THE MODERN AND THE TYPES OF GOTHIC AMBIVALENCE: THE THEORY OF THE GOTHIC FROM THE MODERN TO THE POSTMODERN

YANKI ENKİ
105611008

İSTANBUL BİLGİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
KÜLTÜREL İNCELEMELER YÜKSEK LİSANS PROGRAMI

TEZ DANIŞMANI: BÜLENT SOMAY

2008

Abstract

This study focuses on the correlation between modernity and the British gothic novel of the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries. Novellas, novelettes and short stories concerning the subject are also included. The study aims to explain the nature of modernity as reflected in the gothic novel, through sociological and psychoanalytical perspectives. The main emphasis is on the notion of ambivalence which is claimed here to be the immanent characteristic of the Gothic. What is meant by the term 'the Gothic' comprises of every element that has a gothic and therefore an ambivalent nature, like the Goths, the gothic space, gothic architecture and gothic characters. Ambivalence within this framework is considered to be the realm of uncertainty that is represented by neither/nor conditions as opposed to the realm of certainty represented by modern either/or conditions. The emergence of the British gothic novel is synchronized with the rise of modernity. Accordingly, the study seeks to interpret the parallelism between the rise of modernity and the rise of the gothic novel in the eighteenth century. The French Revolution and the Reign of Terror are considered to be connected with the Gothic, for they represent the nature of modernity. The relation between the Gothic, death, immortality and modernity occupies an important role in this study in order to explain the notion of fear. Various elements in gothic novels are evaluated as reflections of the modern paradoxes of civilization and barbarism, culture and nature, and reason and belief.

Özet

Bu çalışma, modernlik ile on sekizinci ve on dokuzuncu yüzyıl İngiliz gotik romanının karşılıklı ilişkisi üzerinde durmaktadır. Konuyla ilgili kısa romanlar ile öyküler de içeriğe dahil edilmiştir. Bu çalışmanın amacı, modernliğin doğasını, gotik roman içerisinde yansıtıldığı hâliyle sosyolojik ve psikanalitik bakış açıları üzerinden açıklamaktır. Burada üzerinde önemle durulan kavram, Gotiğin içkin özelliği olduğu iddia edilmiş olan müphemliktir. 'Gotik' terimiyle anlatılmak istenen, Gotlar, gotik mekan, gotik mimari ve gotik karakterler gibi, gotik olduğu için müphem bir doğası olan unsurlardır. Bu çerçevede müphemlik, modern ya o/ya bu koşullarıyla temsil edilen kesinliğe karşılık, ne o/ne bu koşullarıyla temsil edilen belirsizliğin alanıdır. İngiliz gotik romanının ortaya çıkışı ile modernliğin yükselişi eşzamanlıdır. Bu çalışma da buna bağlı olarak, modernliğin yükselişi ile gotik romanın yükselişi arasındaki paralelliği yorumlamayı amaçlar. Fransız Devrimi ve Terör Dönemi de modernliğin doğasını gösterdiklerinden, Gotik ile ilişkili olarak ele alınmışlardır. Gotik, ölüm, ölümsüzlük ve modernlik arasındaki ilişki, korku kavramını açıklamakta önemli bir rol üstlenmiştir. Gotik romanlardaki farklı unsurlar, uygarlık ve barbarlık, kültür ve doğa, akıl ve inanç gibi modern paradoksların yansımaları olarak değerlendirilmiştir.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my thesis supervisor Bülent Somay for he has shown me the way on which I have tessellated my path while writing this paper. I would not acquire and keep my perspective on life and literature without his guiding recommendations, illuminating vision and sincere support. I will forever be indebted to his inspiring endeavour on pen and paper.

I would also like to express my gratitude to my friends for encouraging me to write, especially Birgül Oğuz for bringing forward her daring thoughts in our inflaming discussions, and Burak Evren for sharing his experience concerning the formal details of an academical paper.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Roots of the Gothic

"What we think the past had – is what we know we do not have."[1]

(Bauman – *Postmodernity and Its Discontents*)

1.1 Historical and Political Roots

Not only today, but also during its most popular times of usage, the word 'gothic' became a term that was applied to various realms. Today, gothic is a signifier for a way of clothing, a taste of decoration and design and a style of music, besides its centuries old conception of architecture and its literary sense which still breathes on this architectural groundwork. However, there grows a void of one universal meaning as the term evolves through premodern, modern and postmodern epochs. The term then becomes a perpetual battleground of definitions, as these definitions are exactly facing each other as adversaries. The gothic, end in itself, is not a case of either/or, but it is better defined through neither/nor conditions. It represents both ends of an ambivalent term at the same time and it does not depict each end faithfully. The gothic then creates another dimension out of

[1] Zygmunt Bauman, *Postmodernity and Its Discontents* (Cambridge and Malden: Polity Press, 2005), p. 87.

a chaotic set of meanings, a troublesome third dimension that defies the modern either/or condition and makes modernity go astray.

Mary Shelley, the author of *Frankenstein*, suggests in her preface to her masterpiece that "invention, it must be humbly admitted, does not consist in creating out of a void, but out of chaos: the materials must, in the first place, be afforded; it can give form to dark, shapeless substances, but cannot bring into being the substance itself."[2] Therefore, as Maggie Kilgour claims in perfect words, "gothic creation is a Frankensteinian process."[3] The tradition of gothic literature bears this process within and it shows a process of a challenge between modern opponents as nature and culture, human and non-human, individual and society, reason and instinct, life and death, in and out, the self and the other, etc... Following this challenge, the gothic experience does not lead the reader to a better choice between these rivals, but it is mainly an instrument of challenge.

Zygmunt Bauman defines ambivalence as "the possibility of assigning an object or an event to more than one category."[4] The gothic as a genre of literature in this sense is ambivalent. Moreover, this ambivalence lies deep within the roots of the term. The term 'gothic' is doomed to be assigned to more than one category even in its historical, political and architectural roots, in which those categories challenge each other as ultimate rivals. In addition, the *gothicness* of the gothic is not only formed but also deformed by its inner conflict, uncertainty and ambivalence. In other words, the gothic is ambivalent by its nature. The dichotomies

[2] Maggie Kilgour, *The Rise of the Gothic Novel* (New York: Routledge, 2006), p. 4.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and Ambivalence* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998), p. 1.

mentioned above, like nature and culture or life and death do not represent two different branches of the same stem. We should rather admit that the root is ambivalent in itself.

Fred Botting, begins his article *In Gothic Darkly: Heterotopia, History, Culture* by claiming that "The Enlightenment, which produced the maxims and models of modern culture, also invented the Gothic."[5] This seems to be a suitable claim at first sight, because in the eighteenth century, as the resources of the age of reason started to overwhelm the limits of civilization, it was unavoidable for the Western culture to confront its inner demons, especially after the French Revolution and through the Reign of Terror. According to Botting, "the real history of "Gothic" begins with the eighteenth century, when it signified a 'barbarous', 'medieval' and 'supernatural' past."[6] Although Botting is on the mark about the characteristics of the gothic, we cannot speak of an eighteenth century birth. Instead, we should call this confrontation a *rebirth*. Therefore, as we speak of inner demons that were forgotten and dwelling in the past, as they were forgotten because they were part of the Western history on which modernity has turned its back, we should rather call this not an 'invention', but a 'discovery'.

Samuel Kliger, in his article *The 'Goths' in England* (1945) claims that "the real history of the Gothic begins not in the eighteenth but in the

[5] Fred Botting, "In Gothic Darkly: Heterotopia, History, Culture," in *A Companion to the Gothic*, ed. David Punter (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000), p. 3.
[6] Ibid.

seventeenth century, not in aesthetic but in political discussion [...]."[7] The political connotation of the word 'gothic' describes barbarity at first sight, based on the history of the Germanic tribe called the Goths, but in contrast to this connotation, Kliger reveals the evidence that the term was highly perceived as almost a synonym for democracy:

> Writing in 1648, Nicholas Bacon avers that English laws are largely Gothic in origin: 'Nor can any nation upon earth shew so much of the ancient Gothique law as this Island hath.' In 1672, Sir William Temple calls the English a Gothic people: 'The Saxons were one branch of those Gothic nations, which, swarming from the Northern Hive, had, under the conduct of Odin, possessed themselves anciently of all those mighty tracts of Land that surround the Baltick Sea.' [...] In 1694, Robert Molesworth [...] argues that England's government in its origins was Gothic and Vandalic: The Ancient Form of Government here was the same which the Goths and Vandals established in most if not all Parts of Europe whither they carried their conquests, and which in England is retained to this day for the most part.' According to Swift, writing in 1719, parliaments are a peculiarly Gothic institution [...]. John Oldmixon, writing in 1724, also assimilates Gothic to English history: 'No nation has preserv'd their Gothic Constitution better than the English.'[8]

The ambivalence of this connotation here lies in the history of the Goths, the tribe whose first settlement was in the Baltic. Robin Sowerby puts forward the fact that "modern archeology [...] provides evidence of their migration [...] down to the Black Sea. Their first major incursion into Roman territory [...] in the third century [...] was succesfully repelled, but subsequently, as they moved towards the lower Danube, the Romans lost the

---

[7] Samuel Kliger, "The 'Goths' in England," in *The Gothick Novel*, ed. Victor Sage (London: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 2003), p. 115. (Reprinted from 'The "Goths" in England: An Introduction to the Gothic Vogue in Eighteenth-Century Aesthetic Discussion', *Modern Philology* (November 1945), pp 107-17.)
[8] Ibid. at 115-116.

province of Dacia to them [...].”[9] From then on, relations between the Romans and the Goths took an oscillating shape, but what remained inevitable to help defining the word ‘gothic’ was the socially accepted fact that it stood for everything against anything that was dubbed ‘Roman’ or ‘classical’. The challenge between civilized Romans who have settled on their ground long before and the Goths who have been searching for a place to call ‘home’ paved the way to a greater challenge and an ever-blooming gap between rationality and irrationality and the gap became the seed of fear, as fear grew in barbarity and its irrationality as frightening as it grew in civilization and its rationality.

One of the earliest mentions of the Goths was recorded by Tacitus in *Germania* in which Tacitus shows his admiration for the Gothic simplicity and toughness as opposed to the Roman luxury and corruption.[10] Yet, history of the Goths from the Gothic point of view was written by a sixth-century historian Jordanes in his work *Getica*, in which the sixteenth century theory of a “vagina gentium”, a “womb of nations”, justified its basics. According to the theory, the womb of nations was “a great island named Scandza” (Scandinavia) and “Goths”, a general term for all the Germanic tribesmen, were the first tribe that came out of the womb, which is obviously the womb of European nations.[11]

The theory has been argued over centuries and it is still a hot topic in Scandinavia, mainly in Sweden. Yet it caused much more trouble for the

[9] Robin Sowerby, “The Goths in History and Pre-Gothic Gothic,” in *A Companion to the Gothic*, ed. David Punter (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000), p. 18.
[10] Ibid. at 17-18.
[11] Kliger, “The ‘Goths’ in England,” in *The Gothick Novel*, p. 117.

English rather than the Swedish. In Sweden, they were looking for some answers concerning their origins; moreover, as suggested by the theory, the origin they were. The English on the other hand were chosen as the final chapter of this chain and besides being futile in the process of replacing their so-called Gothic origin with something else, they failed to deny the development of the Gothic tradition within their national politics.

Eventually the English, a civilized rational nation was under the obligation to discuss their identity within which a monster of the past dwelled. As stated by Maggie Kilgour, "While the term gothic could thus be used to demonise the past as a dark age of feudal tyranny, it could also be used equally to idealise it as a golden age of innocent liberty."[12] The contradiction is that the monster, as mentioned above, was supposed to bear the symptoms of democracy, freedom and even enlightenment. So which was more enlightened, the free but barbarous past or the restrained but civilized present? Which of them speaks the truth when selfhood and identity are the case? The question is doomed to remain unanswered if we are forced to pick one of the options, but the answer is revealed when we obey the Baumanesque ambivalence: The answer is "both" and "none" of them at the very same time, in the very same body and psyche. The term "gothic" stands for the two opponents in its political connotation and therefore certainty is not the case when there is ambivalence. Another significant account on the ambivalence of the gothic is given by Michael Lewis:

[12] Kilgour, *The Rise of the Gothic Novel*, p. 14.

They could argue that the Gothic was just as much a Whig style as a Tory style. The Tory could say that the Gothic was the style of tradition and legitimacy; the Whig could retort that it was also the style of the thirteenth century and the Magna Carta, when the power of the king was checked. Here, at the very outset of the revival, was the first indication of the infinite elasticity of the Gothic, which could be twisted by literary argument into justifying any cause – church or state, people or king, aristocrat or democrat.[13]

Finally, as perfectly claimed by Robin Sowerby, "'Gothic' has proved to be a truly *protean* term."[14] [emphasis added]

1.2 Architectural Roots

During the eighteenth century, the gothic did not fail to hold its implicit space as still being 'the other' of modernity. It was even stronger this time, because in the times of the Goths, the trouble created by them was a part of the daily agenda, based on the political relations between their tribe and the Roman Empire. Then in the seventeenth century, it was reborn within the question of the English identity. Against all the innovative institutions, the Gothic, while becoming an object of nostalgia, represented the past based on its uncivilized and tough but pure and simple understanding of freedom. In the eighteenth century, however, it conquered another frontier: literature.

With the synchronized revival in literature and architecture, modernity inevitably confronted the present(novel) and the

[13] Michael J. Lewis, *The Gothic Revival* (London: Thames & Hudson Ltd, 2002), p. 19.
[14] Sowerby, "The Goths in History and Pre-Gothic Gothic," in *A Companion to the Gothic*, p. 24.

past(architecture), the living and the dead at the same time. The gothic, as the dead's revival or the undead's arrival started to poke the borders of modernity which claim to have foundations based upon certainty, security and order. So again in the eighteenth century, the gothic represented the ambivalent. It seemed to be fresh, yet ages-old; alive as a new-born, yet already dead. The author of the first significant gothic novel in English, Horace Walpole, declared that "it was an attempt to blend the two kinds of romance, the ancient and the modern."[15] His novel depicts a great yearning for the bygone days as ghosts of the past, reveals solid inconsistency with the modern thought, yields up an expectant survival of the supernatural, but it is not totally a medieval romance. It was written for the modern age, using the past as an instrument. Markman Ellis shows this ambivalence lying within the Gothic:

> In answering a simple question like 'what is a gothic novel?', critics and readers have long been struck by the tension between these two key terms 'gothic' and 'novel'. While 'gothic' invokes an historical enquiry, 'novel' implicitly refers to a literary form; while 'gothic' implies the very old, the novel claims allegiance with 'the new'. As Ian Watt jokes, 'It is hardly too much to say that etymologically the term "Gothic Novel" is an oxymoron for "Old New".[16]

The Castle of Otranto, the founder-novel of the Gothic fiction by Horace Walpole was published in 1764 with a subtitle "A Gothic Story". Until the 1750s, the preferred spelling was "gothick"[17] and before Walpole, as E. F. Bleiler argues, "the word "gothick" was almost always a synonym

---

[15] Horace Walpole, Preface to the Second Edition, "The Castle of Otranto," in *Three Gothic Novels*, ed. E. F. Bleiler (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1966), p. 21.
[16] Markman Ellis, *The History of Gothic Fiction* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd, 2005), p. 17.
[17] Lewis, *The Gothic Revival*, p. 15.

for rudeness, barbarousness, crudity, coarseness and a lack of taste. After Walpole the word assumed two new major meanings: first, vigorous, bold, heroic and ancient, and second, quaint, charming, romantic, [...] sentimental and interesting."[18] With the first Gothic novel, the Gothic was not born but it was reborn, not only within the territory of literature but also within the territory of architecture, hence the movement called 'the Gothic Revival'.

Horace Walpole, deserving his reputation within the gothic tradition, filled the zone of intersection between the two dimensions of the revival. He was not only the author of the first gothic novel in English, but also the owner of Strawberry Hill, the castle on which he spent more than forty years to turn into a Gothic castellino and the building which became the setting of his novel. In the preface to the first edition, Walpole, using a pseudoname and proclaiming that he is the translator of the novel, focuses on the setting's accordance to reality, whereas the other elements are justified to be fictitious: "Though the machinery is invention, and the names of the actors imaginary, I cannot but believe, that the ground work of the story is founded on truth. The scene is undoubtedly laid in some real castle. The author seems frequently, without design, to describe particular parts."[19] Therefore, the castle is the main character of the novel. The castle of Otranto is a reflection of Walpole's residence. The story he tells is the story of a castle and the grand finale is the death of the castle. Not so surprisingly, after

[18] E. F. Bleiler, Introduction. "Horace Walpole and The Castle of Otranto," in *Three Gothic Novels*, p. ix.
[19] Horace Walpole, Preface to the First Edition, "The Castle of Otranto," in *Three Gothic Novels*, p. 19.

Walpole's novel the castle became the main gothic space in gothic literature, especially in the eighteenth century.

