikte atlatıldığını ve öznenin sembolik düzene bu şekilde geçtiğini savunmaktadır. Bu, sağlıklı bir özne gelişiminin temelini oluşturmaktadır. Öte yandan, bilinçaltına atılan düşünce ve hislerin kendini rüyalarda göstermesi gibi semiyotik düzenin izlenimlerini de sembolik düzende görmek mümkündür. Her ne kadar iki düzen birbirinden ayrı dursa da ve bu ayrımın özne için gerekli olduğu savunulsa da bu durum her zaman aynı şekilde tekrar etmeyebilir. Bu anlamda iki düzeni birbirinden tamamen ayırmak mümkün değildir. Kristeva'ya göre semiyotik ve sembolik birlikte işlemektedir fakat ağırlıklı olanın öznenin psikanalitik gelişiminde etkili olduğunu da savunmaktadır. Eğer semiyotik düzen üstün gelirse özne iğrençlik hissine kendini kaptırmış olur ve kendi benliğini yitirir. Fakat aynı şekilde sembolik düzen üstün geldiği halde özne çok

fazla duygu ve düşünceyi bastırmış bir durumda varlığını sürdürür ve bu da iğrençlik hissinin özneyi daha çabuk ele geçirmesine yol açabilir. Bu bağlamda iğrençlik kavramı, öznenin temiz/kirli, içeride/dışarıda, Ben/Öteki gibi sınırlarını tehdit eden bir unsurdur. Gotik yaratıklar da bu noktadan hareketle özne dışında olan, ondan farklı fakat öznenin bastırılmış duygu ve düşüncelerini somutlaştıran varlıklar olarak ele alınabilir. Bu durumun örnekleri hem *Frankenstein*, hem de *Dracula*'da görülmektedir.

Bu çalışmada Gotik roman, içinde barındırdığı Yaratıklarla birlikte iğrençlik teorisi çerçevesinde çalışılabilecek en uygun tür olarak ele alınmıştır. Edebiyat çalışmalarında Gotik türün genellikle insan ırkının bastırdığı duygu ve düşünceleri yansıttığı savunulmaktadır. Aynı bağlamda iğrençlik teorisi de öznenin gelişimini tamamlaması için bastırdığı bir takım hislerin yeniden ortaya çıktığı durumları açıklar ve özneyi bebeklik döneminde yaşadığı kaotik ortama döndürmekle tehdit eder. Kristeva *Korkunun Güçleri* isimli eserinde Gotik türe ilişkin bir analiz yapmamıştır fakat ortaya sürdüğü teori ve fikirler, bu çalışmada incelenen *Frankenstein* ve *Dracula* romanları için gerekli altyapıyı sağlamaktadır.

Bu iki roman, yayımlandıkları tarih ve ortaya çıkma hikâyeleri bakımından benzerlik taşımaktadır. *Frankenstein*, Kraliçe Victoria'nın tahta çıkacağı 19. yüzyıl başlarında, Aydınlanma Çağı fikir ve akımlarının gözde olduğu 1818 yılında basılmıştır. Mary Shelley eserini yazdığı bu dönemde akıl, bilim ve bilimsel araştırmaların ağırlıkta olduğu görülmektedir. Dolayısıyla kitabın ana kahramanı olan Victor Frankenstein'ın da bilim ve deneysel araştırmalara karşı büyük bir ilgisi olduğu görülmektedir. Fakat roman sadece insan-bilim veya insan-doğa arasındaki ilişkiyi değil, bunların yanında o dönemde etkili olan Fransız İhtilali'yle birlikte ortaya çıkmış politik akımlara da değinmektedir. Aynı zamanda dini temalara da yer veren *Frankenstein*, olay örgüsünde genellikle cennet/cehennem, iyilik/kötülük, yaratan/yaratılan vs. gibi ikili karşıtlıkları da incelemektedir. Bu sebeple roman John Milton'ın *Paradise Lost* (*Kayıp Cennet*) isimli eserine bir gönderme ve hatta onu yeniden yazma eylemi olarak değerlendirilebilir. Tıpkı *Dracula* romanında olduğu gibi *Frankenstein* da "Öteki" kavramını betimlemektedir. İlk bakışta bu kavrama uyarlanan karakterin Victor'ın

yarattığı Yaratık olduğu düşünülse de, daha sonra bunun değiştiği ve Victor'ın kendisinin de "ötekileştiği" görülmektedir. Ancak Yaratık sadece diğer karakterlerden ayrı, onların dışladığı bir Öteki olmanın yanı sıra aynı zamanda karakterlerin bastırılmış cinsellik, duygu ve düşüncelerini temsil eden bir varlıktır. Bu bağlamda *Frankenstein*'da betimlenen Yaratık, *Dracula'*da karşılaşılan diğer vampir veya Öteki varlıklarla benzerlik taşımaktadır.

