

Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Filozofická fakulta

Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci

Diplomová práce

**Monsters and Monstrosity in 19th Century
British Literature**

Eliška Filipová

Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Ema Jelínková, PhD.

Olomouc 2015

Prohlašuji, že jsem diplomovou práci s názvem “Monsters and Monstrosity in 19th Century British Literature” vypracovala samostatně pod odborným dohledem vedoucí práce a uvedla jsem všechny použité podklady a literaturu.

V Olomouci, dne 7. 5. 2015

Podpis

Acknowledgement

Na tomto místě bych chtěla poděkovat Mgr. Emě Jelínkové, Ph.D. za odborné vedení práce, poskytování rad a materiálových podkladů k práci, a také za její vstřícnost a čas. Dále bych ráda poděkovala své rodině za podporu během celého studia.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 2. Gothic Fiction | 2 |
| 2.1. Defining the Genre | 2 |
| 2.2. Gothic Emotions | 5 |
| 3. Monsters and Monstrosity | 7 |
| 3.1. Defining and Development of the Monstrous..... | 7 |
| 3.2. Myths as a Source of “Monstrous” Inspiration..... | 11 |
| 3.3. Characteristics of Monstrous Creatures | 13 |
| 3.3.1. Psychology of Monsters | 13 |
| 3.3.2. Physicality of Monsters | 16 |
| 3.4. Types of Monsters..... | 18 |
| 3.4.1. Vampires..... | 18 |
| 3.4.2. Devils..... | 20 |
| 3.5. “Monstrous” Conditions and Processes | 22 |
| 3.5.1. Duality | 22 |
| 3.5.2. Metamorphosis | 23 |
| 4. The Monsters | 27 |
| 4.1. The Case of the Human Created Monster: <i>Frankenstein’s Monster</i> | 27 |
| 4.2. The Case of the Sinner in the Hands of a Devil: <i>Robert Wringhim</i> | 34 |
| 4.3. The Case of the Human Double: <i>Mr. Hyde</i> | 40 |
| 4.4. The Case of the Vampire: <i>Dracula</i> | 44 |
| 4.5. Comparison of the Monsters | 51 |
| 4.6. Findings of the 19th Century British Monsters and Monstrosity Analysis..... | 55 |
| 5. Conclusion | 56 |
| Resumé | 58 |
| Bibliography | 61 |
| Annotation | 66 |

1. Introduction

This master thesis will take its reader into a Gothic fictional world populated with monsters, vampires, devils, evil doers and criminals. The aim of this thesis is to analyze the monstrosity of monsters in four 19th century British Gothic novels. The primary texts that are going to be analyzed are *Frankenstein* by Mary Shelley, *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner* written by James Hogg, *Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* by Robert Louis Stevenson and *Dracula* by Bram Stoker.

Recognized among the best monster stories, these novels have a lot of similarities but also various differences. Above all, they hold an evil monster which is complicating the lives of other main characters of the novels but their mental and physical capacities are different. So the monsters of these novels, Frankenstein's monster, Robert Wringhim, Mr. Hyde and Dracula will be compared and the most monstrous and horrifying monster identified. What will also be analyzed is the monster's metamorphosis, duality, their creation, history and lifestyle.

These Gothic novels are very attractive and well-known by readers, spectators, critics and various kinds of other people who enjoy being both scared and amazed by monsters. The contemporary audience, however, knows primarily the names of the protagonists from the movies or television series. So the original literary works created in the 19th century and their protagonists are gradually falling into oblivion. On one hand, there has been quite an extensive proportion of research of these individual novels from various points of view but, on the other hand, there have not been enough analyses focusing on the comparison of these four monster figures with an aim to discover the most terrifying monster. That is why it might be worth focusing on the characteristics of these creatures and to detect which of these is the most horrifying and what might be the possible reason for such a claim.

The paper is divided into two main parts, which are the theoretical containing the chapters two and three and analytical part consisting of the chapter four. The approaches which are used in this paper are mainly analysis and comparison. Some of the secondary sources that are used are, for example, David Punter's *The Literature of Terror* or Fred Botting's *Gothic*.

2. Gothic Fiction

Before concentrating on the topic of this paper, it is convenient to firstly define the literary genre of the novels to be analyzed as well as its origins and elements. This chapter defines the terms such as Gothic or Gothic fiction and provides an insight into eighteenth and nineteenth English as well as Scottish Gothic fiction. The second part of this chapter deals with the emotions evoked in people when encountering monsters or reading Gothic novels.

2.1. Defining the Genre

The term ‘Gothic’ has had various meanings and might be used in diverse areas. Besides literature it might be used in the context of architecture, art or history. Originally the term referred to an early Germanic tribe called the Goths. Subsequently the term was broadened to the meaning of ‘Germanic’ having connotations with barbaric and then also medieval.¹

In the area of literature, or Gothic fiction, there are different characteristics describing the Gothic genre which has been changing throughout the centuries. In general, Gothic fiction emphasizes a portrayal of the terrifying, dark and archaic settings and there is a prominent use of the supernatural. It displays highly stereotyped characters and employs the techniques of literary suspense. The characters are often terrorized by villains, ghosts, vampires and other monsters. David Punter claims that Gothic might be used in the opposition to the ‘classical’. Where the classical is well-ordered and simple offering a set of cultural models to be followed, Gothic is rather chaotic and complicated representing excess and exaggeration and is the product of the wild and uncivilized.² The atmosphere of Gothic fiction is usually gloomy and mysterious, and its landscapes are desolate evoking feelings of terror and horror.³ As it is often targeting reader’s emotions, the genre is also categorized as a brand of Romantic literature. About its characters Flajšar also says that there are usually two types of protagonists. On one hand there

¹ David Punter, *The Literature of Terror. A History of Gothic Fictions from 1765 to the Present Day* (1980; London: Longman Group Limited, 1996), 1–5.