Following Walpole's efforts of collecting gothic fragments and medieval ornaments from all over the world, Strawberry Hill became "an architectural monstrosity, but apparently a monstrosity with charm."[20] This description in fact exemplifies the nature of the gothic space wherein ambivalence has settled. The castle was the locus of the past, but it was the milestone of the revival both in gothic architecture and literature, with the help of Horace Walpole's fictitious and real-life taste as represented by *The Castle of Otranto* and Strawberry Hill. The dead returned through the presence of the castle which was a plot being used as an instrument of historical grave-digging and exhumation of a family line. The castle and its ambivalent derivatives that served in the same way, mainly abbeys, cathedrals and churches were inevitable elements in order to consruct consistency within the gothic ambivalence, since they were strong elements to challenge modernity in its process of mastering its territory. Modernity was threatened not only by the revived feudal past and medieval values, but also the ambivalence revealed by the gothic architecture depicting its elements, hidden passageways, dark vaults and towers as mirrors at which modernity gazed with much discontent.

The gothic castle and its derivatives represent the ambivalence with their high towers and deep vaults. The gothic hero and/or the villain who dwells within these poles is the landmark of ambivalence, because the

[20] E. F. Bleiler, Introduction. "Horace Walpole and The Castle of Otranto," in *Three Gothic Novels*, p. ix.

gothic character faces the question of identity by which he is rendered confused while deciding where he belongs to. Is it the firmament or the earth? Is it the sky that seems to be ever-distant and unknown but still the object of desire or the underground that is the locus of death and still unknown as well? Both of the paths, upwards and downwards leave the character in the midst of the unknown. The attempt to reply this question is the cause of modern discontent, because it is not possible to fit the modern either/or condition to this trouble with the unknown. The gothic space enables us to witness the neither/nor condition by placing the gothic character in between the tower and the vault. Therefore, gothic identity is the identity that cannot identify itself with one of the options; it is both and none of them. It can only fit into a third option that owes its meaning to the other two but also surpasses them in getting closer to its brighter meaning through uncertainty. The gothic castle then, works as a 'dark light', it darkens its target with the aim to enlighten.

Horace Walpole was not the only one who contributed to the simultaneous revival of the gothic. William Beckford as well, was the author of *Vathek* and also the owner of Fonthill Abbey. The significance of Beckford's real-life residence in relation to his novel is that it was "a huge cathedral-like building with the highest tower in England."[21]

Vathek's palace is one of the derivatives of the gothic castle, but in contrast to *The Castle of Otranto*, here the emphasis is mainly on the unknown that dwells in the skies. Like Beckford, Vathek the caliph builds

[21] E. F. Bleiler, Introduction. "William Beckford and Vathek," in *Three Gothic Novels*, p. xx.

himself a palace and a tower with "the insolent curiosity of penetrating the secrets of heaven."[22] Against his Faustian curiosity "to know everything; even sciences that did not exist"[23], Vathek "saw the stars as high above him as they appeared when he stood on the surface of the earth."[24] The towers of his palace are his torches against the darkness of knowledge, but the eternal knowledge cannot be found by natural ways, methods or sciences. Consequently, Vathek seeks the knowledge of the supernatural or to put it another way, the knowledge that is supernatural. This dimension of knowledge which exceeds the limits of rationality and reason, transgresses the limits of natural sciences. Therefore it should be called *super*natural. Vathek, the seeker of knowledge and undoubtedly, the seeker of power, fails in his trial and as a result he loses "the most precious gift of heaven—HOPE."[25] Without his Faustian modern hope, gothic towers are useless in the process of reaching the eternal knowledge. At the same time, Beckford's novel confesses that the process is again infertile even in the state of hopefulness. The gothic hope is shaped as a gothic tower, but the gothic despair exists simultaneously, causing the ambivalence of the gothic space. Likewise the rest of the modern twins, hope and despair are interdependently connected. Without doubt, this interdependency paves the way for ambivalence.

[22] William Beckford, "Vathek," in *Three Gothic Novels*, p. 111.
[23] Ibid. at 110-111.
[24] Ibid. at 111.
[25] Ibid. at 193.

1.3 Evolution of the Gothic Space and Gothic Individuality

Through the fag end of the eighteenth century and on, the castle, though it owned its gothic reputation as its stronghold, gradually started to share its role with cathedrals, monasteries and abbeys as illustrated in Radcliffe, Maturin, Lewis and Austen's novels. The significance of the towers as an effort to become the all-knowing eye and to reach the forbidden knowledge that is solely grasped by supernatural beings or beings that abide in the heavens (like Mahomet and Eblis in *Vathek*), turned into a darker, but more practical gothic question. In Walpole and Beckford's novels, the ambivalence was based on the gothic identity, which is the question of belonging whether to the past or the present, the natural or the supernatural, the earth or the heavens, the would-be known or the ever-unknown. As the gothic identity yielded up the transactions between and eventually blurred the lines that separate, the question of identity then was doomed to chase its quest through another pattern, that is the ambivalence of the gothic identity based upon the interactivity between the individual and society.

The Monk, written by Matthew Lewis and published in 1796, tells the story of a monk who lives a monastic life and tries to survive through his trial against evil. The whole story is about the monk's ambivalence, whether he is pure evil or good, yet he is not pure in any sense. His state, although seems to be clear in some parts of the novel, as he is a present from the Virgin in the beginning who prays to God for help against temptations and a

sinner who sells his soul to Lucifer in the end, is blurred in general, because Lewis bestows upon him a role that emanates from confusions, a character both respectful and pathetic, restful and restless, benevolent and belligerent, helpful and helpless. The ambivalence here offered by the monk's character is intensified by the effects of a monastic life, a life that requires inclosure and solitude and a life that should not be overpowered by instinctual desires. Therefore the novel discusses the role of the individual as opposed to society's demands as well as the demeanour of nurture and education against nature and free will.

In Lewis's novel, the gothic space is divided into two antagonistic realms: One is above the ground, the abbey, the place of holiness; the other is beneath the abbey, the underground, the dark side of holiness, wherein evil dwells stealthily. So, the monk being the ambivalent character, is pictured in both realms of the gothic space. However, the monk's ambivalence as well as the abbey's, requires an outside factor which is society, because it is only when the monk leaves the abbey for the first time that he seriously deals with evil or evil deals with him. As a religious man within the shelter of an abbey, the evil outside is projected unto the contradictions of his soul. In other words, Lewis in his novel, represents the modern trouble of becoming an individual, in which the progress is led by Lucifer. Therefore, the novel is an antithesis for modernity that paves the way for a representation of a postmodern stage through modernity.

Individuality is of course a significant factor of modernity, but society is also a factor that humanity expects some help. Through

postmodernity, if we are to narrow down what Zygmunt Bauman claims in his *Postmodernity and Its Discontents*, we cannot expect salvation by society. Social security is what we give up for individual freedom in a postmodern society. In a modern society, on the other hand, the security of society is provided by restrained individuality.[26] In the light of these, Ambrosio the monk is a part of the secured society, yet, because of his *oversecurity* based on his religious situation, he is bereft of individual freedom. A postmodern society of less security and more freedom as described by Bauman is then depicted by the monk's trial, through which Lucifer leads the way. Anyhow, what happens in the novel during this transition period is similar to the events that took place after the French Revolution, namely the Reign of Terror, an era that shows the bloody confrontation of the Enlightenment with its ideals.

The ambivalence of the gothic space as reflected by fluctuations of individuality under the influence of society is deeply rooted in the struggle between the past and the present. As Maggie Kilgour has argued, the gothic has a nostalgia for the past in which individuals were members of the body politic and bound by larger symbols and organic relations as opposed to modernity, in which individuals are independent and relations are mechanistic, based on laws of cause and effect.[27] The monk's condition is rather unclear, since he belongs to two different societies at the same time, which are the outside world and the society of monks and nuns. However, the religious society is uniformed, its members are asexual. As the society

[26] Bauman, *Postmodernity and Its Discontents*, pp. 1-39.
[27] Kilgour, *The Rise of the Gothic Novel*, p. 11.

within the abbey is imperfect, there is no chance left for becoming a perfect individual. The outside society, on the other hand, is the cause of the religious one, since, from the perspective of the latter, the former society is also imperfect. Ambrosio the monk, who was taken from the outside society and raised amongst monastic people, eventually suffers the consequences. When he is within the abbey, it is understood that the world outside is corrupt, but when he is out, the novel shows that corruption is not a disease solely suffered by society; monastic life is corrupt as well. As a result, the modern either/or mechanism does not work properly and Ambrosio as the gothic villain reveals the ambivalence.

In *Melmoth the Wanderer*, Charles Maturin brings forward the same challenge. The novel mentions the conditions of monastic life throughout the story of the Spaniard who was forced to be a monk and live a hermit's life just like Ambrosio. Here again, we witness the separation of the conventual society and the outside. For the Spaniard it is more painful to survive, since the emphasis of the novel is on the social effects of the actions of the Inquisition, the effects which cause a quest of individual freedom. Eventually, individual freedom as opposed to society's demands is offered by Melmoth the Wanderer who is a servant of Lucifer, as in the case of Ambrosio in *The Monk*.

The most considerable gothic novel concerning the ambivalence based upon the relations between the individual and society is William Godwin's *Caleb Williams*, published in 1794. Falkland, who is an exact gothic villain with his solitary, anxiety and melancholy beside his evil and

aggressive character, is a total stranger to everything since he has been accused of a murder which stained his most valuable thing, his reputation. In the beginning of the novel, he holds no sense of guilt. His trouble is not being guilty of a murder; it is the accusation. Falkland, as an outsider, resembles Kafka and his heroes, who, according to Bauman, "experienced guilt without crime, complete with its consequence: condemnation without judgement. He lived in a 'world in which it is a crime to be accused', in which the paramount skill for all those who did not want to be conceived of the crime was 'to avoid the accusation.'"[28] Yet, this is the impossible task of Falkland in the process of becoming a social creature. Consequently, he becomes a stranger to society which intervened in his individuality. As a result, Falkland's individuality becomes 'gothic', bearing a character of a villain whom we witness in Lewis's and Radcliffe's novels. As Caleb Williams detects that he is the murderer indeed, then Falkland holds the sense of guilt at its highest degree and finds himself a new target who is Caleb Williams.

As an outcast under the accusations of society, Falkland cannot accept being a social being. His ambivalent condition resembles that of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, that marks the duel between the id and the superego in Freudian terms. Falkland is able to commit a murder and lie as well as he is a total representation of the superego. He is not peaceful within himself as society does not leave him in peace. Therefore, as he is an imperfect social being, he becomes an imperfect individual, too, lest we admit that perfection

[28] Bauman, *Modernity and Ambivalence*, p. 86.

lies in the interaction. In other words, Falkland, being a criminal, gradually a stranger to society and a threat to the security of society, is an absolute Other for the rest, yet he tries to be a complete Self. However, the result is failure as in the case of Mr. Hyde. The fact that Falkland happens to be a murderer is no surprise, because he is also self-destructive.

After using castles and abbeys as its main plots, there seems to be an expansion in gothic fiction, eventually under the influence of innovations and discoveries as well as the growth in industrialisation and urbanisation. As we come closer to the end of the nineteenth century, the castle is again a popular gothic locus, but as in the case of Bram Stoker's *Dracula*, the castle is not only a gothic element based on its architectural structure, but it is also representing what is distant to civilisation and unknown to Western reason. With Stoker's novel, the gothic castle as a realm of *the unfamiliar among the familiar*, turns into a representative of *the unfamiliar among the unfamiliar*. Therefore, Dracula's castle shows the estrangement faculty of a gothic space.

In *Dracula*, the problem with the foreign lands is quite obviously shown through Jonathan Harker's notes: "The impression I had was that we were leaving the West and entering the East [...]."[29] As the modern English solicitor penetrates into the unknown and comes closer to Dracula's castle, he feels as if he is on the edge of the world that is limited by the knowledge of modernism. This is actually what the North pole stands for in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*. The North pole where the narrative begins and ends

[29] Bram Stoker, *Dracula*, Introduction and Notes by David Rogers (Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 2000), p. 3.

is also representing the end of the known world. In *Frankenstein*, Walton's desire for the undiscovered leads him to the North and it is where the two ambitious men, Walton and Victor Frankenstein meet. Walton seeks the answer to the question "what can stop culture?", whereas Frankenstein is a scientist who wonders the mysteries of the earth and the sky. The gothic space then, as illustrated by Dracula's castle and the North pole, is an uncanny threshold between the modern world and the world unknown, the world alive and the world of *unlife*. Therefore, these two major novels of gothic literature exemplify the variety of ways for the evolution of the gothic space that represents the ambivalence. Dracula's castle is gothic in the sense that it depicts the home of the undead who is not dead nor alive. In contrast to most of the gothic loci, the North pole does not require a monastery or a castle to be labeled as a gothic space, since it is the plot where shows the relation between causes of death and the causes of life intensified by the presence of the ambivalent character of Frankenstein's monster as a considerable gothic instrument around the threshold between the known and the unknown. This is the very ambivalence that lies within Walpole's *The Castle of Otranto*, Beckford's *Vathek* and Lewis's *The Monk*.

Chapter 2: The Rise of the Gothic and The Need for Fear

> [...]
> In the tower nam'd Order, an old man, whose white beard cover'd the stone floor like weeds/
> On margin of the sea, shrivell'd up by heat of day and cold of night; his den was short/
> And narrow as a grave dug for a child, with spiders' webs wove, and with slime/
> Of ancient horrors cover'd, for snakes and scorpions are his companions, harmless they breathe[30]

(William Blake, *The French Revolution*, 1791)

2.1 The Gothic as Cultural Praxis

It is to our common knowledge that the Gothic reached its peak in the last decade of the eighteenth century.[31] Franco Moretti's studies have

[30] William Blake, "The French Revolution," in *The Works of William Blake* (Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1994), pp. 191-192.

[31] Most of the novels and stories mentioned and evaluated in this thesis were written in the last decade of the eighteenth century (*Caleb Williams* in 1794, *The Mysteries of Udolpho* in 1794, *The Monk* in 1796, *The Italian* in 1797 and *Northanger Abbey* in the 1790s even it was published in 1818) as well as the last quarter of the nineteenth century, with the exception of Horace Walpole's *The Castle of Otranto* written in 1764. The last quarter of the nineteenth century is a significant period of the gothic as it is the epoch of considerable examples in vampire and werewolf literature (*Carmilla* in 1872*, Olalla* in 1885, *The Mark of the Beast* in 1890, *The Werewolf* in 1896 and *Dracula* in 1897), which will be the subject of the next chapter.

shown that the gothic novel was the most sovereign form in Britain between 1790 and 1810.[32] In addition, Robert Miles shows that the largest number of Gothic novels that were published was recorded in 1800.[33] The sole event to be strongly effective on the authors as well as the readers was the revolution in France followed by the Reign of Terror until 1795. The overlapping of these two distinct realms of the political and the literary is more than a coincidence and their relationship has been a popular subject of study since the Marquis De Sade's prominent essay *Idée sur les Romans*, published in 1800.

The revolutionary period paved the way for the gothic novel, yet this *gothicness* seems to cover a realm more than mere literature. Under the influence of the French Revolution and especially the Reign of Terror, the Gothic, which has developed gradually as political, architectural and literary, attained a conception that is cultural. Before the revolution which built the pillars of the modern nation-state and which also was the epitome of the Enlightenment ideal, the attempt of the Jacobin Reason to bring the light of certainty unto the obscurity of the so-called Ancien Régime and eventually the fountain of terrorism, the Gothic belonged to specific discourses. Politically it was about the tribe called the Goths whose possible influence on the British perception of civilization, democracy and freedom was questioned. Architecturally, it was a form that prevailed between the twelfth and the sixteenth centuries and returned in the eighteenth century.

---

[32] Franco Moretti, "Grafikler". *Edebi Teoriye Soyut Modeller: Grafikler, Haritalar, Ağaçlar*. Trans. Ebru Kılıç (Istanbul: Agora Kitaplığı, 2006), pp. 16-18.
[33] Robert Miles, "The 1790s: The Effulgence of Gothic," in *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction*, ed. Jerrold E. Hogle (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 42.

As a literary form, if we narrow it down, it was about the supernatural. Yet, after the revolution and the Reign of Terror, various connotations of the Gothic as literary, political, historical and architectural are blended together, generating a darker set of meanings and bringing about uncertainty and ambivalence. Accordingly, since the crowds burst with fury have marched to the walls of the Bastille in 1789, the Gothic has become a cultural theme filled with the paradoxes of modernity and therefore it is one of the key elements in the process of evaluating modernity as well as postmodernity.

The Bastille, as stated by Simon Schama, "was also a fortress. Eight round towers, each with walls five feet thick, rose above the Arsenal [...]."[34] Being the symbolic locus of the birth of the revolution, the Bastille bore the characteristics of a Gothic castle. In Hubert Robert's painting, the Bastille appears as "an immense Gothic castle of darkness and secrecy, a place into which men would disappear without warning and never again see the light of day until their bones were disinterred by revolutionary excavators."[35] This is an evocative description of the gothic castle that we come across in many novels of the genre. The concept of the prisoner is an element used frequently in the Gothic. The gothic villain or the heroine, rather than being a prisoner based on a political crime, can be a prisoner in the sense that he/she becomes stuck in the gothic space which is the space of terror that emanates from the implementations of the Inquisition. Ambrosio in Lewis's *The Monk*, The Spaniard in Maturin's *Melmoth the Wanderer* and Ellena in Radcliffe's *The Italian* are the most renowned examples of gothic prisoners.