Mary Shelley olay örgüsünü Batılı, ataerkil, orta-sınıf bir aile ortamında sunmaktadır. Victor Frankenstein varlıklı bir ailenin ilk çocuğu, geleceği parlak ve kendi ailesini kurma yolunda ilerleyen başarılı bir genç olarak betimlenir. Ancak annesini kaybettiği zaman Victor'ın hayatı tamamen değişir ve bir anda yalnız başına Ingolstadt isimli bir şehre üniversite eğitimi almak için gönderilir. Bu eğitim sırasında üzerinde çalışmaya başladığı doğa bilimleri ve anatomi, onu annesinin ardından ortaya çıkan bir boşluk (lack) hissinin peşine düşmeye zorlar. Bu çalışmaların sonunda Victor, ölü hayvan ve insanların vücut parçalarından bir "Yaratık" yaratır ve bir fırtına sonucu düşen yıldırım ile bu yaratık canlanır. Yaratık'ın kendine gelip hareket etmeye başladığı bu ilk anlarda Victor laboratuvardan kaçar ve Yaratık'ı yalnız bırakır. Bu kararı daha sonra gelişecek olaylarda büyük bir etken olacaktır.

Victor Yaratık'ı terk edip gittikten bir süre sonra laboratuvara geri döner. Orayı boş bulduğuna oldukça sevinir ancak Yaratık'tan tamamen kurtulmadığını daha sonra anlayacaktır. Romanın ilerleyen bölümlerinde Victor ve Yaratık'ın etkileşimlerinin arttığı ve daha da ölümcül bir hale geldiği görülür. Her etkileşimin ardından Victor iğrençlik hissini daha da şiddetli yaşar ve bu durum ahlaki ve fiziksel bozulmaları da beraberinde getirir. Yaratık, Victor'ın aile üyelerinin ve arkadaşlarının bir kısmını öldürür, bir kısmının da ölümüne sebep olur. Ayrıca karşılaştığı tüm insanlara kötülük getirip, onların da iğrençlik hissiyle karşı karşıya kalmalarındaki en büyük etken olur. Bütün bu olayların sonucunda Victor ve Yaratık, iki taraf için de zararlı olan bir bağ ile sadece birbirleriyle etkileşim içinde kalırlar. Victor'ın bu olayların ardından artık kendini akılcı, bütün bir özne olarak tanımlayamadığı görülmektedir. Bir kimlik bunalımı içerisine girdiği ve Yaratık sebebiyle başlayan iğrenç (abject) değişimini kabullenemediği için sembolik düzende sahip olduğu yeri kaybettiği anlaşılmaktadır.

Victor kendini Yaratık üzerinden betimlemeye başlar ve Yaratık'ın öldürdüğü ailesi ve arkadaşları için "benim kurbanlarım" gibi sözler kullanır. Sembolik düzende iken Yaratık karşısında sahip olduğu üstünlüğü kaybeder, ve artık onunla aynı seviyede varlığını sürdürmeye başlar.

Victor Frankenstein'ın bir boşluk (lack) hissini takip edip yarattığı bu Yaratık, Kristeva'nın teorileri üzerinden incelendiğinde kaos temsilcisi, otoriter anneyi temsil ettiği ortaya çıkmaktadır. Ancak Victor kaybettiği annesini yeniden canlandırmak amacıyla yarattığı bu Yaratık ile karşı karşıya kaldığında Kristeva'ya göre aynı zamanda gerçek "anne" (the Mother) ile de karşılaşmıştır. Yaratık "doğduğu" andan itibaren sembolik düzene ait değil, annenin hüküm sürdüğü semiyotik düzene ait olarak varlığını sürdürmüştür. Dolayısıyla Victor ve Yaratık'ın etkileşimleri devam ettikçe, Victor iğrençlik hissine daha da çok kapılmış ve tam anlamıyla semiyotik düzene dönemediği için de iki düzen arasında sıkışıp kalmıştır. Bu sebeple Frankenstein, okuyucuya iğrençlik hissinin atılamaması durumunda ne gibi sonuçların ortaya çıkabileceğini göstermiştir. Victor bütün aile üyelerini ve arkadaşlarını kaybetmenin yanı sıra, tek, rasyonel bir özne olma durumunu yitirmiş ve sonunda hayatını da kaybetmiştir.