² Punter, *The Literature of Terror*, 1–3.

³ Fred Botting, *Gothic* (1996; London and New York: Routledge, 2005), 1–2.

are good and isolated protagonists and on the other hand there are villain protagonists committing various evil crimes on the other hand.⁴

The origins of Gothic fiction are generally ascribed to the novel, most usually considered to be the first piece of Gothic fiction, *The Castle of Otranto* written by Horace Walpole in 1764. So it is in the eighteenth century when Gothic fiction began to be popular and this era also corresponds to the rise of the novel itself. This development is attributed to the changing cultural conditions, for example, to the increase in the amount of reading public or the higher number of printing houses in Britain.⁵ Walpole's novel established both the stock characters of the genre in the form of evil tyrants, virtuous maiden or noble peasant, and also its motifs of the supernatural, incest and mistaken identity.⁶ However, as it was contravening the principles of the Enlightenment, such as simplicity, reason or probability, it was received ambivalently, mainly due to its lack of morality.⁷ The main setting of the eighteenth century novel is the castle, decaying, bleak and full of hidden passageways, but also ruined churches or graveyards. However, there were also sublime mountainous landscapes such as the Alps, which is one of the features of Romantic writing.⁸ Since the publication of Walpole's novel, Gothic writing underwent, due to various historical conditions, a number of significant changes in the hands of later writers,⁹ as might be seen in the following passage concerning the subsequent era.

The nineteenth century is crucial era for this paper and it is relevant to talk particularly about it as the analyzed novels were all written in this period of time. In the nineteenth century, the context of Victorian culture was associated with anxieties about the stability of the social and domestic order and the effects of economic and scientific rationality. So the discourse and analyses of science as well as the process of identifying and excluding deviant and degenerate individuals have become a new domain for dark powers.¹⁰ The characters of the nineteenth century Gothic fiction

⁴ Jiří Flajšar, "Gothic Fiction Revisited," in *Scottish Gothic Fiction* (Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2012), 6–9.

⁵ Punter, *The Literature of Terror*, 20–21.

⁶ Sophie Missing, "The Castle of Otranto by Horace Walpole," accessed March 5, 2015, <http://www.theguardian.com/books/2010/mar/14/castle-of-otranto-horace-walpole-review>

⁷ Alexandra Warwick, "Victorian Gothic," in *The Routledge Companion to Gothic*, ed. Catherine Spooner and Emma McEvoy (London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2007), 35.

⁸ Botting, *Gothic*, 2.

⁹ Botting, *Gothic*, 30.

¹⁰ Botting, *Gothic* 88–89.

suffer from both psychological and physical terror, struggling with the mysterious and the supernatural effects,¹¹ such as “scientists, madmen, criminals and the monstrous double signifying duplicity and evil nature”.¹² The ambivalence of Gothic fiction is characterized by its play of oppositions, or antitheses, such as good vs. evil, light vs. dark or reason vs. irrationality. The setting of its corruption and violence might be the city, a gloomy forest or dark labyrinth so a new locus of the nineteenth century Gothic is the urban setting. So in the comparison with the eighteenth century, nineteenth century Gothic fiction has become less romantic.¹³ In the middle of the nineteenth century, the Gothic genre was generally considered to have disappeared but in the 1880s it experienced a revival.¹⁴

Besides the demarcation of English Gothic fiction, it is also necessary to focus on the Scottish Gothic fiction alone, as it employs certain specific features, and because two of the analyzed novels are of Scottish origin. The beginning of the Scottish Gothic fiction is also in the eighteenth century, at a time when the Union of English and Scottish parliaments were created (1707). However, due to its unpopularity and the lack of possibility of coherent Scottish identity in Scotland, there were rebellions. That was the reason the writers such as Walter Scott, James Hogg and Robert Louis Stevenson began to utilize this crisis and Scotland’s fragmented reputation in a Gothic manner. Their Gothic tales are populated primarily with haunted doubles, disclaimed sons and unsuccessful heroes. So Scottish Gothic often uncovers history and past, accompanied with manuscripts and inscriptions to prove its authenticity and authority. Often referred to as ‘North Britain’, the fiction of Scotland remained uncharted, confusing and hostile territory for writers. The examples of the Scottish representation in Gothic fiction, in Shelley’s *Frankenstein*, for example, suggest that Scottish landscape was foreign and hostile, therefore suitable for Gothic fiction writers to tell tales of persecution and religious tyranny.¹⁵ Punter in a similar way claims that due to the fact that English and Scottish relations are historically asymmetrical, it is this asymmetry that is so often portrayed in Scottish

¹¹ Charlotte Barret, “Introduction to the Victorian Gothic,” University of Oxford, accessed March 7, 2015, <http://writersinspire.org/content/introduction-victorian-gothic>

¹² Botting, *Gothic*, 2.