---

[34] Simon Schama, *Citizens: A Chronicle of the French Revolution* (New York: First Vintage Books, 1990), p. 389.
[35] Ibid.

In *The Monk* and *Melmoth the Wanderer*, the redemption of the prisoner is offered by Lucifer himself, who is commonly labelled as the 'bringer of light' or his demonic agents like Matilda and Melmoth. In the case of the Bastille, the prisoners were freed by the crowds whom we can present again as the bringers of light, since the revolution was the main event for the Enlightenment ideal. Moreover, these two novels depict scenes which resemble the revolutionary period as well as the Reign of Terror. In Lewis's novel, the rage of the mob overpowers the vengeance of the Inquisition and the Prioress is killed by the furious mob right after she claims her innocence:

> The Rioters heeded nothing but the gratification of their barbarous vengeance. They refused to listen her: They showed her every sort of insult, loaded her with mud and filth, and called her by the most opprobrious appellations. They tore her one from another, and each new Tormentor was more savage than the former. [...] She sank upon the ground bathed in blood, and in a few minutes terminated her miserable existence. Yet though She no longer felt their insults, the Rioters still exercised their impotent rage upon her lifeless body. They beat it, trod upon it, and ill-used it, till it became no more than a mass of flesh, unsightly, shapeless, and disgusting.[36]

Maturin displays a correlative scene of enraged mob in *Melmoth the Wanderer*:

> They dashed him to the earth – tore him up again – flung him into the air – tossed him from hand to hand, as a bull gores the howling mastiff with horns right and left. Bloody, defaced, blackened with earth, and battered with stones, he struggled and roared among them [...]. With his tongue hanging from his lacerated mouth, like that of a baited bull; with, one eye torn from the socket, and dangling on his

[36] Matthew Lewis, *The Monk*, ed. Howard Anderson, Introduction and Notes by Emma McEvoy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 356.

bloody cheek; with a fracture in every limb, and a wound for every pore, he still howled for 'life – life – life – mercy!' till a stone, aimed by some pitying hand, struck him down.[37]

What happened in France during the Reign of Terror, resembling these gothic scenes above, was deeply rooted in the earlier actions of the revolutionaries in 1789. In *The Monk* and *Vathek*, as Lucifer becomes the pathfinder of his victims, he leads them into Purgatory where is an ambivalent gothic space of suffering between two worlds, the earthly and the heavenly, and where the victims exist bereft of hope. The so-called bringer of light leads them into total darkness and hopelessness which is the grand punishment for modern individuals. If immortality is the ultimate desire of modernity, then the project fails at the instant it was born, as observed in the case of French Revolution. Melmoth, whose ambivalence is more intense than Ambrosio and Vathek since he is the sublime and the miserable, immortal and independent of time and space, shows the correlation between the modern reason and the desire of immortality:

There can be no crime into which madmen would not, and do not precipitate themselves; mischief is their occupation, malice their habit, murder their sport, and blasphemy their delight. Whether a soul in this state can be in a hopeful one, it is for you to judge; but it seems to me, that with the loss of reason, [...] you lose the hope of immortality.[38]

The reason quickened its self-destruction on the day the Bastille fell. Like a gothic castle, "the massive thickness of the walls, which made it impossible to speak to, or hear,other prisoners [...] only added to the sense

[37] Charles Maturin, *Melmoth the Wanderer*, ed. Douglas Grant, Introduction by Chris Baldick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 255-256.
[38] Ibid. at 57.

of live burial. The walls of the Bastille then became the frontier between being and nonexistence."[39]

The prisoners of the Bastille whose lives are disjoined by gothic-like walls, have ambivalent gothic characteristics, since they are the living dead, living in-between two realms. Then it is very revealing to depict the Bastille as a gothic castle, for ambivalence lies in the nature of the Gothic. Eventually, the prisoners return to life and society with the symbolic birth of the revolution. In other words, the fall of the Bastille is the symbolic birth, because it was not only the birth but also the rebirth or revival of the buried. This is the gothic process eligibly exemplifying the Freudian *return of the repressed*. Stuck in the middle of life and death, the prisoners serve as the modern examples of ambivalence. As they are gradually absorbed by the revolution, they prove the arrival of the imminent "loss of reason", which contributes to the period that is labelled as the Reign of Terror and simultaneously, the rise of the gothic novel.

2.2 The Ambivalence of Modernity Based on the Modern Response To Death and Immortality

Immortality is an obscure and unclear condition of modern desire, because there are two ways to define it: Death itself and/or the death of death. The former condition where the ultimate desire is death, is a Freudian explanation based on the argument of Eros and Thanatos. According to

[39] Schama, *Citizens*, p. 394.

Freud, "the aim of all life is death,"[40] and "Eros operates from the beginning of life and appears as a 'life instinct' in opposition to the 'death instinct' which was brought into being by the coming to life of inorganic substance."[41] The interdependency of life and death eventually generates ambivalence for the modern. Death is an end that should be reached through natural causes, yet modernity prefers cultural causes while intervening in this relationship of life and death. Before the industrial and technological innovations led by the modern hope, the catalyst of immortality was rather supernatural. In contrast to the Dark Ages, the intervention became more scientific in the nineteenth century. This comparison shows the dividing line between the Gothic and Science-fiction which is vaguely drawn by Mary Shelley in *Frankenstein*.

Frankenstein's monster is a product of scientific research, yet the monster is made out of death, mainly because the body is a composition of various corpses. The monster is then, in Freud's words above, "the coming to life of inorganic substance." The process of animating the lifeless matter is recorded by Victor Frankenstein in one of the most gothic passages in the novel:

> To examine the causes of life, we must first have recourse to death. [...] I do not ever remember to have trembled at a tale of superstition, or to have feared the apparition of a spirit. Darkness had no effect upon my fancy; and a churchyard was to me merely the receptacle of bodies deprived of life, which, from being the seat of beauty and strength, had become food for the worm. Now I was led to examine

[40] Sigmund Freud, *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, trans. James Strachey (New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company Inc., 1989), p. 46.
[41] Ibid. at 73.

the cause and progress of this decay, and forced to spend days and nights in vaults and charnelhouses.
[...] After days and nights of incredible labour and fatigue, I succeeded in discovering the cause of generation and life; nay, more, I became myself capable of bestowing animation upon lifeless matter.[42]

Despite mentioning the interdependency of life and death, Frankenstein heads for death, but not in its sense of representing the unknown. His focus is rather on a scale of the view of the enlightenment in which the conception of death solely consists of a corpse, only a material body with no soul. What he calls "death" is only the visible waste of life, since the invisible he cannot express in a scientific formula. Accordingly, what are supposed to be the elements of the gothic; the dark atmosphere of the churchyard, cemetary and the vaults as well as the tales based upon their influence, do not constitute fear within him. They are rather replaced by his scientific curiosity.

Curiosity is defined by Edmund Burke as "the most superficial of all the affections; it changes its object perpetually; it has an appetite which is very sharp, but very easily satisfied; and it has always an appearance of giddiness, restlessness and anxiety."[43] For it is easily satisfied, curiosity in its modern sense does not seem to be totally satisfied. The perpetual change of the object of curiosity shows that the chaser of knowledge fails perpetually as well. The restlessness of the chaser, like Frankenstein's in our case, is then generated by perpetual failure. The Gothic, with all its

[42] Mary Shelley, *Frankenstein or The Modern Prometheus*, Introduction and Notes by Maurice Hindle (London and New York: Penguin Books, 1992), pp. 50-51.
[43] Edmund Burke, *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*, Introduction and Notes by Adam Phillips (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 29.

mechanisms of anti-enlightenment, demonstrates the stories of modern failure. Curiosity brings destruction to gothic characters like Vathek, Frankenstein and Melmoth in whom we see the anxiety mentioned by Edmund Burke. Moreover, it is their discontent and final destruction what make them possess their *gothicness*. The progress they execute until they face their punishment shows the correlation between curiosity and death, and the finest warning concerning this, lies in the final message of Melmoth: "Remember your lives will be the forfeit of your desperate curiosity. For the same stake I risked more than life – and lost it! – Be warned – retire!"[44]

As opposed to Vathek, who bargains with Eblis for knowledge and Ambrosio, who is offered salvation by Lucifer, and, Melmoth and Dracula, who suffer from a doomed life for the sake of immortality, Frankenstein do not deal with the invisible or the supernatural, since his modern project is put in practice in order to turn the invisible and the supernatural into the visible and the natural. His is a different form of fear than the horror experienced by other gothic villains, in which the worst possible outcome is failure. The outcome of Frankensteinian process seems to emanate from that of the French Revolution and the Reign of Terror. Born from the dead or the living dead, as in the case of the fall of the Bastille mentioned above, the revolution in France and the reanimation of the the unknown and the forgotten, follow parallel paths. In France, the revolution paved the way for the bloodshed. It is the process through which we observe the similarity to

[44] Maturin, *Melmoth the Wanderer*, pp. 540-541.

the evolution of the monster. In both there is failure of the creators and death from the hands of the monster unleashed.

Besides projecting the interdependency of life and death, the creation and existence of the monster is reflected from a modern process that Zygmunt Bauman calls "creative destruction,"[45] through which the Faustian quality of modernity depicting the destruction of strangers and of the strange for order-building is explained. Accordingly, Frankenstein's monster is reborn from the dead who represent "the strange" and also "the unknown". Therefore, the monster is a stranger in both situations: before and after the creation. Modernity, as symbolized by Victor Frankenstein in the novel, attempts to change the strange into familiar. The result is inevitably *the uncanny* or *unheimlich*, a term used by Freud which is "the opposite of '*heimlich'* ['homely'], '*heimisch'* ['native'] – the opposite of what is familiar; and we are tempted to conclude that what is 'uncanny' is frightening precisely because it is *not* known and familiar."[46] Yet, Freudian uncanny has its basis of meaning in its ambivalence: "*Heimlich* is a word the meaning of which develops in the direction of an ambivalence, until it finally coincides with its opposite, *unheimlich*. *Unheimlich* is in some way or other a sub-species of *heimlich*."[47]

Within this framework, the unhomely as the dead and the destroyed as well as the past and the forgotten, becomes homely as the living and the constructed as well as the present and the extant, as they are created again,

---

[45] Bauman, *Postmodernity and Its Discontents*, p. 19.
[46] Sigmund Freud, "The Uncanny," in *Writings on Art and Literature* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1997), p. 195.
[47] Ibid. at 201.

but the recreation of the modern summons the uncanny. One of the entries in *Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary* for 'uncanny' is "uncomfortably strange,"[48] a definition that perfectly represents the *gothicness* of the Freudian uncanny. The monster which is created by civilization itself is not only strange; it is uncomfortably strange, therefore the discomfort aroused by the uncanny, reflects the discontent of civilization, hence the ambivalence of modernity. A monster is inherently strange, but a monster of modernity is in addition discomforting.

In *Frankenstein*, the creator is different from the original one. It is the modern man, hence the creation called "monster". His creation is the zombie, the living dead and therefore an ambivalent gothic creature within whom the forces of life and death, as well as the elements of nature and culture exist together, not nullifying each other, yet frequently stiffening and ultimately determining what the nameless monster is all about: indeterminateness. Modernity, facing the monster, is inadequate in naming it. The imminent end for the nameless creation is its destruction along with its creator, Victor Frankenstein, who has only two goals which summarize the progress of modernity illustrated as well by the revolutionaries in France: To create and to destroy.

After we have seen the procedure how immortality as death itself is related with the modern desire of the French Revolution and consequently the Reign of Terror in order to reveal the ambivalence that lies within modernity, based on Freud's argument of the death instinct and the

[48] "Uncanny." *Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language*. 1996 ed.

Uncanny, it is time to look at the second dimension of immortality, in which it is defined above as the death of death.

If the Jacobins were doomed with the inability to grasp their object of desire, then it seems that the modern desire projected itself as the death of death, which depicts another effort to reach immortality, yet another effort that summons fear again. There are two ways to consider this definition of immortality: First, it is the rationalization of death, a process that is the result of the failure of modernity in dealing with the conception of death; and secondly, it means to be accustomed to death, a process in which death becomes a part of the daily agenda, an ordinary and familiar thing.

According to Bauman, modernity "banished death and the dying out of sight and thus, [...] out of mind. [...] All in all, it 'de-metaphysicized' mortality. Death under modern conditions was no more 'tamed'; but it has been *rationalized* instead."[49] By rationalization, it is understood that death, a concept which is supposed to be the other of modern life based on its irrationality, became the subject within the territories of modernity by being translated or gaining expressions while abandoning its obscurity. If death is known, then it becomes an object which is governed by the so-called power of knowledge, allowing modernity to explain its causes and ends, and to place it into frames within which the unknown becomes partly known or at least questioned and evaluated.

Nevertheless, what happened during the Reign of Terror shows us the trouble of modernity with the uncertainty of death that is supposed to be

[49] Zygmunt Bauman, *Mortality, Immortality and Other Life Strategies* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992), p. 152.

enlightened. The power then, is not of knowledge but of information, which is knowledge that is partly rationalized. Like earthquake, a natural and sublime phenomenon that is today can be measured and reported in terms of numbers and statistics, which also is the object of a science called seismology, death is also rationalized as a sickness without a cure, through studies on autopsy, discussions on euthanasia and encouragement for martyrdom which especially holds an essential role for the survival of the modern nation-state. Beyond these forms of rationalization, and like earthquake again, death is but unpredictable, sudden and unavoidable.

Viewing death as the target of modern projects of rationalization helps us in taking a close look or partaking in the vision of modernity. In this way, we are accustomed to see what the modern sees rather than what it avoids. However, using the second way to consider immortality as the death of death, through which the ordinariness of death plays a revealing role, draws us a better picture of the connection between death and the Gothic. As opposed to the first, the second way shows what the modern could not foresee.

If Bauman's critique on the relationship of immortality and postmodernity is reflected on the conditions concerning the French case, then it becomes an expository observation:

> So banalized death is made too familiar to be noted and much too familiar to arouse high emotions. It is the 'usual' thing, much too common to be dramatic and certainly too common to be dramatic about. Its horror is exorcized through its omnipresence, made absent through the excess of visibility, made negligible through being ubiquitous, [...] . And as death fades away and eventually dies out

through banalization, so does the emotional and volitional investment in the craving for its defeat...[50]

The consequence of the bloodshed in France, then, was the death of death, meaning that there were too many *deaths*, but not *Death* at all. As blood and death become ordinary and artificial, then terror becomes a notion that insufficiently utters the fear. Horror instead, becomes the name of the fear, eliminating the ordinariness of death and replacing terror with its suddenness and unpredictability. The catalyst that was the main element in the process which death retrieved its identity of fearful uncertainty again and left behind its ordinariness, was the gothic novel. Yet, the question was whether it should be a novel of terror or horror.

2.3 The Ambivalence of Fear

The Marquis de Sade, who suffered a toilsome life resembling that of gothic characters since through a long period of his life he was a prisoner in gothic-like dark and dreary prisons, while looking out from his prison window, saw hundreds of people being murdered by the revolutionaries.[51] Correspondingly, he was the first to compare the novel of terror and horror in accordance with the incidents of the French Revolution and the Reign of Terror, by setting Matthew Lewis and Ann Radcliffe in opposition. De Sade wrote:

---

[50] Bauman, *Postmodernity and Its Discontents*, pp. 159-160.
[51] Richard Davenport-Hines, *Gotik*, trans. Hakan Gür (Ankara: Dost Kitabevi Yayınları, 2005), p. 206.

Perhaps at this point we should by rights analyse the new novels whose only merit, more or less, consists of their reliance on witchcraft and phantasmagoria, by naming the best of them as The Monk, which is superior in every respect to the strange outpourings of the brilliant imagination of Mrs Radcliffe. [...] It was the necessary offspring of the revolution upheaval which affected the whole of Europe. To those acquainted with all the evil which the wicked can bring down on the heads of the good, novels became as difficult to write as they were tedious to read. There was hardly a soul alive who did not experience more adversity in four or five years than the most famous novelist in all literature could have invented in a hundred. Writers therefore had to look to hell for help in composing their alluring novels, and project what everyone already knew into the realm of fantasy by confining themselves to the history of man in that cruel time.[52]

Along with De Sade's *Idée sur les Romans*, Ann Radcliffe's essay *On the Supernatural in Poetry* paved the way for the dichotomy of fear as terror and horror. According to Radcliffe, "Terror and horror are so far opposite, that the first expands the soul, and awakens the faculties to a high degree of life; the other contracts, freezes, and nearly annihilates them."[53] Radcliffe's intention was to denigrate horror as she was in favour of terror. Besides, it was the conception of 'the sublime' which Radcliffe evaluated as a third factor to compare terror and horror, based on the studies of Edmund Burke.