Dracula, Victoria dönemi gerçekçiliğinin ve Gotik türe olan ilginin azaldığı 19. yüzyıl sonlarında, 1897 yılında basılmıştır. Bu dönem sert toplumsal kuralları, kadın-erkek dünyalarının keskin bir çizgiyle ayrılması ve iki cinse yüklenen rollerin belirginliğiyle bilinmektedir. Özellikle yine bu dönemde artan mülteci ve göçmen oranları sebebiyle toplum kendi kültürü dışında olan bütün ırk ve kültürlere karşı önyargılı olma eğilimi de göstermektedir. Dolayısıyla romanda betimlenen karakterler belirlenmiş sınırların dışına çıkan her türlü kişi ve olayı yargılama ve dışlama eğilimi göstermektedir. Edebi incelemelerde de *Dracula*, genellikle xenophobia (yabancı düşmanlığı) ve işgalci karakterler bakımından incelenmiştir. *Dracula*'nın ilk bölümlerinde takip ettiğimiz Jonathan Harker isimli karakter, iş için gittiği Transilvanya turunda kendinden farklı olmanın Batı emperyalist bir toplumdan gelen bir karakter için ne kadar çarpıcı olduğunu yansıtmaktadır. Özellikle Kont Dracula ile tanıştığı sayfalarda bu farklılığı açıkça dile getirir ve daha yeni başlamış olan etkileşimlerinde onu ötekileştirir. Ancak

ilerleyen bölümlerde bu etkileşimin, *Frankenstein*'da da görüldüğü gibi karakterlerin kendi benliklerini tehdit edecek seviyeye çıktığı görülmektedir.

Kont Dracula, şatosunda yaşayan üç vampir kadın ve Kont'un vampire dönüştürdüğü tüm karakterler, geriye kalanları rahatsız edip iğrençlik hissini yakın bir mesafeden yaşamalarına sebep olmaktadırlar. Kont ile en fazla etkileşimde bulunan Harker ile birlikte diğer tüm karakterler, vampirlerin iğrenç (abject) doğalarından ötürü karakterleri yaşadıkları sembolik düzenin uç noktalarına sürmektedirler. Dr. Seward, hikâyenin akılcı ve düzen sağlayıcı karakterlerinden biri olarak ilk başta çalışkan, işiyle meşgul bir doktor olarak betimlenmektedir. Ancak hikâyenin ilerleyen bölümlerinde bir zamanlar âşık olduğu Lucy'nin vampire dönüşmesi sonucu onun ölümünü zevkle izlediğini itiraf eder. Lucy'nin nişanlısı Arthur, başta nişanlısının vampir halini korkunç bulsa da, daha sonra baştan çıkarıcılığından etkilenip kendini Lucy'ye teslim etmek ister, ancak diğerleri tarafından engellenir. Aynı şekilde, popüler kültürde "vampir avcısı" ve doğaüstü olaylar araştırmacısı olarak bilinen Dr. Van Helsing, Kont'un kalesinde yaşayan vampir kadınları görünce onlardan etkilendiğini gizleyemez. Hikâyenin en temiz ve saf karakteri olarak betimlenen Mina bile Kont tarafından ısırıldıktan sonra sahip olduğu koruyucu, sevecen ve güven veren anne pozisyonunu yitirir. Diğer karakterler tarafından dışlanır ve Kont'un peşine düştükleri Transilvanya yolculuğunda geride bırakılır.

Daha önce de belirtildiği üzere Harker, diğer karakterlere nazaran iğrençlik hissini en çok yaşayan kişidir. Harker'ın nasıl bir dönüşüm geçirdiği Kont'un Transilvanya'daki kalesinde yazmaya başladığı günlük kesitlerinden, hikâyenin sonuna doğru diğer karakterler tarafından betimlenen halinden anlaşılmaktadır. Harker'ın ilk başta sahip olduğu Batı emperyalist üstünlüğünü zamanla kaybedip, iğrenç ("abject") canavarlar tarafından bastırıldığı ve güçsüzleştirdiği görülmektedir. Bunun sonucunda semiyotik ve sembolik düzen arasında tehlikeli dalgalanmalar yaşandığı ve bir düzenin diğer düzene üstün gelmesiyle sosyal ve kişisel sınırların da bozulduğu ortaya çıkmaktadır. Harker bu düzenin bozulmasına sebep veren etkeni ortadan kaldırana dek fiziksel ve zihinsel çöküşten kurtulamayacağını anladığı an diğer karakterle birlikte üstünlüğü tekrar ele almak için uğraşmaya başlar.