¹³ Botting, *Gothic*, 7.

¹⁴ Jiří Flajšar, “Gothic Fiction Revisited,” in *Scottish Gothic Fiction* (Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2012), 8.

¹⁵ Angela Wright, “Scottish Gothic,” in *The Routledge Companion to Gothic*, Catherine Spooner and Emma McEvoy (London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2007), 73–76.

Gothic fiction, deploying a range of motifs in supernatural and also political and historical terms.¹⁶

2.2. Gothic Emotions

Gothic emotions are very important for Gothic fiction due to the fact that its general aim is to horrify and terrify, as already stated above. Therefore, writers of Gothic genre use various tools to evoke feelings of terror and horror in their readers.

Secret or perceptible, innate or acquired, everybody possesses a certain kind of fear or phobia. People might be afraid of animate or inanimate objects, such as monkeys, spiders, snakes, or they may suffer from mental fears of, for example, flying, rejection or failure. Gothic emotions, however, are predominantly ambivalent and by means of terror and horror, both disgust and reader's interest are evoked. So it might be said that Gothic fiction evokes not only the feelings making people scared and terrified but also those that attract and amaze.¹⁷ In the following quote describing the effects of Gothic at readers' emotions, it might be seen that the aim of Gothic fiction is not to inform or educate, but to engage readers feelings and emotions.

Though its presentations of supernatural, sensational and terrifying incidents, imagined or not, Gothic produced emotional effects on its readers rather than developing a rational or properly cultivated response. Exciting rather than informing, it chilled their blood, delighter their superstitious fantasies and fed uncultivated appetites.¹⁸

As already said above, what predominated throughout the eighteenth century is the sublime which is associated with grandeur and magnificence also evoking ambivalent emotions of terror and wonder.¹⁹ In the nineteenth century, however, the sublime ceded to the uncanny, and instead the feelings of terror and horror were largely employed. Terror is an emotional condition meaning 'to frighten', it is a state when the character or reader is terrified or is in intense fear, fright or dread of an

¹⁶ David Punter, "Scottish Gothic," in *The Cambridge Companion to Scottish Literature*, ed. Gerard Carruthers and Liam McIlvanney, (Cambridge University Press, 2012), 143.

¹⁷ Botting, *Gothic*, 3.

¹⁸ Botting, *Gothic*, 3

¹⁹ Botting, *Gothic*, 2–3.

object in the external world or of the danger it provides. Horror, on the other hand, is rather the physical emotion meaning ‘to bristle or shudder’. It usually refers to the corporeal painful emotions compounded of loathing and fear appealing to and exploiting the sentient body. So terror is an imaginative state while horror rather invokes the corporeal state of pain.²⁰ Moreover terror is accompanied by the sense of unknown constructing uncontrollable and overwhelming power which threatens the loss of rationality, honor or social standing.²¹ Radcliffe in her posthumously published essay “On the Supernatural in Poetry” provides a useful delineation of both terror and horror saying that they “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.”²² Important is that terror activates the mind and the imagination, allowing it to overcome its fears and doubts. So the object of threat is escaped by means of terror.²³ About horror Fahy also states it is aroused under two of the circumstances, firstly when evil supernatural or monstrous appears, or during the intentional elicitation of dread, disgust or fear in the reader.²⁴ Besides the feelings of terror and horror, interest, or amazement, Gothic fiction evokes also emotions of shock, astonishment or anticipation.

²⁰ Steven Bruhm, *Gothic Bodies: The Politics of Pain in Romantic Fiction* (Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994), 37–38.

²¹ Botting, *Gothic*, 5–7.

²² Ann Radcliffe, “On the Supernatural in Poetry,” *New Monthly Magazine* 16 (1826): 149.

²³ Botting, *Gothic*, 48.

²⁴ Thomas Fahy, *The Philosophy of Horror* (1995; Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 2010), 15.

3. Monsters and Monstrosity

In this extensive chapter, the crucial theoretical background terminology is going to be defined. The chapter is divided into five subchapters. Firstly it is revealed what exactly is meant by the terms monster, monstrosity or monstrousness and also the history of perceiving the terms is going to be outlined. Second subchapter deals with two myths referring to the development of the monsters and the inspiration for later writers. The third part of this chapter is going to explore the mental state and physical appearance of monsters. In the fourth part, various types of creatures that are called monsters are going to be delimited with a focus on vampires and devils, as they are crucial for this paper and can be classified into a certain monstrous category. The last part of this chapter is going to discover the concept of duality and monstrous transformational processes that are dealt with in the analyzed novels. As this paper's focus is the literary monsters, the main focus is paid on them.

3.1. Defining and Development of the Monstrous

The words 'monster', 'monstrosity' and 'monstrousness' have their etymological root in the Latin *monstrare* meaning both 'to show' and to 'warn or advise.' The idea of monstrousness encloses the impossible, dreadful, amoral, inhuman and unspeakable qualities that lie at the periphery of human identity. The monstrous is the inverse or outside of what is acceptably human in social or cultural context. Monstrosity is never an intrinsic quality, it is a tangible means and both an effect and a cause of monstrousness. By monstrosity the unspeakable and threatening force of the monstrous is brought into being.²⁵

A monster is the individual object, or subject, in which monstrousness and monstrosity come together.²⁶ The word 'monster' itself comes from the Latin *monstrum* meaning, similarly as the three words mentioned above, that which is 'shown forth' or 'revealed.' This meaning is rather contrary from the modern perception of a monster, a strange, frightening, allegedly mythical creature.²⁷ A

²⁵ Alexa Wright, *Monstrosity: The Human Monster in Visual Culture* (London: I.B.Tauris, 2013), 3.