Tzvetan Todorov, writing in 1970, also contributed to this dichotomy in *The Fantastic* by studying on different attitudes observed in the gothic novel. The significance of his study is based on the ambivalent nature of what he calls "the fantastic". Within Todorov's framework, the uncertainty

[52] The Marquis De Sade, "An Essay on Novels" in *The Crimes of Love*, trans. David Coward (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 13-14.
[53] Ann Radcliffe, "On the Supernatural in Poetry" in *New Monthly Magazine*, No:16: 1826, p. 149.

that the reader experiences when he/she is puzzled to decide whether the fiction belongs to the realm of "the uncanny"[54] or that of "the marvelous" creates a third realm within which the reader hesitates to determine whether the story told by the author is real or imaginary. The fantastic is the realm in between which makes the reader hesitate and leads him to ambiguity.[55] The fantastic then, belongs to both realms, yet it cannot be determined in terms of either/or. It exhibits ambivalence in Bauman's terms, since the fantastic is neither the uncanny nor the marvelous, neither real nor imaginary; but both of them at the same time.

In the light of these, Todorov reflects again what was mentioned by De Sade and Radcliffe, by claiming that there are two distinct tendencies in the literary gothic: "that of the supernatural explained ("the uncanny"), as it appears in the novels of Clara Reeves and Ann Radcliffe; and that of the supernatural accepted ("the marvelous"), which is characteristic of the works of Horace Walpole, M. G. Lewis, and Maturin."[56] According to Todorov, both tendencies in the literary gothic do not exemplify the fantastic[57], because a terror novel like Radcliffe's offers a final rational explanation whereas in Walpole's, Lewis's and Maturin's novels the reader meets the supernatural right from the beginning until the final scene. *The Castle of Otranto*, for instance, opens with the fall of a giant helmet. In *The Monk*, Lucifer himself is a main character taking part in considerable scenes

[54] Todorov's usage of the word "the uncanny" is not a contribution to, or a reflection of the Freudian "unheimliche" and his use of the conception does not overlap with Freud's definition.
[55] Tzvetan Todorov, *The Fantastic: A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre*, trans. Richard Howard (New York: Cornell University Press, 1975), pp. 24-40.
[56] Todorov, *The Fantastic*, pp. 41-42.
[57] Ibid.

and *Melmoth the Wanderer* is the story of an immortal who tries to abandon his curse.

On the other hand, in both tendencies the reader faces several twists which would leave him in doubt. Yet, the doubt does not survive after the end of the book. For example, as claimed by Robert Miles,

> Lewis includes both the explained and unexplained supernatural, but by reversing their proper order, makes a mockery of both: we are given the natural explanation first (Agnes frightening the servants by dressing up as the ghost of the Bloody Nun) and the supernatural cause second (the real Bloody Nun turns up).[58]

Todorov calls this type of novel not "fantastic", but "fantastic-marvelous,"[59] meaning that there are twists in the story which would leave the reader in ambivalence, but finally the supernatural is accepted. In contrast to marvelous-fantastic novels, Radcliffe's explained supernatural fits into the realm of the "fantastic-uncanny,"[60] in which the causes of fear are rationalized. As a result, the ambivalence in these gothic tendencies creates ephemeral uncertainty and a short-term indecision.

According to this formulation, a novel of terror is slotted within the realm of the fantastic-uncanny, whereas fantastic-marvelous comprises of the horror novel. In other words, terror is related with reality, rationality and naturality, while on the contrary, horror is connected to the imaginary, supernatural and the excessive. In relation, Todorov's distinction contributes to Ann Radcliffe's comparison of terror and horror. As *the fantastic* is

---

[58] Miles, "The 1790s: The Effulgence of Gothic," in *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction*, p. 53.
[59] Todorov, *The Fantastic*, p. 44.
[60] Ibid.

Todorov's main focus while comparing two different tendencies, Radcliffe's perspective is based on *the sublime*, which is a conception usually ascribed to Edmund Burke, on account of his renowned study *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*, published in 1757.

Radcliffe's attempt is to disconnect the sublime and horror, by laying the sublime solely on terror and using their collaboration as a gothic device. Radcliffe's endeavour of distinction and collaboration is indebted to Burke's association of the terrible and the sublime:

> 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 objects, 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.[61]

Under the influence of Burke's definition, Radcliffe frequently uses the sublime as a cooperative conception with the terrible, by mentioning romantic sceneries and enchanting landscapes, comparing natural scenes of simplicity with the insincerity of great cities, while generating suspense, mystery and anticipation throughout the whole novel. Therefore, since Radcliffe, the sublime in its Burkean sense is a gothic conception, for many subjects, like magnitude, darkness and sound, curiosity and uncertainty which are evaluated by Burke in relation to the terrible and the sublime happen to be the elements of gothic fiction. The magnitude in building producing a sense of infinity reminds of gothic architecture; darkness creates a gothic space by giving way to the appearance of ghosts; sound and

[61] Burke, *A Philosophical Enquiry*, p. 36.

loudness, as of storms and thunders, display the examples of gothic climate. Curiosity is also a gothic element since Beckford's Vathek, and uncertainty as well dominates the literary gothic.

Employing both the sublime and the terrible, Radcliffe avoids the unexpectedness, transgression and violence of horror. However, in Burke's framework, the distance of the sublime is a prominent agent in creating *delight*, which also has an important role in relation with the sublime. According to Burke, "when danger or pain press too nearly, they are incapable of giving any delight,"[62] and Terry Eagleton illustrates this by claiming "Antigone is sublime, but a bomb in a crowded bus station is not."[63] The nature of the sublime is then bestowed upon its effect by this conception of distance. The enchanted scenes and landscapes frequently depicted by Radcliffe, as in "those distant and sublime mountains, [...] these luxuriant plains, this blue vault, the cheerful light of day,"[64] or "vineyards, woods, and pastures, delighted with the romantic beauty of the landscape, [...] the grandeur of the Pyrenées,"[65] also contribute to Burke's framework in which the impact of the sublime is sustained by the impact of delight. However, if the case of terror and horror is being discussed on account of De Sade's perspective, based on the literary influence of the French Revolution and the Reign of Terror, Radcliffe's novel of terror lacks the distance, since the suddenness, excess and violence of the horror novel is not employed as a gothic device by Ann Radcliffe, as a retaliatory move

[62] Ibid.
[63] Terry Eagleton, *Holy Terror* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p. 47.
[64] Ann Radcliffe, *The Mysteries of Udolpho*, ed. Bonamy Dobrée, Introduction and Notes by Terry Castle (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 61.
[65] Ibid. at 58.

against *the death of death*. In other words, Radcliffe's novels could not generate the distance of death during the French terror, or in Sade's words, Radcliffe could not "look to hell," and death, bereft of its sublimity, had to be a part of an estrangement process run by writers who could "look to hell," by accepting the supernatural, not by explaining it. As a result, Lewis and Maturin's novels are evaluated as novels of horror, which do not familiarize death, but rather provides sublimity and distance by employing supernatural elements. As opposed to Radcliffe's association with the Burkean sublime, Lewis and Maturin seems to offer the sublime as well. If, as in the case of Radcliffe, a supernatural gap or irrational excess is not displayed by the author, then how it is possible to create the distance, and accordingly the delight and finally the sublime?

Horror is then, the terror intensified by all means. In *Melmoth the Wanderer*, when John faces a strange and familiar figure, he is incapable of uttering "an exclamation of terror,"[66] and this incapability of the modern against the Freudian uncanny is the horror. It is terror, but unspeakable. Bauman's definiton of fear perfectly outlines the nature of horror as opposed to terror: "'Fear' is the name we give to our *uncertainty*: to our *ignorance* of the threat and of what is to be *done* – what can and what can't be – to stop it in its tracks – or to fight it back if stopping it is beyond our power."[67] Uncertainty and the lack of power to fight back are elements of the horror novel, whereas uncertainty in Radcliffe's novels is always taken

[66] Maturin, *Melmoth the Wanderer*, p. 20.
[67] Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Fear* (Cambridge and Malden: Polity Press, 2007), p. 2.

into the realm of reason. Therefore, Radcliffean novels represent the tendency to accept fear as being not beyond modernity's power.

As opposed to Maturin's, Radcliffe's method is to express fear in natural and rational ways. In *The Italian*, she foreshows that nothing will remain unclear in the end: "[...] , he would, perhaps, have been somewhat disappointed to have descended suddenly from the region of fearful sublimity, to which he had soared – the world of terrible shadows! – to the earth, [...] , and to an explanation simply natural."[68] Terror in Radcliffe is something that mankind is able to subdue, yet in Maturin, horror is "a terror we can never overcome."[69] Therefore, the distinction of terror and horror seems to be necessary while discussing the gothic fiction. The reader overcomes the terror of Radcliffe, because the supernatural as a gothic device of estrangement is *explained*. Lewis and Maturin's reader experiences the loss of words, mainly based on the effect of the supernatural *accepted*. It is accepted, because no response is possible against the gothic horror. This is the reason why De Sade justifies the superiority of *The Monk*.

The distance of the sublime as a gothic device brings forward the other gothic elements like darkness, uncertainty, magnitude and infinity. The essential usage of this device lies in gothic architecture. The isolation of gothic characters, as in the example of Ambrosio in *The Monk*, is connected to the ambience of the gothic space, mainly the cathedral and the castle. Samuel Coleridge has noted the impact of the gothic space: "On entering a cathedral, I am filled with devotion and awe; I am lost to the actualities that

[68] Ann Radcliffe, *The Italian*, Introduction and Notes by Robert Miles (London: Penguin Books, 2004), p. 70.
[69] Maturin, *Melmoth the Wanderer*, p. 191.

surround me, and my whole being expands into the infinite; earth and air, nature and art, all swell up into eternity, and the only sensible impression is that 'I am nothing'."[70] Undoubtedly, the sublime introduces the sense of nothingness which ends up in wholeness of the subject, a sort of a religious process that justifies the relationship between Catholicism and gothic architecture. Besides, anti-catholicism is an obvious character of the gothic novel, especially employed by Radcliffe in *The Italian*, by Lewis in *The Monk* and Maturin in *Melmoth the Wanderer*, as the Inquisition is displayed as the base of fear. Accordingly, terror and horror in gothic fiction are in alliance with the sublime. This alliance creates the ambivalence of the sublime, which is defined by the interdependency of fear and wonder. Burke has shown the ambivalence by giving examples:

> Several languages bear a strong testimony to the affinity of these ideas. [...] Θάμβος is in greek, either fear or wonder; δεινός is terrible or respectable; αίδέω, to reverence or to fear. *Vereor* in latin, is what αίδέω is in greek. The Romans used the verb *stupeo*, a term which strongly marks the state of an astonished mind, to express the effect either of simple fear, or of astonishment; the word *attonitus*, (thunder-struck) is equally expressive of the alliance of these ideas; and do not the french *etonnement*, and the english *astonishment* and *amazement*, point out as clearly the kindred emotions which attend fear and wonder?[71]

Both of these emotions are strong elements of the gothic novel. Gothic architecture is not the only realm wherein the mutuality of fear and wonder takes place. It is also reflected in gothic characters in whom the reader can sense the sublime. The most frequent example is Lucifer or any of his agents who are the source of fear as well as delight, as illustrated by

[70] Quoted by Kilgour, *The Rise of the Gothic Novel*, p. 30.
[71] Burke, *A Philosophical Enquiry*, p. 54.

Lewis in *The Monk*: "Enchanted at a vision so contrary to his expectations, Ambrosio gazed upon the Spirit with delight and wonder: Yet however beautiful the Figure, He could not but remark a wildness in the Dæmon's eyes, and a mysterious melancholy impressed upon his features, [...]."[72] Accordingly, the demonic character becomes melancholic, paving the way for the identification of the reader with the doomed persona of the supernatural character. Frankenstein's monster, Dracula and Melmoth are renowned derivatives of this gothic ambivalence, since they are both miserable and alluring, merciless and suffering, lost and firm at the same time. The ambivalent domain of these gothic characters is generated essentially by dread and temptation. They are dreadful, mainly because they are alive; and, they are tempting, because they have conquered death and finally become the outlaws of the enlightenment and the outsiders of modernity. Even they have passed the borders of modernity, they are still a part of the modern process, seeking resolution for their ambivalent identities.

2.4 Reading the Gothic Through Modernity and Postmodernity

In Radcliffe's novels, since suspense and anticipation together with the sublime generate terror, the reader experiences the sense of fear and witnesses its inevitability. The weakness only lies in the explanation of the supernatural while introducing fear. In this case, Catherine's admiration of

[72] Lewis, *The Monk*, p. 277.

Ann Radcliffe and her novels, especially *The Mysteries of Udolpho* in Jane Austen's *Northanger Abbey* is a revealing detail, for Catherine as well faces the gothic within the boundaries of reality. Yet, it does not prevent the emergence of fear from intervening in the daily life of Austen's heroine.

In Lewis's novels on the other hand, the need for fear is again extant, but the progress through which it intervenes in the character's existence is different. Since the supernatural is not denied, the paradoxes of modern life which are intensified by rationality become a catalyst of the reader's awareness, by the use of supernatural as a gothic instrument. The Gothic holds a potential power for causing awareness, because the reader grasps the chance of facing the supernatural which is supposed to be nonexistent.

Therefore the Gothic, with all its ambivalent components, constitutes a cultural praxis. Since the French Revolution, literature of fear, whether classified as terror or horror, makes the reader discuss the paradoxes of modernity throughout the period of transition from modernity into postmodernity. As a result, Gothic novel does not collaborate in a process of escaping the reality of modern life, instead, it builds the groundwork of the return, to what has been avoided.

Jane Austen's *Northanger Abbey* is a contrasting example of the eighteenth century gothic novel, although it did not appear in print until 1818. Since considered as a gothic parody or satire by many considerable

critics, it is generally accepted as a non-gothic gothic novel.[73] However, the novel has several aspects that render its *gothicness* possible.

It is accepted as a parody, mainly because the gothic space, the abbey, does not function as it does in Radcliffe's novels. Expectations of the heroine, named Catherine, fail to come true, despite all her efforts to change the mood from modern comfort to gothic unrest. Radcliffe is known for explaining the supernatural by rational means, but Catherine, who is a fan of Radcliffe's novels, tries to explain natural events by supernatural causes, or tries to add the sense of fear and alarm on what is simple and mundane. Eventually, the result is failure.

On the other hand, the nature of the gothic is revealed although the gothic abbey seems to be hardly gothic at all. The first mention of the abbey is very delayed in the novel and only a small part of the plot takes place therein. Yet, Catherine, "who had by nature nothing heroic about her,"[74] in the beginning of the novel, becomes a heroine only after she returns from the abbey with a gothic experience. This gothic experience is based on real life fear rather than a supernatural cause. Since the novel is about the journey of a young lady with the purpose of becoming socialized, Catherine becomes a heroine only after the true character of General Tilney, who possesses the characteristics of a Radcliffean villain, is exposed. The key element of the novel which renders its gothicness is that Catherine, who

---

[73] E. J. Clery in *The Rise of the Supernatural Fiction* (p. 146), Dorothy Scarborough in *The Supernatural in Modern English Fiction* (p. 47) and Fred Botting in *Gothic* (p. 68) indicate that *Northanger Abbey* is a gothic parody or satire.

[74] Jane Austen, *Northanger Abbey*, Introduction and Notes by David Blair (Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 2000), p. 4.

claims that she is not "easily frightened,"[75] is introduced to the passion of fear during her presence in the gothic abbey, which shares its name with the title of the novel. Therefore, Austen has shown that fear is what makes an ordinary English girl a heroine. Moreover, fear is the only passion that Catherine tries to experience before arriving at the abbey. So it is not surprising that the heroine is a reader of gothic novels. Nonetheless, Austen mentions "the absurdity of her curiosity and her fears,"[76] blaming Catherine's expectations based on gothic romances, but Catherine experiences fear through reality, and therefore the literary fear is not sufficient for her, as also observed in the example of the Reign of Terror, during which the Radcliffean explained supernatural remained mundane for the French citizens who witnessed the real life terror coming from the original source, the modern man, not from a novel of terror.

According to Edmund Burke, "no passion so effectually robs the mind of all its powers of acting and reasoning as fear."[77] In Catherine's case, however, there is no fear in the first place, but there is also the absence of reason. When she enters the non-gothic gothic space, her fear emerges based on unreasonable expectations. In other words, the loss of reason creates fear. It shows that Catherine's situation illustrates Burke's claim, but only the process is reversed, as fear and reason exchange their initial roles. In Burke's view, fear causes unreason, whereas in Austen's novel, unreason causes fear.

---

[75] Ibid. at 101.
[76] Ibid. at 129.
[77] Burke, *A Philosophical Enquiry*, p. 53.

The impact of fear is intensified by experiencing the sublime and the terrible. Fear in this case seems to be in alliance with Radcliffe's perception of horror, that it freezes the human faculties and destroys them. On the other hand, as fear robs the mind of its reasoning, the void of ignorance it produces projects itself on wisdom, as thought by most of *the graveyard poets* in the 1740s, who are the forefathers of the literary gothic. One of the kernel ideas of graveyard poetry is that "to learn wisdom, it is necessary to take a quicker and more frightening path,"[78] and this path is parallel to the path of death. Knowledge is related to fear and eventually death as well as the sublime, since the Burkean sublime represents something greater than the reason. This chain reaction is employed again by fear as it is concluded by the unreasonable.

Burke's comments on the concept of fear shows the reason why the ideals of the age of Enlightenment are connected with the exclusion of fear. The paradox is that despite the effort to exclude, the incidents which took place from the beginning of the French Revolution until the end of the Reign of Terror show that the ideals have reached only failure, because of the modern fear. The so-called fearlessness paved the way for terror again, in terms of reality and literature, and the return of what has been denied produced a more frightening effect.