Bu çalışma, her iki romanda da norm dışı, düzen bozan ve tutarsız olan her türlü şeyin atılması gerektiğini ortaya koymuştur. Bu gerekliliğin en başta ortaya çıkmasına sebep olan iğrenç (abject) canavarlar, özneyi düzen bozmak ve öznenin kendini korumak için oluşturduğu sınırları yıkmakla tehdit etmektedirler. Bu bağlamda *Frankenstein,* atılma eylemi özne tarafından gerçekleştirilemediği zaman nasıl bir sonuç ortaya çıkacağını göstermektedir: sembolik düzenin yıkılması, semiyotik düzenin üstün gelmesi veya sembolik düzen ile karışması ve öznenin kendi kendini yok etmesi. Ayrıca, öznenin ve içinde bulunduğu bu düzende ayakta durmasını sağlayan temiz/kirli, ben/Öteki, içeride/dışarıda gibi ikili karşıtlıklar da iğrenç (abject) canavarlar tarafından değiştirilmiş, bozulmuş ve anlamını yitirmiştir. Bu durum *Dracula*'da ise farklı bir şekilde gözlemlenmektedir. Betimlendiği ilk sayfalarda bile düzeni ve alışılagelmiş davranış biçimlerini bozan Kont Dracula, İngiltere'ye gelmesiyle birlikte karakterlerin öznelliğini ve kimlik anlayışlarını tamamen değiştirir. *Frankenstein*'ın aksine Stoker'ın hikâyesindeki karakterler, her ne kadar iğrençlik hissine yenik düşseler de bir süre sonra toparlanıp kendi varlıklarını tehlikeye atan bu iğrenç ("abject") canavarlardan kurtulmak için harekete geçerler. Dolasıyla Dracula, iğrençlik hissinin ve iğrenç (abject) canavarların başarılı bir şekilde atılmasının getirdiği sonucu göstermektedir: mevcut sosyal-sembolik düzenin, kişisel ve çevresel sınırların korunması ve ikili karşıtlıkların tekrar yerine oturtulması.

Bu çalışmada öne sürülen fikir ve argümanlar, feminist teoriler çerçevesinde genişletip incelenebilir. Örneğin Mary Shelley bir kadın olarak semiyotik, yani annenin düzeninin üstün geldiği bir noktada; fakat Bram Stoker bir erkek olarak kitabını sembolik düzenin korunduğu ve tekrar üstünlük kazandığı bir noktada bitirmiştir. Bu açıdan bakıldığında iki romanın tekrar incelenmesi mümkün olduğu gibi farklı sonuçlara da ulaşılabilmektedir. Feminist eleştirel incelemelerin yanı sıra, *Frankenstein* ve *Dracula*'nın tiyatro ve film adaptasyonları da bu eleştirel çerçeve içerisinde incelenebilir. İlk basım tarihi 1818 olan *Frankenstein,* 1823 gibi erken bir tarihte farklı bir yazar tarafından tiyatroya uyarlanmıştır. Aynı zamanda revizyonu Mary Shelley'ye ait olan 1831 tarihli ikinci bir *Frankenstein* baskısı da bulunmaktadır. 1897'de basılan *Dracula* ise hem daha ileri bir tarihte, 1924 yılında, hem de Bram Stoker tarafından tiyatroya uyarlanmıştır. Bu iki roman, daha önce

birçok akademisyen tarafından farklı bakış açılarıyla incelenmiş olsa da, hala eleştirel anlamda zengin olan ve daha birçok konuda incelenebilecek iki “klasik” eserdir.

APPENDIX B: TEZ İZİN FORMU / THESIS PERMISSION FORM

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences	
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences	X
Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics	
Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics	
Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences	

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : Şentürk
Adı / Name : Betül Selcan
Bölümü / Department : İngiliz Edebiyatı

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (**İngilizce** / English) :
A Study of Monstrous Abjection in Relation to Two Gothic Novels: Dracula and Frankenstein

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE**:** **Yüksek Lisans** / Master [X] **Doktora** / PhD [ ]

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. /** Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide. [X]
2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two years. *** [ ]
3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for period of **six months**. [ ]

***** *Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir.*

A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature ..... **Tarih** / Date ……