²⁶ Alexa Wright, *Monstrosity*, 3.

²⁷ John Michael Greer, *Monsters: An Investigator's Guide to Magical Beings* (2001; Woodbury: Llewellyn Publications, 2011), 3.

monster can be a display of God's wrath, a portent of the future or a symbol of moral virtue or vice. As literal creatures, monsters are connected to folk cultures but may be also, especially nowadays, perceived as metaphors.²⁸ It might be said that metaphors shape our way of thinking and communicating and therefore monsters might be perceived as metaphorical archetypes of this nature. This reasoning has its roots in Johnson and Lakoff's claim that "our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature. The concepts that govern our thoughts are not just matters of the intellect. They also govern our everyday functioning."²⁹ So our response to these fictional monsters helps us shape our thoughts and actions when we are confronted with a 'real monster', a person who hides the evil, who can attack and damage our bodies, thought and emotions. Therefore it might be said that monsters can teach us to be heroes or kill the monsters. Because monsters have to be conquered, as they represent a lack of control and anarchy threatening to destroy the society, there always need to be heroes who conquer them.³⁰

The figure of a monster was perceived differently at various stages of history and it might be said that each century has had a privileged form of a monster. A word 'monster' has classical, pre-Christian echoes. Since ancient times the monster, thought of as a child born with physical abnormalities, was an object of both fear and wonder. This unnatural monstrous birth was apprehended as an omen from the gods, a rebuke to humans for their faults which was often abandoned or put to death. Since those times monsters have evaded mixed emotions ranging from fear to curiosity.³¹ In the Middle Ages the monster was perceived in terms of 'the bestial man,' the person who is half man and half animal. During Renaissance it was a mixture of two individuals in one body, 'the Siamese twins.' During this era all kinds of monsters shared the property of being strange 'mixtures'³² as might be seen from the following Foucault's quote.

²⁸ Stephen T. Asma, *On Monsters: An Unnatural History of Our Worst Fears* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 13–14.

²⁹ George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1980), 3.

³⁰ Joni Richards Bodart, introduction to *They Suck, They Bite, They Eat, They Kill: The Psychological Meaning of the Supernatural Monsters* (Plymouth: Scarecrow Press, 2012), xxv.

³¹ Edward J. Ingebreetsen, *At Stake: Monsters and the Rhetoric of Fear in Public Culture* (Chicago: The University of Chicago, 2001), 1.

³² Michel Foucault, *Abnormal: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1974-1975* (London: Picador, 2004), 66.

It is the mixture of two individuals: the person who has two heads and one body or two bodies and one head is a monster. It is the mixture of two sexes: the person who is both male and female is a monster. It is a mixture of life and death: the fetus born with a morphology that means it will not be able to live but that nonetheless survives for some minutes or days is a monster. Finally, it is a mixture of forms: the person who has neither arms nor legs, like a snake, is a monster.³³

In the Classical Age it was a mixture of two sexes, ‘hermaphrodites.’ Foucault links these three monster archetypes, the bestial man, the Siamese twins and hermaphrodites, to the contemporary figure of the abnormal individual. The Classical monster was a criminal because it broke the natural law. In the modern period, however, beginning at the end of the eighteenth century, monstrosity is perceived as simply an irregularity, a deviation. Monsters are no longer criminals but the criminals are monsters because they violate the norms of the society.³⁴

Foucault also delimits three figures, the human monster, the individual to be corrected and the masturbating child, that were defined in the eighteenth century³⁵ but “come together in the nineteenth century to give rise to the domain of abnormality.”³⁶ The ‘human monster’ violates the laws of both the society and nature and it combines the impossible and the forbidden. The monster provokes violence, medical care or pity. The ‘individual to be corrected’ is a person in whose case the ordinary rules of the family failed. The attempts to correct the behavior of these individuals by means of school, church, police or army failed too so they are in part incorrigible. The third figure is the ‘child masturbator’, a completely new figure of the nineteenth century. The practice of masturbation was thought to be the universal secret and the possible root of almost every possible evil. It was believed to cause not only physical, nervous and psychiatric illnesses but also physical deformities and the worst kinds of monstrous behavior. Thus the abnormal individual of the nineteenth century might be seen as ‘a descendant’ of these three individuals, the human monster, the incorrigible and the masturbator. It is so due to the fact that the abnormal individual is marked with monstrosity that is increasingly faded,

³³ Foucault, *Abnormal*, 63.

³⁴ Foucault, *Abnormal*, 66–67.

³⁵ Foucault, *Abnormal*, 55.