Fear, as stated in the introduction of Lovecraft's renowned essay *Supernatural Horror in Literature*, is "the oldest and strongest emotion of

[78] David Punter and Glennis Byron, *The Gothic* (Malden, Oxford and Victoria: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2004), p. 11.

mankind."[79] The gothic novel, as the novel of fear is therefore in deep relation with the past, not only because its roots dwell in the Goths or the centuries-old gothic architecture, but also the passion of fear is as old as civilization. Accordingly, Lovecraft's claim that "the oldest and strongest kind of fear is fear of the unknown,"[80] reflects the nature of the Enlightenment and as well as the emergence of the Gothic which is a *necessary evil* in the modern or a *stranger within* that collaborates in the making of the modern. This is a perspective that unites the frameworks of Sigmund Freud and Zygmunt Bauman: the modern cannot master its home; and accordingly, the Freudian discontent along with the Baumanesque ambivalence becomes the content of modernity. In other words, the discontent and the ambivalence are *normal* conditions of modernity. The realm of the Gothic, as shown throughout this study, reflects the *necessary evil* or the *stranger within*, since the Gothic is defined through modern paradoxes of life and death, mortality and infinity, individuality and sociality, etc.

Freud's *Civilization and Its Discontents*, in which the discontent is shown through the challenge between pain and pleasure, life and death, instincts and reason, was published in 1930. In 1997, Zygmunt Bauman published a correlative book called *Postmodernity and Its Discontents*, in which the way that Freud understands culture and/or civilization is linked to the interaction between modernity and postmodernity. In general, Bauman's perspective is related to Freud's thoughts on the discontent of modernity. In

[79] Howard Phillips Lovecraft, *Supernatural Horror in Literature*, ed. E. F. Bleiler (New York: Dover Publications, 1973), p. 12.
[80] Ibid.

fact, the German title of Freud's work is *Das Unbehagen in der Kultur*, but according to Bauman, Freud's perspective in the evaluation of culture is now projected on modernity:

> We know now that it was the story of modernity which the book told, even if its author preferred to speak of *Kultur* or civilization; only modern society thought of itself as of an activity of 'culture' or 'civilization', and acted on such self-knowledge, with the results Freud set out to explore; the phrase 'modern civilization' is, for this reason, a pleonasm.[81]

As the paradoxes mentioned above lie at the pillars of Western thought, modern individual suffers the consequences, and the Gothic works like an antidote for the healing of that individual. Through reading a gothic fiction, modern individual is taken to a stage wherein the divisions and either/or conditions of modernity are deconstructed, mainly by the effect of uncertainty in novels. As seen in the examples of Frankenstein's monster and Melmoth, the return of the dead or the delayed mortality of a gothic character creates an effect of identification for the reader. The Gothic is therefore the realm wherein the unspeakable demands an opportunity of utterance.

Accordingly, as stated by Steven Bruhm, "the Gothic itself is a narrative of trauma. Its protagonists usually experience some horrifying event that profoundly affects them, destroying (at least temporarily) the norms that structure their lives and identities."[82] The reader identifies himself with the traumatized gothic character. Eventually, this shows a

---

[81] Bauman, *Postmodernity and Its Discontents*, p. 1.
[82] Steven Bruhm, "The Contemporary Gothic: Why We Need It," in *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction*, ed. Jerrold E. Hogle, p. 268.

significant cause for reading the Gothic, for "Gothic fiction in general can perform some kind of exorcism on us."[83]

Reading the Gothic through postmodernity is different than reading it through modernity. In order to make a distinction, it is convenient to evaluate the emergence of the postmodern within modernity, based on Zygmunt Bauman's conception of *the doubt*, in which he claims that there are two kinds of doubt: "The first kind of doubt does not undermine the authority of science,"[84] and this is the modern doubt. The second kind of doubt, that "undermines the trust that whatever is being said by science at a given time is the best one can say at that time,"[85] is the postmodern doubt. The disappearance of this second doubt *as a doubt*, "marks most vividly the passage of modernity into its postmodern stage."[86] Eventually, as modernity comes to a stage in which the authority of certainty is rendered uncertain and the ambivalence of modernity is accepted, then we are in the territory of the Gothic, wherein "living with ambivalence"[87] is illustrated frequently.

The absence of security and order which is a characteristic of a postmodern society is usually dramatized in the Gothic. The modern society, on the other hand, confronted the Gothic while trying to build these qualities. Therefore, what has been disappearing in the twentieth century as well as what has been forgone, bears the content which is reflected in a 250 years old gothic novel. In the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries, when

---

[83] Ibid. at 272.
[84] Bauman, *Modernity and Ambivalence*, p. 242.
[85] Ibid. at 243.
[86] Ibid.
[87] The title of the chapter in which Bauman discusses the concept of the doubt is "Postmodernity, or Living with Ambivalence".

the modern doubt is extant, the gothic novel caused *traumatization*. However, reading the Gothic after the emergence of the postmodern stage causes *dramatization*. Nonetheless, this does not lead to a stage of undermining the influence of the Gothic on the postmodern reader, because the postmodern reader lives in an environment where the ambivalence of modernity is an object of enjoyment. For today's reader, a gothic character like Ambrosio, Melmoth or Dracula is incapable of causing traumatization, but, since they represent the nature of the gothic by their ambivalence, they are capable of sharing the postmodern role of living with ambivalence. The final impact is that these gothic characters cause dramatization, because for the postmodern reader, they represent a more accessible territory in which the reader can deal with the passion of fear offered by the novel. As we are in the postmodern stage, we observe that the dichotomies of modernity have become obscure. Traces of this obscurity can be followed in gothic characters, for their condition seems to be similar to that of the postmodern subject. The identity quest of Frankenstein's monster, for instance, is different than the quest of Anne Rice's vampires, but there are still common grounds with the postmodern subject. In other words, postmodern subject's subjectivity is in correlation with the ambivalence of gothic characters.

Today's anxieties are substantially different than the terrors of the eighteenth century, but fear is a perpetual passion. Writing in 1917, Scarborough compares the ambiences of the eighteenth and the twentieth centuries in accordance with the supernatural:

Supernaturalism was probably more generally believed in then than now, and people were more given to the telling of ghost stories and all the folk-tales of terror than at the present time. One reason for this may be that they had more leisure; and their great open fires were more conducive to the retailing of romances of shudders than our unsocial steam radiators. The eighteenth century seemed frankly to enjoy the pleasures of fear, and the rise of the Gothic novel gave rein to this natural love for the uncanny and the gruesome.[88]

The rise of the gothic novel shows a synchronic progress with the rise of modernity, for the paradoxes of modernity are directly reflected by gothic fiction. However, today's anxieties are not clearly defined as modern fears which are related to death, mortality, violence and transgression. As a result, today's reader is not easily frightened by these macro-level concepts, for yet he/she is familiar with the ambivalence of the Gothic.

[88] Dorothy Scarborough, *The Supernatural in Modern English Fiction* (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1917), p. 13.

Chapter 3: The Stranger and the Beast

"'My thesis is this: I want you to believe.'

'To believe what?'

'To believe in things that you cannot.'"[89]

(Van Helsing to John Seward in *Dracula*)

3.1 The Stranger Within: Modernity and the British Vampire Novel

3.1.1 The Vampire within Reason and Belief in the Vampire

The emergence of the vampire myth in England is deeply rooted in the eighteenth century myths of distant locations, especially Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria, concerning the supernatural elements of folk beliefs. The first use of the term 'vampyre' in English dates back to a period when the supernatural was not expressed in novels, but offered to readers as a part of reality, not of fiction. It was in 1732, when the *London Journal* published a report about a Hungarian called Arnold Paul who was supposed to be *a*

[89] Stoker, *Dracula*, p. 160.

Vampyre.[90] It is now to our common knowledge that the eighteenth century stands for many signs of modern mentality and the trust in reason. Therefore, a report concerning the unreasonable inevitably became a threatening topic in England. The controversy did not only lie in the supernatural elements of the reported story, but also in the reliance on the written reports published in newspapers, which were meant to be the source for reasonable news and comments, not a document of superstition. In other words, the report on the story of a vampire engendered a controversy between truth and fiction.

This is the point where the significance of the novel is displayed. Markman Ellis reminds us of Michael McKeon's observation: "What was 'new' about the novel, [...] was the analogy it constructed between epistemological problems (questions of truth) and social problems (questions of virtue)."[91] The discussions concerning the challenge between reason and belief are caused by a supernatural element, and as claimed by Scarborough, supernaturalism had been expressed before in many various epics, dramas, romances, but "Gothicism brought it over frankly into the novel, which was a new thing."[92] So it was only with the gothic novel that the supernatural gained its modern sense while being introduced by the novel, whether it was explained or not. The rise of the gothic novel in the eighteenth century and the rise of modernity function in unison, since a modern set of paradoxes is reflected in the gothic novel through the

[90] The report is quoted by Markman Ellis, *The History of Gothic Fiction*, pp. 162-163. The name of the so-called vampire differs from source to source, as Arnold Paul, Arnold Paole, Arnont Paule and Arnaut Pavle.
[91] Ellis, *The History of Gothic Fiction*, p. 164.
[92] Scarborough, *The Supernatural in Modern English Fiction*, p. 54.

problematic response of modernity to supernaturalism, representing the ambivalence embedded within modernity.

The role of the vampire in modern English fiction therefore lies in the challenge between belief and reason. Belief in the supernatural was strongly represented in folk tales of people living away from the city in the advance guard states like England and France or in the folklore of cultures which produced a stronger effect of estrangement based on their distance to England. The folklore of the Balkan states was highly effective on the response of modernity to supernaturalism and on the resistance of anti-enlightenment perspective. For Dom Augustin Calmet, who studied on supernatural elements of distant cultures, presence of the vampire was an evidence for the presence of God.[93] Consequentially, as mentioned by Rickels, the vampire became a topic of study by many academicians in the eighteenth century:

> During the first half of the eighteenth century, there was a matching upsurge of scholarly interest in vampirism (which thus coincided with the foundation of the modern university). There were, beginning around 1728 and in the course of maybe fifteen years, as many as forty treatises on vampirism researched and published at German and French universities.[94]

As the interest of the European antiquarians and scholars in the eighteenth century moved towards the realm of the supernatural, with the purpose of either bringing it into the realm of the reasonable or rendering its borders only by belief, the gothic novel became the territory of what the

[93] Ellis, *The History of Gothic Fiction*, p. 172.
[94] Laurence A. Rickels, *The Vampire Lectures* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), p. 15.

readers could believe or not rather than what is known or unknown to them. As the efforts of the antiquarians resulted in the written records of folk tales through the eighteenth century and on, the challenge against modernity in the nineteenth century became projected unto the realm of the Gothic.

In 1819, John Polidori showed the modern scepticism about vampires and its consequences in the first prose fiction in English concerning vampirism: *The Vampyre*. In the novella, the problematic relationship between belief and reason is a cause of contention, as depicted by the return of Lord Ruthven who is a vicious and seductive vampire, sufferings of Aubrey, a young British man governed by reason, and warnings of Ianthe, a Greek girl who believes in the reality of legends about vampires.

The contribution of Ianthe's standpoint to the plot of the story is prominent for the representation of folk-belief against the rational rejection of supernaturalism, as shown by Polidori in the following passage:

> Her earnestness and apparent belief of what she narrated, excited the interest even of Aubrey; [...] whilst he attempted to laugh her out of such idle and horrible fantasies; but Ianthe [...] begged of him to believe her, for it had been remarked, that those who had dared to question their existence, always had some proof given, which obliged them, [...] to confess it was true. She detailed to him the traditional appearance of these monsters, and his horror was increased, by hearing a pretty accurate description of Lord Ruthven; he, however, still persisted in persuading her, that there could be no truth in her fears, though at the same time he wondered at the many coincidences which had all tended to excite a belief in the supernatural power of Lord Ruthven.[95]

[95] John Polidori, "The Vampyre," in *Three Gothic Novels*, p. 271.

As seen in most of the gothic novels, there is always a believer of the supernatural if there is a non-believer. Ianthe, by depicting the distant location and the folk-belief, is precisely the opposite of Aubrey. Eventually, her warnings are not considered as a part of reality from Aubrey's point of view, which is the enlightened view. Polidori's novella clarifies that when the realm of belief overlaps with the realm of reason, modern reason fails to cope with it and finally the modern man, as illustrated by Aubrey, loses his mental health. Therefore, the modern endeavour to include belief within the borders of modernity engenders discontent. Although belief and folklore became the focus of researches by academicians and antiquarians, *The Vampyre* points out the trouble with defining belief in terms of reason. The supernatural then, cannot become natural, while reason arrives at the stage of unreason.

The groundwork of the final stage of unreason is the modern either/or condition. Because of the method of inclusion and exclusion, the paradoxes of modernity grow stronger, as the set of inclusion expands while the set of exclusion wanes. This expansion in the territory of reason by the inclusion of belief creates a gap within the realm of reason. This gap or void, which is defined by reason but survives with a ghostly aspect after being expressed by the language of modernity, depicts the realm of the Gothic and the ambivalence of modernity.

Polidori's novella illustrates vampirism through two male figures. Sheridan Le Fanu's *Carmilla*, however, shows the vampiric relationship between two females. In contrast to *The Vampyre*, here the vampire and her

victim are in a more intense and intimate affair. Polidori employs the impossible friendship of a supernatural being and a modern rational man, whereas Le Fanu runs a connection between two females that could be almost called love. In fact, by depicting the cooperation of love and hate, Le Fanu creates a more revealing example for the parallelism of modernity and the Gothic. The vampire is closer to her victim than all the other vampires like Lord Ruthven and Dracula are to their preys. Carmilla is therefore close, but also peculiar. Within this framework, she exemplifies the Freudian uncanny, by being strange and familiar at the same time. For example, Carmilla visits Laura in the shape of a monstrous cat, yet cat is commonly supposed to be a symbol of coziness:

> It was a sooty-black animal that resembled a monstrous cat. It appeared to me about four or five feet long for it measured fully the length of the hearthrug as it passed over it; and it continued to-ing and fro-ing with the lithe, sinister restlessness of a beast in a cage. [...] The two broad eyes approached my face, and suddenly I felt a stinging pain as if two large needles darted, [...] deep into my breast.[96]

Laura's confrontation with the uncanny eventually generates horror and in Le Fanu's words we can follow the tracks of distinction between horror and terror: "It would be vain my attempting to tell you the horror with which, even now, I recall the occurrence of that night. It was no such transitory terror as a dream leaves behind it. It seemed to deepen by time,

[96] Sheridan Le Fanu, *Carmilla* (Wildside Press, 1872), p. 52.

[...].”[97] As the victim faces the uncanny and experiences the horror, her vampiric progress gains speed.

Another considerable matter for the junction of modernity and the Gothic is the modern diligence of defining the unreasonable in terms of reason, which is represented by Laura’s father in Le Fanu’s novella. Accordingly, Le Fanu’s novella shares the same tendency towards the relationship between reason and belief with Polidori’s *The Vampyre*, although Le Fanu published his masterpiece in 1872. Yet, *Carmilla* almost seems to be written with the purpose of justifying the belief in supernaturalism, rather than showing the modern condition of ambivalence. It shows that as the twentieth century approaches, the line between modern paradoxes grows thicker and trespassing is not easier than it was in the eighteenth century, but it is then more fearful because of the growth in denial: “It is difficult to deny, or even to doubt the existence of such a phenomenon as the Vampire.”[98] In contrast to Aubrey, who loses his mental health after denying the supernatural, Laura is almost close to a loss of reason as she continues to have nightmares even after the elimination of the vampire. Therefore, Le Fanu’s novella of the nineteenth century’s last quarter shows the same way which Polidori follows in the first quarter of the century, but from the other way around.

As claimed above, distant locations are the sources of the vampire myth in English fiction. This is exemplified by Ianthe, a Greek girl in Polidori’s novella, and Mircalla Karnstein, an Austrian vampire in Le

[97] Ibid. at 53.
[98] Ibid. at 102.

Fanu's *Carmilla*. The victims in both novellas are of course British, although the signs of vampirism are introduced away from home. As an Austrian is unintelligible to a British or Carmilla is unintelligible to Laura, these novellas show that belief is also unintelligible for reason. The trouble that emerges with the classifications of modernity is depicted by the nineteenth century vampire fiction. Therefore, reading the Gothic today is a prominent effort in order to follow and construe the progress throughout modernity and postmodernity.