³⁶ Foucault, *Abnormal*, 55.

diaphanous and is increasingly surrounded by technology to correct him.³⁷ Moreover Unterthurner and Vogt claim that in the nineteenth century monsters of flesh and blood were replaced by a new form of monstrosity. What became monstrous in this era is the slightest deviation from order such as criminals, different races etc. and every order was racked by the ‘invisible monstrosity of the interior.’³⁸

What was earlier believed to be reality, during the era of the Scientific Revolution was inverted, as science opened a new way of thinking about the world. The idea of monstrous weakened and with this new philosophy the old monster lore of the ancient and medieval periods was labeled ‘nonsense’ because the scientific model of the universe had no room for monsters. It was thought that everything real should have had material, however, the rejection of magic, alchemy and the like was based only on rhetoric, but not experiment. Therefore anyone claiming to see a monster was thought to be mistaken and crazy. The focus of this paper is, however, fictional monsters, appearing in literature, movies and television, which are thought by scientists as well as the readers and spectators as nonexistent. Despite the fact people know that these monsters are nonexistent, they are anyway frightened and amazed by them. Because of their strangeness, otherness, and fear evocation, supposedly, they are very popular.³⁹ Ingebretsen claims that what is so astonishing about monsters might be their painful beauty, unlimited individuality or liberties that they take. They get away with murder which fascinates us, they are supposed to do what they desire which frightens us.⁴⁰

The term monster is nowadays quite ordinarily used as a concept to apply to *inhuman* creatures which might even be of human species, so monsters do not always have to be mythical or supernatural. In the nineteenth century, for example, there were common so called ‘freak shows’ and ‘monster spectacles,’ where genetically and developmentally disabled people were shown and exploited. The concept of monsters has evolved to become a moral term in addition to a biological and theological term. So the term monster can be often applied to humans who have by

³⁷ Foucault, *Abnormal*, 55–60.

³⁸ Gerhard Unterthurner and Erik M. Vogt, preface to *Monstrosity in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and Philosophy* (Wien: Turia and Kant, 2012), 8.

³⁹ Greer, *Monsters*, 5–10.

⁴⁰ Ingebretsen, *At Stake*, 4.

their actions abdicated their humanity. It might be also said that everyone has a potential to become monstrous,⁴¹ as will be discovered later.

3.2. Myths as a Source of “Monstrous” Inspiration

Monsters have existed in every culture around the world since 3000 BC when the first stories about them were told.⁴² So monsters have their roots much further in the history than the genre of Gothic fiction originating in the eighteenth century, and monsters are, supposedly, largely linked to myths and mythology. As myth, a hereditary story of ancient origin once serving to explain the world and its various actions, usually displays supernatural protagonists, it apparently deals with monsters.⁴³ One of the best known of such monsters, the serpent-haired Medusa, can be traced back to Greek mythology. She was, however, not always the hideous monster but it has also been suggested that she was once part of the Libyan Triple goddesses. In Ancient Greek art she and her sisters, the Gorgons, were depicted as serpentine monsters, half-women and half-serpents. The Roman poet Ovid described in his *Metamorphoses* (8 AD) how Medusa was once a beautiful woman but was raped by Poseidon. In the revenge against Medusa Athene changed her golden hair into hideous yellow serpents. She became so ugly that it was said any man who looked at her would be turned into stone.⁴⁴

Similarly as Medusa, a serpent is also associated with the Christian mythology and the temptation of Eve. It was the serpent who tempted Eve to eat the forbidden fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil and brought evil into the world.⁴⁵ This serpent was, however, the changed form of Satan who in John Milton’s *Paradise Lost* (1667) has not strictly negative connotations as he might be also a positive figure. Satan might be perceived as the originator of Evil but it is also said that he has absorbed many so called ‘Promethean elements’, such as his loyalty in leadership, courage in adversity, unflinching courage and splendid recklessness.⁴⁶

⁴¹ Asma, *On Monsters*, 7.

⁴² Bodart, introduction to *They Suck*, xix.

⁴³ M. H. Abrams, *A Glossary of Literary Terms*, (USA: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1999), 170.

⁴⁴ Cassandra Eason, *Fabulous Creatures, Mythical Monsters, and Animal Power Symbols* (London: Greenwood Press, 2008), 24–25.

⁴⁵ Eason, *Fabulous Creatures*, 25.

⁴⁶ R J Z Werblowsky, *Lucifer and Prometheus: A Study of Milton’s Satan* (1999; London: Routledge, 2001), 3.

What is also noticeable about Satan is his vocabulary through which Satan's values might be considered to be also associated with the pagan hero of Homeric epic, such as strength, pride or charisma. Moreover Satan combines the strength and pride of Achilles with the linguistic skill of Odysseus. So the figure of Satan might be rather taken as an embodiment of epic ambition than of evil.⁴⁷ Newlyn talks similarly about moral ambiguity of Satan. She says that "if what is good may be the origin of what is evil, then what is evil may none the less still has access to what is good."⁴⁸ Moreover she claims that it is God who might be perceived as the origin of evil, since he is the creator of a repressive order which invites the rebellion of Satan.⁴⁹

So in the example of these two monsters, Satan and Medusa, it might be seen that they are highly ambivalent, as explained in the second chapter, as they are consisting not of only bad, violent or disgusting properties of monsters, but also of beauty, courage or ambition. Moreover they might be also perceived as characters undergoing a certain kind of transformation, as will be explained later.