England is not involved in the plot of Carmilla, but Laura is educated enough to make a distinction between the core of modernity and the rest of Europe:

> In Styria, we, though by no means magnificent people, inhabit a castle, or schloss. [...] My father is English, and I bear an English name, although I never saw England. But here, in this lonely and primitive place, where everything is so marvelously cheap, I really don't see how ever so much more money would at all materially add to our comforts, or even luxuries.[99]

Since Laura's mother is symbolically represented by Carmilla the vampire, it is possible to argue that modern reason is represented in the father figure as opposed to a more intimate mother who represents the distance, Eastern Europe and accordingly, belief. As reason and belief are compared, the reader is able to doubt the validity of science and reason from a sentimental perspective. Belief is not doubted by the believers of the supernatural, yet for modernity, reason is by definition not doubted. As argued by Rickels in *The Vampire Lectures*, "you never, [...] really knew

[99] Ibid. at 7.

who your father was: *paternitas semper incertus est*. Who your mother is was always a sure thing."[100] Therefore, commitment to the mother is instinctual rather than reasonable. Commitment to the father is educational, whereas the loyalty to the mother is inescapable. As the child, here the victim of vampirism, leaves the territory of reason and enters the realm of the mother. In the case of Aubrey, we witness the *inbetweenness* of modernity which results in the loss of reason based on modern resistance against belief in the supernatural. The selfhood then, is not only constructed on either reason or belief. This is one of the paradoxes of the modern self, which ends in a state which is labelled by Freud as the discontent of civilization and by Bauman the ambivalence of modernity. Gothic novel, by displaying the vampire and the one who faces it, reflects these paradoxes which build the nature of modernity.

3.1.2 Vampire as the Stranger

Bram Stoker's *Dracula*, published in 1897, closes the nineteenth century vampire novel. The significance of Stoker's novel lies in the characteristics of Dracula, who is commonly known as the greatest vampire figure ever. He is indeed a distinctive vampire compared to Lord Ruthven and Carmilla, because as Nina Auerbach claims, he "is less the culmination of a tradition than the destroyer of one."[101] As opposed to the friendship of Lord Ruthven and Aubrey and the intimacy between Carmilla and Laura,

[100] Rickels, *The Vampire Lectures*, p. 70.
[101] Nina Auerbach, *Our Vampires, Ourselves* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1995), p. 64.

Dracula "makes no attempt to bridge the distance"[102] between his prey and himself.

On the other hand, if the novel is divided into two as Dracula as *the visited* and Dracula as *the visitor*, then a resemblance to *The Vampyre* and *Carmilla* becomes clearer. In Polidori's novella, the predator and the prey travel together; they are both visitors whereas in *Carmilla*, the predator is the sole visitor but only at first sight. However, in *The Vampyre*, as Aubrey who represents the modern male is visiting Greece, the vampire is also a visitor in England meeting his prey who is Aubrey's sister. Also in *Carmilla*, as the vampire is a visitor, Laura as an English girl is a visitor in Styria, too. In all of these vampire fictions, modernity's territories of exclusion and inclusion play the home and the visitor by turns.

According to Nina Auerbach, the lack of intimacy between Dracula and his preys is based upon Dracula's feature of hierarchy, which results in his hatred for strangers: "Dracula is in love less with death or sexuality than with hierarchies."[103] However, Dracula is depicted by Stoker as *the stranger* within modernity, who tries to abandon his strangeness among the British:

> Here I am noble; I am boyar; the common people know me, and I am master. But a stranger in a strange land, he is no one; men know him not – and to know not is to care not for. I am content if I am like the rest, so that no man stops if he see me, or pause in his speaking if he hear my words, to say, "Ha, ha! a stranger!"[104]

Dracula therefore is afraid of becoming a stranger, a homeless visitor from the other side of Europe. He wants to be one of the rest, joining the

[102] Ibid. at 70.
[103] Ibid. at 66.
[104] Stoker, *Dracula*, p. 19.

commoners of modernity. It could be caused by his will to still be the master by not being mastered by the rest, yet as the novel is about Dracula's failure in fitting in modernity, we are assured that the eastern vampire especially with his ambivalence of being neither human nor beast but both of them at the same time, faces his pathetic end from the hands of modern society which is represented by Jonathan and Mina Harker, Van Helsing and Quincey Morris, who all in all try to define the vampire in terms of reason. The modern will to destroy the vampire is so strong that the stranger is followed back to his home wherein he is eliminated. In contrast to the modern will to destroy the stranger, Dracula also represents a strong response of supernaturalism, because the destruction of the vampire is not achieved in the realm of reason. Firstly, they had to travel to the home of the vampire, and secondly, the vampire is destroyed by ancient means, not using the instruments of modern science and technology. Dracula is killed in the way as told by folk tales in the eighteenth century. Finally, he is destroyed in the realm of belief, not reason.

The fact that the slayer of Dracula is a young American male among other Europeans reveals a powerful political foresight by Bram Stoker, as the event takes place in the closure of the nineteenth century. In the novel, Quincey Morris is a figure coequally strange as Dracula, representing the distance to British modernity. Moreover, like Dracula, he is also the vampire as claimed by Franco Moretti:

> In killing Dracula, Quincy P. Morris, the American who has been helping his British friends to save their nation, dies too, almost by accident. The occurrence seems inexplicable, [...] yet it fits perfectly into Stoker's sociological design. The

American, Morris, *must* die, because Morris is a vampire. [...] What does Mr Morris do? Where does he live? Nobody knows any of this. [...] Nobody suspects even when Lucy dies – and then turns into a vampire – immediately after receiving a blood transfusion from Morris.[105]

Within this framework, the American and the Transylvanian are the vampires challenging each other. Morris dies while killing Dracula with his American knife, and the child of Jonathan and Mina Harker is named after the American vampire by the British couple, showing the rising capitalist power of the USA as opposed to that of Britain. This is also expressed by Stoker in the novel: "What a fine fellow is Quincey! [...] If America can go on breeding men like that, she will be a power in the world indeed."[106] What is feared by the British is destroyed by the American, and what the British failed to do is and will be completed by the American who is historically born from the ashes of the British.

Another contributor to Dracula's destruction is Jonathan Harker, who is, in the beginning of the novel, a visitor in Dracula's castle. Interestingly, the reason of his visit to that gothic space is connected to Dracula's visit to London. The nature of gothic space and the horror of facing the supernatural in the novel are illustrated throughout Jonathan Harker's journal. Therefore the reader is to identify with either Jonathan or the vampire. However, since Dracula is an ambivalent figure whereas Jonathan represents the modern white male who first denies supernaturalism and then cannot escape it, like Aubrey in *The Vampyre*, the reader is led to a

[105] Franco Moretti, *Signs Taken for Wonders*, trans. Susan Fischer, David Forgacs and David Miller (London and New York: Verso, 1988), p. 95.
[106] Stoker, *Dracula*, p. 144.

state in between. As a result, Jonathan, like Aubrey, experiences the loss of reason. Reason's denial of the supernatural troubles modernity. Even after Harker is rescued, he still avoids the presence of the supernatural. Aubrey could not regain his reason, but Bram Stoker in a way carries on with Polidori's story and inserts another character to display a solution for the trouble of modernity with fear, who is Van Helsing, a scientist who does not deny supernaturalism. Therefore *Dracula* becomes a milestone in the vampire fiction by attaching a new perspective to modernity just before the twentieth century arrives. Polidori, in 1819, showed the loss of reason; Le Fanu in 1872 showed the justification of belief and Stoker in 1897 showed the challenge of modern paradoxes in a more detailed way, finally arriving at the state of ambivalence. *Dracula* is therefore an evidence for the modern discontent, through which the reason is advocated and belief is vindicated.

Van Helsing is a scientist struggling with the vampire and his agents, using not only scientific instruments but also every possible way learned through folk tales. Use of science against the vampire[107] is represented by telegram, typewriter, phonograph and blood transfusion, but these are used as a remedy for the already vampirized. Holy water, crucifix and garlic on the other hand, are employed in order to prevent vampirism. The destruction of the vampire, as indicated above, is executed as told in folk beliefs.

The significance of Van Helsing is intensified by a comparison to another scientist in the novel, John Seward, who is a man of enlightenment,

[107] There are examples of the effort to bring scientific explanations to the supernatural in the nineteenth century, but in vampire fiction the most prominent example of the use of science against vampirism is given in the twentieth century, by an American writer Richard Matheson in his novel *I am Legend*, published in 1954.

denying the supernatural and trying to shed light on mysteries. It is not possible for Seward to believe in the presence of the vampire in London in the nineteenth century: "Do you mean to tell me that Lucy was bitten by such a bat; and that such a thing is here in London in the nineteenth century?"[108] So, it is not only the time but also the space that do not settle the vampire into the modern frame. The supernatural in the eyes of modernity fits into the past and the distant. When it is in the present and close, moreover, in a familiar body like of Lucy's, then it creates horror, bringing the uncanny into modern sight.

The guidance of Van Helsing to Seward properly shows the advocacy of a new outlook of modernity: "It is the fault of our science that it wants to explain all; and if it explain not, then it says there is nothing to explain. But yet we see around us every day the growth of new beliefs, which think themselves new; and which are yet but the old, which pretend to be young – like the fine ladies at the opera."[109]

As indicated in the begining of this chapter, the Eastern Europe-originated vampire myth is introduced to British culture in the eighteenth century, and eventually the antiquarians started to study on the folklore of remote countries. Van Helsing's speech is then a confession that the modern myth is not newly born. It is rather revived in modernity. This confession alludes to the presence of the premodern and the postmodern within modernity. Consequentially, what is commonly defined in the realm of so-called 'new age' and evaluated as a postmodern element is not new. It was

[108] Stoker, Dracula, p. 159.
[109] Ibid. at 158-159.

premodern, and because of the ambivalent nature of modernity which is projected unto the Gothic, it now pretends to be postmodern. The growth of new beliefs therefore indicates the growth of old beliefs, which accordingly dethrones the worldview of modernity and also shows the *gothicness* of modernity, and the reason why the rise of the gothic novel coincides with the rise of modernity.

The revival of the past is represented in the gothic novel by the *undead*, a term discovered by Stoker in *Dracula*, showing the ambivalence of the gothic figure who is neither dead nor alive. Besides, before publication, Stoker suggested the title of the novel as *The Dead Undead* and then, *The Undead*.[110] Before Stoker, the term undead did not contribute to any means of ambivalence; it only meant the opposite of dead.[111] However, the ambivalence of the undead is brought by Stoker, as he tried to add a third dimension in which the undead is not alive, not dead, but both of them. The most gothic definition of the term undead is made by Slavoj Žižek: "An undead, [...] retains all the predicates of a living being without being one."[112] The ambivalent nature that Stoker brought to the undead intensifies the significance of his novel. Since Stoker, the realm of the ambivalent

[110] David Rogers, Introduction. *Dracula*, p. x.
[111] In Bosworth's *An Anglo – Saxon Dictionary* (1898), "un-deáded" is defined as "not deadened"; "un-deadlíc" as "immortal, undying, imperishable, endless". Joseph Bosworth, *An Anglo – Saxon Dictionary: Based on the Manuscript Collections of the late Joseph Bosworth* (London: Oxford University Press, 1954).
[112] Slavoj Žižek, "A Hair of the Dog that Bit You," in *The Žižek Reader*, ed. Elizabeth Wright and Edmond Wright (Oxford and Malden: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1999), p. 279.

undead made great contributions to gothic culture by becoming a frequent instrument used especially in zombie films in the late twentieth century.[113]

According to Maggie Kilgour, "the revived past cannot be an alternative to the present for it is a nightmare version of it."[114] The undead returns in a different form. Bram Stoker's vampire is a returned version of a feudal figure, known also as Vlad Tepes and the son of Vlad Dracul, hence the name Dracula. Yet, when the feudal figure of the fifteenth century arrives at the nineteenth century and reaches into the heart of modernity, he turns into a modern tyrant, a figure in between his belonging to the past and his effort to adapt to the conditions of modernity. The *gothicness* of his character is not only a key element in his connection with modernity, but it is also a key for modernity to confront the supernatural again after the age of enlightenment as well.

On the other hand, Dracula does not suddenly return in the nineteenth century; he has been undead for more than centuries and this long period has granted him the time he needed for becoming accustomed to modernity. In the time of the novel, he speaks a perfect English and he is acquainted with modern law and science, wishing to live in London, but in an old house. Therefore, it would be superficial and insufficient to simply claim that Dracula represents a gothic or feudal tyrant who returns from the dead in order to take revenge. Dracula has a mission, but rather than

[113] The undead theme has been the groundwork of zombie films, mainly employed by George Romero in *Night of the Living Dead* (1968), *Dawn of the Dead* (1979), and *Day of the Dead* (1985).
[114] Kilgour, *The Rise of the Gothic Novel*, p. 30.

returning from the dead and conquering the world, it is shown in his decisive actions concerning modernity.

One of the main characteristics of modern time is the progress, the forward movement with purposeful actions. As properly put by Bauman, "modern time had direction, just like any itinerary in space. Time progressed from the obsolete to the up-to-date, and the up-to-date was from the start the future obsolescence."[115] This modern progress is represented by Dracula's definitive actions towards modernity. The second part of the novel as mentioned above as Dracula *as the visitor*, illustrates the movement from the obsolete to the up-to-date. Dracula's actions concerning the modern time and space are observed by John Seward as he sees a bat:

> Then I caught the patient's eye and followed it, but could trace nothing as it looked into the moonlit sky except a big bat, which was flapping its silent and ghostly *way to the west*. Bats usually wheel and flit about, but this one seemed to *go straight on*, as if it knew where it was bound for or had some *intention* of its own.[116] [emphases added]

A bat flying as if it has a purpose or intention represents Dracula's nightmarish presence. It comes in the shape of a creature of the night, yet acts in a reasonable manner. Dracula is therefore the bat who knows how to fly within the realm of reason and the vampire is accordingly the uncanny for the modern view.

As Dracula becomes a threat for modernity, modern man finds a way to eliminate him, which is rendering the vampire homeless. The conception

---

[115] Bauman, *Postmodernity and Its Discontents*, p. 86.
[116] Stoker, *Dracula*, p. 91.

of *vampiric homelessness* bears a great value in relation to *vampiric strangeness*. Here, there are two aspects in need of attention:

a) Home of the vampire is deeply connected with the homely soil and eventually depicted as the graveyard.

b) Home of the vampire is always strangely close to home of its prey.

The significance of a vampire's home is shown fittingly by Stoker, by depicting Dracula in need of his home's soil when moving to another country. In order to be the master of his home, Dracula needs to sleep on Transylvanian earth in his coffin. Without his native soil, he is homeless and therefore a stranger. As this is a fact known by modern vampire hunters, and since they are incapable of catching Dracula materially, they try to sterilize the homely soil of Dracula, through which they destroy his memories and leave him without any belonging in the modern world. From this point on, Dracula begins his journey back home and the modern hunters follow him until he becomes completely homeless. As a result Dracula fails in his project in which he avoided becoming a stranger within modernity.

The vampire's trouble is, as Mina Harker notes down in her journal, "to get back to his own place."[117] The fact that Dracula's homelessness is noted down by Mina Harker is a revealing detail, because the character who usually alludes to Dracula's loneliness and almost respects his efforts of playing a role in modernity, is Mina Harker. She advices the others to "be

[117] Ibid. at 292.

pitiful to him,"[118] because she thinks that "that poor soul who has wrought all this misery is the saddest case of all."[119] In Mina Harker's view, Dracula's destruction would bring peace not only to modernity, but also to Dracula, since his pathetic state would end as he is exterminated. Therefore in modern view, the elimination of the other is a remedy for both modernity and its exclusions. It shows us a characteristic of modernity by which we are assured that the modern knows the best for the other.

The vampire's trouble with its home is projected unto a very frequent gothic space: the graveyard. In gothic fiction, it represents the state between life and death, but in daily life the graveyard is a must for the modern separation of life and death. Therefore with the ambivalent nature of gothicism, the graveyard in the gothic novel serves to blur the dividing line between life and death. As the vampire is the leading gothic figure who has a problematic relationship with life and death, the gothic graveyard becomes its home, wherein it finds peace during daytime, which is the busiest and most restless time of modern daily life. For the vampire is a nocturnal creature, it completes the restlessness of modernity by showing itself at night.

Zygmunt Bauman mentions the role of cemeteries in modernity, by referring to Baudrillard: "Cemeteries, Baudrillard suggests, were the first ghettos; the archetypal ghettos, [...]. However they differ in ritual, all funerals are acts of exclusion. They proclaim the dead abnormal, dangerous, those to be shunned. They expel the dead from the company of the normal,

[118] Ibid. at 257.
[119] Ibid.

[...] ."[120] Accordingly, as the vampire represents the abnormal, dangerous and those to be shunned in the gothic novel of the nineteenth century, the modern zeal of seeking the vampire in cemeteries is comprehensible. In Stoker's *Dracula*, Van Helsing points the graveyard in order to "designate what to a vampire was 'home'."[121]

The second aspect concerning the homelessness and strangeness of the vampire is the closeness of its home, which reminds us the Freudian uncanny defined by being strange but familiar. In Stoker's novel, Dracula's castle has an open address to which Jonathan Harker finds his way by himself, although he suffers from several strange incidents. However, when Dracula becomes the visitor of modernity, and when he is in the realm of reason, his home is not found that easy. It therefore creates horror when they find out that home of the vampire is closer than it is in their estimations, as illustrated by John Seward's confession: "Strange that it never struck me that the very next house might be the Count's hiding-place!"[122]

Bram Stoker's *Dracula* has been the inspiration for more than a hundred vampire films, but if the case is the *stranger within*, the closeness of the vampire who is supposed to be dismissed by modernity, then the most fitting example is *Van Helsing*[123], directed by Stephen Sommers.

---

[120] Bauman, *Mortality, Immortality and Other Life Strategies*, p. 24.
[121] Stoker, *Dracula*, p. 167.
[122] Ibid. at 187.
[123] *Van Helsing*, dir. Stephen Sommers, perf. Hugh Jackman and Kate Beckinsale, Universal, 2005. As opposed to Stoker's Van Helsing, here Sommers gives him another aspect. In the film, Van Helsing is a young and ambitious vampire hunter who do not remember his past. Moreover, he is despised by people and considered as a criminal all over the world, since he works for Vatican's hidden agenda of fighting the supernatural and cannot articulate what he is all about. Renowned gothic figures like Frankenstein's monster, Mr. Hyde and Dracula are threats for Vatican, and therefore they are Van Helsing's enemies. His journey to Transylvania with the mission to destroy Dracula strangely reveals

In Sommers's film, Van Helsing and his colleagues search for Dracula's castle, which is supposed to be very close. The location of the castle is unknown for centuries, but as the vampire brides attack frequently, people are sure that it is in fact very near. Finally, it is understood that there is a secret gateway to Castle Dracula in the very palace where the Transylvanian princess and her family live under Dracula's curse with the threat of extinction. Moreover, the secret gateway is covered with a mirror, showing that the vampire or the other is behind the mirror, and in order to be the master of her home, she has to pay a visit to the other side of the mirror, wherein a vampire lives casting no mirror image. In other words, one has to confront the dark side that is within the self, in order to deal with it and have a peaceful self.

The stranger as the source of fear is right in the middle of one's home, yet existing furtively. The vampire is, as displaced in modern vision, covered or excluded because of fear, and as it cannot be found, like in the film, fear becomes inescapable. Accordingly, the modern fear caused by graveyards is based on modernity's own separations. As Bauman puts forward, "haunted houses and haunted lives testify to the porousness of cemetery walls."[124] The Gothic then works as an antidote, showing the closeness of the excluded.

Vampire is the stranger within modernity, who represent "the *undecidables*. [...] These are the true hybrids, the monsters – not just

---

facts about his true identity. He finds the peace he needs as he concludes his quest by destroying Dracula.

[124] Bauman, *Mortality, Immortality and Other Life Strategies*, p. 24.

unclassified, but *unclassifiable*."[125] Within this perspective, the vampire is employed as an instrument to refer to modernity's ambivalence. Vampires are neither close nor distant, neither strange nor familiar, neither feared nor wondered, neither terrible nor delightful, but both of these dualities. Eventually, vampire novel of the nineteenth century resembles the mirror-gate in *Van Helsing*, revealing the stranger within the realm of reason and rendering the confrontation of modernity with its inner demons who are unclassifiable and unfitting for the framework drawn through modernity. Accordingly, Bram Stoker's *Dracula* is a story of the quest for the self through the other which ends up in not justifying one over another, but in their togetherness which renders the modern discontent. The modern then, by definition, ambivalent and discontented.

As suggested in *Dracula*, the vampire needs an invitation to enter a space with the aim of vampirizing, unless there is already a vampirized person inside or someone who is very welcoming to strangers. In the novel, Renfield is the already vampirized whereas Lucy is the welcomer. The conception of invitation shows that modernity is in need of a vampiric presence. Since it is invited or already vampirized, it means that the stranger is a must for modern selfhood. It has to be invented, if it is not discovered yet. Modernity discovered the vampire myth in the eighteenth century, but with the intentions of classification. Vampire novel, on the other hand, had to invent a figure like Dracula, showing that the vampirized is "already in place on the inside."[126] Renfield is an important figure in this case, because

[125] Bauman, *Modernity and Ambivalence*, p. 58.
[126] Rickels, *The Vampire Lectures*, p. 27.

he is the vampirized who throughout the novel stays in the core of science as a patient of Dr. Seward who in the novel represents the modern scientific reason.

The strangehood of the vampire is parallel to its homelessness. According to Bauman, "the essence of the stranger is homelessness. Unlike an alien or a foreigner, the stranger is not simply a newcomer, a person temporarily out of place. He is an *eternal wanderer*, homeless always and everywhere, [...]."[127] The miserable condition of Dracula is caused by his homelessness. Moreoever, it is caused by the modern efforts which aim at excluding the stranger. However, the stranger is within modernity in the first place. Therefore it is a paradox starts and ends within modernity itself. This ambivalent spiral is reflected by gothic novel, which reveals the fact that the modern discontent is homelessness. Homelessness of the vampire is the homelessness of modernity, which shows the true nature of modernity. In Bauman's words, modern culture is "the culture that feels truly at home only in its homelessness."[128]

Stoker's novel does not concentrate on the process through which Dracula became a vampire and rather than a lack, it makes a great contribution to the novel's sociological value, however, historical studies have shown that Vlad Dracula changed his creed from Orthodoxy to Catholicism just before he died, which is actually considered as heresy.[129] According to Frayling, "the Greek Orthodox Church [...] supported the

[127] Bauman, *Modernity and Ambivalence*, p. 79.
[128] Bauman, *Postmodernity and Its Discontents*, p. 77.
[129] Radu R. Florescu, and Raymond T. McNally, *Drakula ya da Kazıklı Voyvoda*, trans. Ali Cevat Akkoyunlu (Istanbul: Dogan Kitapçılık AŞ, 2000), p. 205.

dogma that it is the bodies of wicked unholy, and especially excommunicated, person which do not decompose."[130] In contrast to the Roman Catholic Church, "the Greek Orthodox Church taught that heretics became vampires after death."[131] Other than heresy, it is commonly accepted that it is not possible to indicate the exact location of Dracula's grave. As a result, it justifies that Dracula was not buried properly, which is an adequate cause for his return from the dead, as told in the folk beliefs.

According to Rickels, vampirism accounts of Eastern Europe include robbers, arsonists, prostitutes, people who were buried without proper rites or committed suicide.[132] These are all in all the strangers of modernity, who are excluded from the borders of modern order. As claimed by Bauman, "the typical modern strangers were the waste of the State's ordering zeal. What the modern strangers did not fit was the vision of order."[133] Modernity for a long time tried to displace them, by taking the melancholic into hospitals, criminals into prisons, prostitutes into certain neighbourhoods and elderly people into nursing homes, with the effort to purge the society from these homeless strangers. These are the modern strangers who eventually returned in the twentieth century gothic and horror fiction. They were strangers while they were alive and they become strangers as they return as the undead.

---

[130] Ernest Jones, "On the Vampire," in *The Vampyre: Lord Ruthven to Count Dracula*, ed. Christopher Frayling (Hertfordshire: The Garden City Press Limited, 1978), pp. 313-314.
[131] Ibid. at 314.
[132] Rickels, *The Vampire Lectures*, pp. 3-4.
[133] Bauman, *Postmodernity and Its Discontents*, p. 18.

3.2 The Beast Within: The Modern Paradox of Nature and Culture

3.2.1 A Comparative Look at the Vampire and the Werewolf

In similar fashion to fictional vampires of the nineteenth century, stories involving the werewolf, as published in the last decade of the century, also serve to reflect the ambivalence of modern strangers. On the other hand, in popular culture, vampires and werewolves are often considered as antagonists, based on the tendency to evaluate their strife on class distinction. Within this framework, the vampire stands for the aristocrat whereas the werewolf represents the working class. The nineteenth century British vampire novel demonstrates this view entirely, because Lord Ruthven, Carmilla and Dracula are aristocrats. This also reveals the cause of vampiric crave for blood, because it is an aristocratic craving; the existence of the vampire as well as the aristocrat is provided by blood. Against noble vampires, werewolves in fiction are ordinary people. They are the commoners living further away from modern city centres or under the ground.

The theme of class distinction is also observed in Stoker's *Dracula*, though there is not a werewolf figure in the novel. In the novel, Dracula uses his vampiric ability of shapeshifting and turns into a wolf. Moreover, wolves represent the sons of Dracula as the vampire can command them.

Therefore, in *Dracula*, the political power of the aristocrats over the labourers is illustrated by the father – son relationship of vampires and werewolves.[134]

The superiority of the vampire over the werewolf is displayed in both cases. Correspondingly, the werewolf is a figure usually portrayed as furious, enraged, waiting for an opportunity of revenge. The werewolf is more beastly than the vampire.

Brian Frost mentions the role of revenge when describing a werewolf candidate:

> A prime candidate is the shunned outcast from society who falls into such a depressed state of mind that it leads to scorn and hatred for his fellow men. If, at the same time, he develops a burning desire for revenge, then bodily transference to animal shape becomes very desirable, especially with the complete disguise and total freedom it provides.[135]

Revenge is therefore a significant catalyst for becoming a werewolf. As opposed to vampires who crave blood for permanence or immortality, werewolves do not attack just to satisfy the hunger; they avenge their state of strangehood. The vampire novel/novella shows the uncanniness of the modern stranger who is the undecidable and the unclassifiable, and the horror experienced by modernity after witnessing the presence of the

---

[134] In the film *Van Helsing*, the relationship between Dracula, the vampire, and Van Helsing, who turns into a werewolf, shows an obvious father – son controversy. Dracula is aware of the fact that he could only be killed by a werewolf, therefore he has an antidote that transforms the werewolf into a human being, waiting to use it when his son, the werewolf, attacks him. As a result, Van Helsing, in the form of a werewolf, destroys Dracula and as his colleagues grasp the antidote, he turns into human again, after the father figure is killed. Accordingly, the film demonstrates various connotations concerning Freudian psychoanalysis. (*Van Helsing*, dir. Stephen Sommers, perf. Hugh Jackman and Kate Beckinsale, Universal, 2005.)

[135] Brian J. Frost, *The Essential Guide to Werewolf Literature* (Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2003), pp. 7-8.

stranger within, which leads to a third dimension which does not fit into the frame of modern either/or conditions, whereas the werewolf novella/novelette in the nineteenth century tells the story of the horrible return of the homeless stranger who is the outcast of modern society, employing the ambivalence of modernity by showing the challenge between civilization and barbarism, and nature and culture. The concept of revenge is therefore a strong characteristic of werewolf fiction since the nineteenth century, through which *the beast within* is illustrated appropriately.

3.2.2 The Gothic Body of Ambivalence Inhabiting the Threshold Between Civilization and Barbarism

Terry Eagleton calls civilization and barbarism as "near neighbours as well as sworn antagonists,"[136] and exhibits their interdependency as a paradox of modernity, which is also embedded within the nature of the Gothic. Modern incidents like French Revolution or various wars have proven the claim that as humanity becomes more civilized, the barbaric side that is immanent in mankind's nature grows concurrently. With the rapid innovations achieved in technology, the immanent animal finds new chances to resurface. So, as modern culture employs the premodern nature like a market, nature in reply takes advantage over civilization, which generates a process of mutual supply and demand. As instruments of

[136] Eagleton, *Holy Terror*, p. 11.

destruction are being invented, civilization loses its hope of immortality, on the way to reach the achievement of Victor Frankenstein, which is the invention of the instrument of creation. Yet, Frankenstein's monster, without doubt, represents the failure of this modern desire. In the novel, the metaphoric birth of Frankenstein is the moment he gives life to inorganic matter. As the modern creator and the monster who are near neighbours and antagonists, are symbolically born together, their end is also joint.

Frankenstein's monster is an early beast of the British gothic novel when compared to the gothic beasts of the last decade of the nineteenth century. The novel which depicts the final example of the beast theme in relation with modern science in the nineteenth century is *The Island of Dr. Moreau*, written by H. G. Wells. Like Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, Wells's novel as well is commonly considered as a science fiction. Even science is the main element of Wells's novel, its author deeply concentrates on a paradox of modernity which fits into the realm of the Gothic, as happens in the case of Shelley's novel. It is at least considered as a gothic novel by several academicians. David Punter and Glennis Byron interpret Wells's novel as an example of 'imperial gothic'.[137] It is also accepted as a gothic novel by Kelly Hurley:

> We may easily describe a novel like *Moreau* – structured on good scientific principles but marked by its frequent and graphic depictions of grotesquely liminal bodies, the overheated language of its narrator, and hysterical moments of narrative disjunction and refusal – as Gothic rather than (or as well as) science fiction.[138]

[137] David Punter and Glennis Byron, *The Gothic*, pp. 44-49.
[138] Kelly Hurley, "British Gothic Fiction, 1885 – 1930," in *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction*, ed. Jerrold E. Hogle, p. 194.

The use of science becomes a gothic medium through the nineteenth century as perfectly exemplified by Shelley and Wells. Since here the Gothic is claimed to be a domain of modern paradoxes which constitute the character of modernity, science and cultural reflections of scientific studies of the nineteenth century are inevitably mirrored in the gothic novel. For modern science is antagonistically connected to the preternatural, the strange and the abnormal, gothic novels inherently reflect its modern trouble.

Fred Botting observes the ambivalence of modernity through the nineteenth century science in which civilization and barbarism come across:

> Darwin's theories, by bringing humanity closer to the animal kingdom, undermined the superiority and privilege humankind had bestowed on itself. Along similar lines, the work of criminologists like Cesare Lombroso and Max Nordau attempted to discriminate between humans: some were more primitive and bestial in their nature than others.[139]

Apart from *Frankenstein* and *The Island of Dr. Moreau*, Stevenson's renowned novella *Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* makes a great contribution to the realization of science as a gothic tool in the nineteenth century. The gothic space is set in motion by the dark and frightening ambience of London whereas the foggy streets of London represent the gothic climate. Yet, the *gothicness* of the plot lies in the ambivalent character of Jekyll/Hyde.

---

[139] Fred Botting, *Gothic* (New York: Routledge, 2006), p. 137.

These three novels that show the correlation between science fiction and gothic fiction differ in the way by which *the other* is formed. The scientist in Shelley's novel creates the monster out of death. Nature is therefore taken into the realm of culture as the inorganic matter represented by corpses is brought into life scientifically. The scientist in Wells's novel, however, creates the monster out of living animals, yet, by carrying them into the realm of culture as well. An ordinary animal becomes the monster, when it is reformed in civilized means. Finally, the scientist in Stevenson's novella creates the monster out of himself, his own body and soul. Therefore, in contrast to the cultural use of death and animal as the seed of the monster, the use of the modern self as a tool to exhibit the monster as *the other*, is the clearest way of manifesting the ambivalence of modernity, because it is the darkest way to depict the gothic identity that is innately ambivalent.

Along similar lines with Shelley and Wells, Stevenson reveals the *inbetweenness* of modern identity. For the monster and its creator constitute a single subject, that modern subject is discontented. Absence of the monster, in *Frankenstein*, means the absence of its modern creator. Emergence of the monster in *The Island of Dr. Moreau*, exhumes the modern trouble of identity. Empowerment of the monster in Stevenson's novella, awakens the awareness of the modern subject, that "man is not truly one, but truly two."[140] Despite the awareness, all three novels reflect the narrow-mindedness of modern vision against the recognition of

[140] Robert L. Stevenson, "The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde," in *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde & The Merry Men and Other Tales and Fables*, Introduction and Notes by Tim Middleton (Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1999), p. 42.

ambivalence. These gothic novels concerning *the beast within* show that civilization and barbarism are immanent in each other and modern reason, as represented by scientists, cannot cope with it. This is the reason why these three examples end with a desperate finale.

Kelly Hurley defines the bodies that show the ambivalence of modernity as *abhuman*:

> Such a Gothic body – admixed, fluctuating, abominable – can best be called an *abhuman* body, [...] . The abhuman being retains vestiges of its human identity, but has already become, or is in the process of becoming, some half-human other – wolfish, or simian, or tentacled, or fungoid, perhaps simply "unspeakable" in its gross, changeful corporeality. Or the abhuman being may be some unimaginable "thing" incorporating, mimicking, or taking on a human form, thereby constituting another kind of threat to the integrity of human identity.[141]

The monster of the nineteenth century British gothic novel sets an example of abhumanness. Since the abhuman inhabits the threshold between the excluded and the included, the denied and the accepted, its modern body is a gothic body in which the adversaries meet and generate discontent for the modern subject. With respect to Hurley's framework, this gothic body also can be depicted by the uncanny, the threshold between the strange and the familiar.

In *The Island of Dr. Moreau*, Edward Prendick, who is the civilized visitor on a distant and obscure island, confronts many creatures whom he cannot conclude to be human or animal. His description of the unintelligible being is almost identical to the definition of the Freudian uncanny: "I

[141] Kelly Hurley, "British Gothic Fiction, 1885 – 1930," in *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction*, p. 190.

perceived clearly for the first time what it was that had offended me, what had given me the two inconsistent and conflicting impressions of utter strangeness and yet of the strangest familiarity."[142] Here the monster is a cultural beast, who was once a commoner of the animal kingdom, but rendered human, or at least attempted, by the scientific experiments of a Faustian doctor whose ultimate desire is "to find out the extreme limit of plasticity in a living shape,"[143] reminding us the modern curiosity of Victor Frankenstein.