These mythological monsters, as well as many others, are also a source of great inspiration for many later writers of not only Gothic fiction. It is especially Milton's figure of Satan who inspired a lot of Romantic writers, besides several contemporary writers, who used this figure in their writing to revise it, show their own version or perception of it. One of the most notable English Romantics who took inspiration in Milton's Satan is Percy Bysshe Shelley. In his play *Prometheus Unbound* (1820) he uses his hero, Prometheus, as a response to Milton's Satan. In Shelley's view Satan represents troubling creation that drew both his admiration and his disapproval. He praises Milton's rendering of Satan's sublimity in contrast to the popular conception of the devil.⁵⁰ Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, subtitled *The Modern Prometheus*, is also highly influenced by Satan as the monster of the story, for example, refers to himself as Satan and it is similarly 'evil.'⁵¹

⁴⁷ Margaret Kean, contextual overview of *John Milton's Paradise Lost: A Routledge Study Guide and Sourcebook* (New York: Routledge, 2005), 8.

⁴⁸ Lucy Newlyn, "Paradise Lost and the Romantic Reader," in *John Milton's Paradise Lost*, 73.

⁴⁹ Newlyn, "Paradise Lost and the Romantic Reader," 73.

⁵⁰ Madeleine Callaghan, "Shelley and Milton," in *The Oxford Handbook of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, ed. Michael O'Neill and Anthony Howe (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 482–483.

⁵¹ Dr Siv Jansson, introduction to *Frankenstein*, by Marry Sheley (London: Wordsworth Editions, 1999), xi.

3. 3. Characteristics of Monstrous Creatures

What makes a monster to be perceived or defined as a monster? When a person imagines a monster, it is usually its hideousness or ugliness that makes it monstrous. A creature may be, however, monstrous also in its mind, mainly when it commits evil, crimes and other wrongdoings. The troublesome issue is primarily the detection of what makes monsters, criminals or ordinary people evil and why do they commit crimes. In the following two subchapters, answers for these and many other questions are going to be formed.

3. 3. 1. Psychology of Monsters

There are various psychologists, psychiatrists and scientists who strive to search for clues of evil and crimes. In his research of the psychology of evil, for example, Zimbardo tries to solve the puzzle of where the evil comes from. He says that “the world has always been filled with good and evil, because good and evil is the yin and yang of the human condition”.⁵² He notes that evil is mainly the exercise of power, meaning to intentionally harm people psychologically, physically, mortally, or to commit crimes against humanity. He, for example, speaks about the power of anonymity. He takes an example of soldiers, who are partly anonymous in their uniform. He says that if people do not change appearance, only one of eight kills, tortures or mutilates, but if their appearance is changed, ninety percent of them commit these evil acts. By stating this he intends to claim that when people are free of responsibility, de-individualized and anonymous, they are more prone to commit crimes.⁵³ He also quotes Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn saying that “the line between good and evil cuts through the heart of every human being.”⁵⁴ So that the line is thin and it depends on the individuals whether under certain circumstances they will choose to commit evil, be passively inactive or heroes.⁵⁵

The truth of what are the thoughts of criminals and psychopaths while they commit crimes and why they commit them have troubled not only Phillip Zimbardo but also many other neuropsychologists and forensic psychiatrists. In the fascinating

⁵² Phillip Zimbardo, “Philip Zimbardo: The Psychology of Evil,” YouTube video, 23:11, 2008, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OsFEV35tWsg>.

⁵³ Zimbardo, “Philip Zimbardo: The Psychology of Evil.”

⁵⁴ Zimbardo, “Philip Zimbardo: The Psychology of Evil.”

⁵⁵ Zimbardo, “Philip Zimbardo: The Psychology of Evil.”

German documentary “On the Trail of Evil” scientists try to find answers for these questions. The documentary shows various ways and experiments of determining where the evil comes from, such as penetrating into the brain of criminals, using magnetic resonance, interviews, therapies and many other ways. Two Canadian scientists, Steve Porter and Michael Woodworth, focused on the specific type of offenders who are hardly to recognize, psychopaths, who are the extremely dangerous delinquents with a high degree of relapse. Woodworth claims that psychopaths suffer from a range of emotional problems and they often do not establish relations in a usual way. What is very deceitful about them is the fact they are able to cleverly mask their deficits. If they choose to, they can function in society as normal or even charming people and nobody can be able to recognize them. What makes them incomprehensible to us is the fact they feel no empathy which makes them ‘stone cold soul.’ Woodworth talks about his experience with a sexual delinquent, to whom he was giving therapy sessions in prison. Even though it seemed to him he was improving, the reality was different. As his diary confirmed, he was enjoying the feeling of being the victim and took pleasure in lying to the therapist. Using the method of magnetic resonance and watching the brain activity, it was determined that in a part of brain where people feel compassion and empathy, there is a high activity in case of normal people but in case of psychopaths there is no activity. So it seems that criminals are not able to feel compassion and empathy.⁵⁶

Very important in assessing of evil arising in psychopaths and criminals is their childhood. Gerhard Roth claims that when a person has had a bad experience in childhood, in the future he is going to react at evil and wrongdoings not sensitively but insensibly. He also says that the criminal activity is influenced mainly by the environment, one third by genetics and two thirds by environment. These environmental influences deform the brain of people in a very early childhood. What seems interesting is the fact Roth that claims due to their traumas, these people are not responsible for their evil acts and should not be blamed for them.⁵⁷

The documentary also features warfare in Kongo where very young men are becoming soldiers. Disturbing is that after a while they start to like it, take pride in it, and they want to continue in making the war. Thomas Elbert says that due to similar

⁵⁶ Karin Jurschick, “Lidský mozek – Kde sídlí zlo?” *YouTube* video, 52:33, 2012, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=drDipK_bjtg. (my translation)