Wells's novel shows that as long as the realms of the civilized and the bestial overlap, the tension unleashes the monster. The novel tells the story of this tension and justifies the presence of the beast within modernity. The novel can be divided into two, in similar fashion to Stoker's *Dracula*, for Prendick after visiting the island returns to his civilized society. However, in the eyes of a modern man who has experienced the uncanny, civilized society makes no difference, since he is accustomed to the ambivalent mode in which the beast within lies in wait. In the first part of the novel, Prendick represents the stranger among a society of beasts, whereas in the second part, he becomes a stranger in modern society. The title of the final chapter as well symbolizes his loneliness: The Man Alone. Therefore Prendick, in the final part of the novel, illustrates the ambivalence embedded in civilization, not by becoming a monster, but confessing the fact that both sides of the equation, both barbarism and civilization occupy a lack or an excess. Because of that gap, the beast within modernity survives.

---

[142] H. G. Wells, *The Island of Dr. Moreau* (New York: Bantam Classic, 2005), p. 42.
[143] Ibid. at 78.

The modern stranger's final message vindicates the state of inbetweenness: "It is strange, but I felt no desire to return to mankind. I was only glad to be quit of the foulness of the Beast Monsters."[144]

As a result, these novels concerning the beast within, brings forward the modern trouble with identity, and as claimed by Du Coudray, "the Gothic has been read primarily as a discourse about identity and/or subjectivity, [...] ."[145]

3.2.3 The Werewolf as a Discourse of Identity

The werewolf is not a modern invention, since there are literary accounts of the werewolf before modernity, especially in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Petronius's *Satyricon*. The first appearance of the werewolf in the nineteenth century is displayed by Charles Maturin in his gothic novel *The Albigenses*: "I tell thee I am a wolf. Trust not my human skin – the hairs grow inward, and I am a wolf within – a man outward only."[146] Therefore, the emergence of the modern monster is not a modern invention; it is a discovery or a gothic revival which reflects the ambivalent nature of modernity.

Published in the same year with *The Island of Dr. Moreau* and a year before Stoker's *Dracula*, Clemence Housman's novelette *The Werewolf*, exhibits a classic example of the werewolf tale, illustrating the monster as a

[144] Ibid. at 137.
[145] Chantal Bourgault Du Coudray, *The Curse of the Werewolf: Fantasy, Horror and the Beast Within* (London and New York: I. B. Tauris & Co. Ltd, 2006), p. 44.
[146] Quoted in Coudray, *The Curse of the Werewolf*, p. 14.

distant figure by setting the plot in Scandinavia, where is claimed to be *the womb of nations* and the Gothic homeland.[147] Therefore, the werewolf represents the distance not only geographically but also historically. The monster shows the gothic past and the belief in supernaturalism projected unto *the other*. In a similar way with Le Fanu's *Carmilla* which is about a metamorphic female vampire, here the metamorphic beast who transforms into wolf is also female. Yet, her victims are two brothers who represent opposite mentalities. Sweyn is a modern sceptic whose "reason refused to bend in accepting the possibility of the supernatural materialized."[148] Christian, on the other hand, who conceives life as spiritual mystery, believes in the supernatural. Accordingly, and suitably outlining the Gothic ambivalence, he is aware of "the complex and antagonistic forces that constitute one soul."[149]

Christian therefore represents the uncertainty concerning the modern identity and/or subjectivity. The more he gets in touch with the werewolf, the more he questions his identity. In contrast to his brother, he follows the beast within, and eventually, as he destroys the werewolf, he is also killed. It is commonly known that holy water is considered as a repellent for supernatural beings like vampires and werewolves, but the monster is destroyed by Christian's own blood, for "no holy water could be more holy, more potent to destroy an evil thing than the life-blood of a pure heart poured out for another in free willing devotion."[150]

---

[147] See Chapter 1, Part 1.1.
[148] Clemence Housman, *The Werewolf* (Ægypan Press, 1896), p. 49.
[149] Ibid. at 50.
[150] Ibid. at 86.

Robert L. Stevenson's another contribution to the concept of the beast within is *Olalla*, a novelette published in 1885, in which a modern man living in the city visits the country and falls in love with ambivalent Olalla, a spanish girl who represents the impossible love of the beast within. Olalla's state of neither woman nor animal is not directly related with her individuality, but with her family lines. In other words, she suffers from a genetic sin which reminds of the notion of the original sin in Christian belief. Besides, Olalla intensely identifies herself with Jesus Christ in order to express her inevitable loneliness to the narrator who does not believe in Christianity:

> The Padre says you are no Christian; but look up for a moment with my eyes, and behold the face of the Man of Sorrows. We are all such as He was – the inheritors of sin; we must all bear and expiate a past which was not ours; there is in all of us – ay, even in me – a sparkle of the divine. Like Him, we must endure for a little while, until morning returns bringing peace.[151]

As a result, the narrator awakens to a truth in Christianity and accepts that Olalla is bound to her inescapable solitude. On his way back home, the crucifix becomes for him "an emblem of sad and noble truths; that pleasure is not an end, but an accident; that pain is the choice of the magnanimous; that it is the best to suffer all things and do well."[152]

There is a similar framework in Housman's *The Werewolf* that connects Christianity and the belief in supernaturalism. First of all, the name of the boy is Christian. Secondly, the monster is killed by blood which is

---

[151] Robert L. Stevenson, "Olalla," in *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde & The MerryMen and Other Tales and Fables*, pp. 175-176.
[152] Ibid. at 176.

again a notion of Christianity. As Christian's blood, like the holy water, poured unto the werewolf, she dies. The final state of Sweyn who sees the corpse of his brother reveals the correlation between Christianity and the werewolf: "And he knew surely that to him Christian had been as Christ, and had suffered and died to save him from his sins."[153]

These two nineteenth century novelettes illustrate Calmet's opinions on the relationship between the belief in God and the belief in supernaturalism. According to Calmet, "a world without such practical manifestations of the supernatural as apparitions, witches and vampires was akin to a world without God."[154] In his framework, the mention of supernatural beings in newspaper reports as a real incident rather than a folk-belief proved the supernatural existence. In short, if there was a vampire, then there was a god. Following Calmet's eighteenth century claims, the novelettes of Housman and Stevenson identify the beast within with the truth of life and death, and the original sin, by slotting an antagonistic modern figure against the believer.

The identity question of Olalla is identical to that of Frankenstein's monster: "What am I?"[155] Yet, her question also has a second dimension: "what is mine?"[156], because it is only in her natural state that she is satisfied by what she possesses. As a cultural being, she cannot possess what she desires. She is under this modern curse of ambivalence that without the

[153] Housman, *The Werewolf*, p. 99.
[154] Ellis, *The History of Gothic Fiction*, p. 172.
[155] Stevenson, *Olalla*, p. 169.
[156] Ibid.

unfolding of the beast within, no satisfaction is guaranteed for the modern subject.

Rudyard Kipling's werewolf story *The Mark of the Beast*, contributes to the genre by setting the space again in a distant location, India, to show the beast within modernity. The victim's state, in whom a beast tries to show itself, depicts the realm of uncertainty in between the supernatural and scientific explanation, as his friends observe and try to explain Fleete's growing bestiality. One option is to explain it by evaluating the symptoms as symptoms of hydrophobia. Yet, at the same time, the narrator confesses that Fleete's state is beyond modern reason. This is in fact, a very postmodern confession: "I tried to say 'Hydrophobia', but the word wouldn't come, because I knew that I was lying."[157] In addition, Kipling begins his story with a native proverb: "Your Gods and my Gods – do you or I know which are the stronger?"[158]

The narrator connects Fleete's werewolfism to his isolation: "I said that he ate his food like a beast; but that this might have been the result of living alone in the hills out of the reach of society [...] ."[159] This shows that Fleete is the modern stranger, an outcast avoiding the company of people. He is a stranger of society, even before he is cursed by the mark of the beast. In other words, he is the stranger even before he becomes the beast, and accordingly, modernity bears the beast within until the beast finds a catalyst to show up. The excluded returns in time, yet in a different shape. It

[157] Rudyard Kipling, "The Mark of the Beast," in *Strange Tales*, Introduction by David Stuart Davies (Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 2006), p. 9.
[158] Ibid. at 3.
[159] Ibid. at 7.

does not even speak, it snarls, and the modern stranger's snarls are "those of a wolf, not of a man."[160]

Finally, the beast within the modern man is simply taken out by an Indian leper, in the realm of belief, not reason. The story therefore shows the challenge between civilization/culture and barbarism/nature, yet to a point in which the superiority of one is not justified. The finale rather represents the gothic uncertainty, which is the bridge between the man and the animal. The bridge in between is the sign of modernity in the identity of the gothic monster.

[160] Ibid. at 9.

CONCLUSION

The historical and political roots of the word ‘gothic’ show us that it is assigned to more than one category and because of that, the realm of the Gothic represents ambivalence. Its connotations lead us to modern paradoxes of civilization and barbarism and, culture and nature. Since the rise of the gothic novel in the eighteenth century is synchronized with the rise of modernity, we can follow the progress of modernity and the emergence of the postmodern through gothic fiction. In postmodernity, the line between the classifications of modern thought is blurred. Therefore, in gothic fiction it is possible to observe this uncertainty, which proves that the postmodern was extant together with the rise or birth of modernity.

In the seventeenth century, discussions on the Gothic in England reflected the doubts on the English identity regarding whether the political past of England had a gothic origin or not. In the eighteenth century, rise of the gothic novel shows parallelism with the gothic revival in architecture. Accordingly, revival becomes a gothic theme, not only in architecture, but also in literature. The past, the distant and the excluded are the gothic elements which frequently play a significant role in gothic fiction, and which at the same time represent the troubles of modernity. The modern trouble with mortality is essential for gothic fiction, for it paves the way for

depicting the passion of fear, which eventually troubles modern reason. Immortal figures in the gothic novel directly show the modern paradox of life and death. Demonic figures, ghosts, vampires, monsters and werewolves are therefore representations of the ambivalence of modernity. The gothic novel brings back the uncanny figures who are distant, strange and unfamiliar for the modern thought and shows the horrible condition in which they become close and familiar. Following the revival of gothic identity in the seventeenth century and the revival of gothic architecture in the eighteenth century, the gothic novel shows the revival or the return of the unaccepted, denied and the excluded. This return is depicted by the figures of the past, the dead, the undead and distant locations.

Reading the gothic novel today generates a different experience. The fact that the postmodern reader has witnessed the decline of modern reason in its struggle against supernaturalism does not mean that it is now easier to believe the existence of the supernatural. On the contrary, today's gothic reader has many causes for finding it hard to believe. However, the advantage of today's reader is that he/she is capable of identifying his/her selfhood and subjectivity with that of the gothic characters, for these gothic characters, immortals, the undead, strangers and beasts reveal us the ambivalence, the obscure line between belief and reason, and order and chaos. A gothic story is therefore more frightening for the reader of the nineteenth century, but gothic fiction all in all does not aim at generating a belief in the supernatural, it rather depicts the horror that emanates from the denial of the supernatural. The Gothic deals with this state of

inbetweenness, of belief and reason, culture and nature, civilization and barbarism, which accordingly represents the discontent of civilization and the ambivalence of modernity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Auerbach, Nina. *Our Vampires, Ourselves*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Austen, Jane. *Northanger Abbey*. 1818. Introduction and Notes by David Blair. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1993; 2000.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Modernity and Ambivalence*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991; 1998.
---. *Postmodernity and Its Discontents*. Cambridge and Malden: Polity Press, 1997; 2005.
---. *Mortality, Immortality and Other Life Strategies*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992.
---. *Liquid Fear*. Cambridge and Malden: Polity Press, 2006; 2007.

Blake, William. *The Works of William Blake*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1994.

Bosworth, Joseph. *An Anglo – Saxon Dictionary: Based on the Manuscript Collections of the late Joseph Bosworth*. 1898. Ed. Northcote Toller. London: Oxford University Press, 1921; 1954.

Botting, Fred. *Gothic*. New York: Routledge, 1996; 2006.

Bunson, Matthew. *Vampire: The Encyclopædia*. London: Thames and Hudson Ltd, 1993.

Burke, Edmund. *Reflections On the Revolution in France*. 1790. Introduction by Conor Cruise O'Brien. Harmondsworth, Maryland and Victoria: Penguin Books Ltd, 1968; 1969.
---. *A Philosophical Enquiry Into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*. 1757. Ed., with Introduction and Notes, by Adam Phillips. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990; 1998.

The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction. Ed. Jerrold Hogle. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002; 2006.

Clery, E. J. *The Rise of Supernatural Fiction: 1762 – 1800*. Cambridge, New York and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1995; 1999.

A Companion to the Gothic. Ed. David Punter. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000.

Coudray, Chantal Bourgault du. *The Curse of the Werewolf: Fantasy, Horror and the Beast Within*. London and New York: I. B. Tauris & Co. Ltd, 2006.

Davenport-Hines, Richard. *Gotik: Aşırılık, Dehşet, Kötülük ve Yıkımın Dört YüzYılı*. 1998. Trans. Hakan Gür. Ankara: Dost Kitabevi Yayınları, 2005.

Eagleton, Terry. *Holy Terror*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Ellis, Markman. *The History of Gothic Fiction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd, 2000; 2005.

Fanu, J. Sheridan Le. *Carmilla*. 1872. Wildside Press.

Florescu, Radu R., and Raymond T. McNally. *Drakula ya da Kazıklı Voyvoda*. Trans. Ali Cevat Akkoyunlu. Istanbul: Dogan Kitapçılık AŞ, 2000.

Freud, Sigmund. *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*. Trans. James Strachey. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1989.
---. *Writings on Art and Literature*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1997.

Frost, Brian J. *The Essential Guide to Werewolf Literature*. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2003.

Godwin, William. *Caleb Williams*. 1794. Ed., with Introduction and Notes, by Maurice Hindle. London: Penguin Books, 1988; 2005.

The Gothick Novel. Ed. Victor Sage. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1990; 2003.

Hobsbawm, Eric. *The Age of Revolution: 1789 - 1848*. 1962. England: Abacus, 1977; 2003.

Housman, Clemence. *The Werewolf*. 1896. Ægypan Press.

Kilgour, Maggie. *The Rise of the Gothic Novel*. New York: Routledge, 1995; 2006.

Kipling, Rudyard. *Strange Tales*. Introduction by David Stuart Davies. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 2006.

Lewis, Matthew. *The Monk*. 1796. Ed. Howard Anderson. Introduction and Notes by Emma McEvoy. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980; 1998.

Lewis, Michael J. *The Gothic Revival*. London: Thames & Hudson Ltd, 2002.

Lovecraft, H. Phillips. *Supernatural Horror in Literature*. Ed. E. F. Bleiler. New York: Dover Publications, 1973.

Maturin, Charles. *Melmoth the Wanderer*. 1820. Ed. Douglas Grant. Introduction by Chris Baldick. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968; 1998.

Moretti, Franco. *Edebi Teoriye Soyut Modeller: Grafikler, Haritalar, Ağaçlar*. 2005. Trans. Ebru Kılıç, Nurçin İleri and Esin Düzel. Istanbul: Agora Kitaplığı, 2006.
---. *Signs Taken for Wonders*. Trans. Susan Fischer, David Forgacs and David Miller. London and New York: Verso, 1983; 1988.

Punter, David, and Glennis Byron. *The Gothic*. Malden, Oxford and Victoria: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2004.

Radcliffe, Ann. *The Mysteries of Udolpho*. 1794. Ed. Bonamy Dobrée. Introduction and Notes by Terry Castle. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966; 1998.
---. *The Italian*. 1796. Introduction and Notes by Robert Miles. London: Penguin Books, 2000; 2004.
---. "On the Supernatural in Poetry." In *New Monthly Magazine*, No:16, 1826.

Rickels, Laurence A. *The Vampire Lectures*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

Sade, Marquis de. "An Essay on Novels." In *The Crimes of Love*. 1800. Trans., with Introduction and Notes, by David Coward. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. 3-20.

Scarborough, Dorothy. *The Supernatural in Modern English Fiction*. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1917.

Schama, Simon. *Citizens: A Chronicle of the French Revolution*. 1989. New York: First Vintage Books, 1990.

Shelley, Mary. *Frankenstein or The Modern Prometheus*. 1818. Ed., with Introduction and Notes, by Maurice Hindle. London and New York: Penguin Books, 1985; 1992.

Stevenson, R. Louis. *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde & The Merry Men and Other Tales and Fables*. Introduction and Notes by Tim Middleton. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1993; 1999.

Stoker, Bram. *Dracula*. 1897. Introduction and Notes by David Rogers. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1993; 2000.

Three Gothic Novels: The Castle of Otranto, Vathek and The Vampyre. Ed. E. F. Bleiler. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1966.

Todorov, Tzvetan. *The Fantastic: A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre*. 1970. Trans. Richard Howard. New York: Cornell University Press, 1975.

The Vampyre: Lord Ruthven to Count Dracula. Ed. Christopher Frayling. Hertfordshire: The Garden City Press Limited, 1978.

Van Helsing. Dir. Stephen Sommers. Perf. Hugh Jackman and Kate Beckinsale. Universal, 2005.

Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language. New York: Gramercy Books, 1996.

Wells, H. G. *The Island of Dr. Moreau*. 1896. Introduction by Alan Lightman. New York: Bantam Classic, 1994; 2005.

Wolfram, Herwig. *History of the Goths*. 1979. Trans. Thomas J. Dunlap. Rev. Ed. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1990.

The Žižek Reader. Ed. Elizabeth Wright and Edmond Wright. Oxford and Malden: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1999.