⁵⁷ Jurschick, “Lidský mozek – Kde sídlí zlo?”

environmental influences everybody would be capable of killing, primarily thanks to the biological evolution. In times of lack or during a hunting the body drains the neurochemical substances, mainly in case of men, that bring feelings of satisfaction. So it might be said that evolution has made us hunters, not necessarily of other humans, but it also equipped us with barriers, that are risen thanks to our thinking, upbringing and moral education. When a child is not taught what is good and what is evil, this person might become an evil murderer or criminal who enjoys it. The social psychologist Harald Welzer speaks about another interesting fact. He says that when people are faced with the challenge that is not in accordance with their moral convictions, namely to kill people that have not done anything to them, execution of such an act is easier when they justify it. In genocide of Jews in 1940s, for example, a soldier killed only children, while his colleague only mothers, so thinking that without mothers the children would die anyway, this soldier felt he was in a way helping them. Through this ‘justification’ he could stay a moral person in his own eyes.⁵⁸

Similarly as Zimbardo or Elbert, Russell claims that although seldom anyone admits it, evil is present in everybody so anyone can be a torturer, killer or sadist.⁵⁹ “One of the great dangers to humanity is our tendency to project our own evil onto others.”⁶⁰ Evil is intentionally malicious and it may be a product of weakness. So a torturer may act from fear or misled rationalization. He also differentiates two kinds of evil, namely natural and moral. He argues that natural evil is caused by destructive ‘acts of God’ or nature such as tornadoes or cancer. Moral evil, on the other hand, proceeds from the hands of a human causing harm to another being. Russell furthermore says that there are various causes of evil. Similarly as Roth, he discusses primarily genetic and environmental causes. He says that genetic cause has been recently popular which is shown by the fact that in every being there is an animal nature where the violence is coming from.⁶¹ The following quote states how the genetic human violence causing people to commit evil might be formed.

⁵⁸ Jurschick, “Lidský mozek – Kde sídlí zlo?”

⁵⁹ Jeffrey Burton Russell, *The Devil: Perceptions of Evil from Antiquity to Primitive Christianity* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1987), 22.

⁶⁰ Russell, *The Devil*, 22.

⁶¹ Russell, *The Devil*, 24.

Like other animals, primitive humans had to struggle endlessly against an indifferent or hostile environment, and the merciless habits learned during those long eons, now veneered only thinly by civilization, frequently and easily burst forth destructively from beneath their tenuous covering. This unconscious, 'genotypal' aggressiveness is universal and powerful enough to destroy us completely when coupled with runaway technology.⁶²

So he claims that 'the unconscious evil aggressiveness' is within each of us from the beginning, as within animals, and that only civilization helps to tame. Other important causes of evil are social reasons or the way the person is nurtured. The behavior of the person is influenced by the person's surroundings such as their family or institutional and cultural environment. So another of the usual cause producing evil might not be the individual but the society.⁶³

Cole's opinion is that there are two possibilities for committing evil. The first he calls the monstrous conception meaning that humans freely and rationally choose to make others suffer so that they cross the border beyond humanity. According to this conception, the monsters have human shape, they are 'human/inhumans' or 'inhuman/humans,' and they are capable of pure evil precisely because of their monstrosity. The second conception is psychological according to which humans commit evil acts but they do not choose it freely and rationally. The explanation for their evil might depend on their social or psychological history, or they also might have been forced to do it. What could also drive them to commit crimes is madness due to loss of contact with reality so they pursue ends which they consider reasonable.⁶⁴

3. 3. 2. Physicality of Monsters

As for the physical appearance of monsters, it is their ugliness, irregularity or otherness what most usually makes monsters monstrous. Ugliness is the most negative aesthetic value, with beauty on the other side and the sublime in the middle. The 'ugly object' might be, however, also placed on a scale, being either more or less

⁶² Russel, *The Devil*, 26–27.

⁶³ Russel, *The Devil*, 27.

⁶⁴ Phillip Colle, *The Myth of Evil: Demonizing the Enemy* (USA and Canada: Praeger, 2006), 13.

ugly.⁶⁵ Ugliness is usually associated with “qualities of deformity, decay, disease, disfigurement, disorder, messiness, odd proportions, mutilation, grating sounds, or being defiled, spoiled, defaced, wounded, dirty, muddy, slimy, greasy, foul, putrid”⁶⁶ and many other aspects. Ugliness is usually judged in relation to the perceptual qualities and judgments of negative reactions such as shock, repulsion, disgust or dislike. There are many theories of ugliness. Brady, for example, quotes Rudolf Arnheim who describes ugliness as a ‘clash of uncoordinated orders’ where each of the parts has its own order which do not fit together so that the whole is fractured. Ugliness is also often associated with evil and immorality.⁶⁷ Schlegel says that the result of extreme ugliness is considered to be despair and pain. He also claims that ugly is everything we loathe, despise or hate.⁶⁸ So it seems that the physical appearance is connected to the mental properties of monsters. As Botting claims, “external forms, deceptive, inhuman and evil, lead to alienation, guilt and self-destruction, in which values of humanity, justice and identity are left in torturous doubt.”⁶⁹

So visible deformity coincides with moral weakness and where external form fails, by extension moral or spiritual form is found to be deficient too.⁷⁰ However, on the other hand, in the nineteenth century, with the help of anatomical, physiological and psychological theories, criminals were identified to be genetically determined to be degenerate and deviant. Moreover, atavism and recidivism, the regression to archaic or primitive characteristics, were what dominated the constructions of deviance and abnormality. Physiognomy was also important in the process of making atavistic tendencies visible.⁷¹

In the past there were various attempts to determine how a typical criminal looks like. At the end of the nineteenth century, for example, an Italian doctor Cesare Lombroso, best known for his theory of dangerous criminals marked by physical and psychological abnormalities which he called ‘anomalies,’ tried to differentiate

⁶⁵ Emily Brady, *The Sublime in Modern Philosophy: Aesthetics, Ethics, and Nature* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 174.

⁶⁶ Brady, *The Sublime in Modern Philosophy*, 174–175.

⁶⁷ Brady, *The Sublime in Modern Philosophy*, 175–176.

⁶⁸ Friedrich Von Schlegel, *On the Study of Greek Poetry* (New York: State University New York Press, 2001), 69.

⁶⁹ Botting, *Gothic*, 63.

⁷⁰ Botting, *Gothic*, 6.

⁷¹ Botting, *Gothic*, 89.

various kinds of criminals according to their facial features, or physiognomy.⁷² He tried to prove that the most dangerous criminals are “atavistic throwbacks on the evolutionary scale.”⁷³ Later, an Englishman Francis Galton also tried to define ‘the face of evil’ using photos of criminals in order to find out what a face of a typical criminal is. These and many other similar experiments were realized in order to recognize evil in order to eradicate it out of the society, which is unfortunately not an easy task at all.⁷⁴

3.4. Types of Monsters

In relation to what has been already said in the previous chapters, it is clear that there are various types of monsters. Bodart says that there are four monster archetypes, the bloodsucker, the shapeshifter, the ghost and the thing. Each culture in the world, however, changes these archetypes to fit that culture. Werewolves, vampires and other shapeshifters, such as ghosts, maniacal machines or zombies are frightening, threatening and evil but also sexy, attractive or tempting. Nevertheless, as it was already suggested in the previous subchapters, there are not only supernatural monsters but also those that can be real and human. The rapist, the murderer, the abuser, it can be everyone who deals with spiritual, psychological or moral evil.⁷⁵

The three monster archetypes defined by Foucault, the bestial man, the Siamese twins and hermaphrodite, were described in the chapter 3.1. as well as the nineteenth-century abnormal individual who is the descendant of the three individuals, the monster, the incorrigible and the masturbator. As was said earlier, during the 1880s the Gothic fiction experienced a revival and, as Botting claims, during this time two Gothic figures, the double and the vampire, reappeared in new shapes. Among the most impressive of these figure are the two texts to be analyzed, *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* and *Dracula*.⁷⁶ This subchapter, however, focuses primarily on two types of monsters that are clearly classifiable, namely vampires and devils, as these two monsters appear in the analyzed novels.

⁷² Lombroso, *Criminal Man*, 1.

⁷³ Lombroso, *Criminal Man*, 1.

⁷⁴ Jurschick, “Lidský mozek – Kde sídlí zlo?”

⁷⁵ Bodart, introduction to *They Suck*, xxiv–xxviii.

⁷⁶ Botting, *Gothic*, 88.

3.4.1. Vampires

Similarly as monsters in general, vampires have been part of every culture throughout the history. These mythical creatures have been occurring since ancient times and Greece, Rome, Egypt and Eastern Europe were the locations of the most significant activities and folktales. The origins of the word ‘vampire’ are vague but it was used in 1740s in English, French and German documents to describe vampires in Russia, Serbia or Poland.⁷⁷ So most folklorists agree that the word ‘vampire’ has Slavic roots as its form, ‘vampir,’ has been found in a fifteenth-century South Slavic source.⁷⁸

Vampire is a “corpse supposed to leave its grave at night to drink the blood of the living by biting their necks with long pointed canine teeth.”⁷⁹ Therefore vampires are often defined as un-dead creatures, which means they are beings who are technically dead but still animate.⁸⁰

The earliest vampires were said to drink blood of children as it was believed to be more pure and less tainted by world’s influences. These cultures naturally understood that without blood life cannot exist. So the vampire has acquired a mark of a deadly and dangerous creature, which has to kill for the only reason, to live and to satiate his hunger, which he satisfies on his favorite prey, humans. Bodart says that in general there have been three types of vampires, folkloric vampire or revenant, the classic vampire such as the vampire created by Bram Stoker, and the modern vampire created by Anne Rice. Two of them, folkloric and classic, are now going to be explicated. Folkloric vampires are frightening and zombielike creatures who arose from graves to right the wrong done to them, to torment or give warnings to those left behind. They have the ability to suck the blood and when the dawn broke, they go back to their graves. They appeared mainly in Romania where they were feared so that many methods of killing them were developed.⁸¹ As for the classic vampires, one of the first classic romantic vampire in literature is John Polidori’s “The Vampyre” (1819). His contribution to classical vampire template included the facts, for example, that vampires are the dead who have reanimated themselves. They are

⁷⁷ Bodart, *They Suck*, 1–2.

⁷⁸ Elizabeth Miller, *A Dracula Handbook* (Indiana: Xlibris, 2005), 11.

⁷⁹ “Vampire,” *Oxford Dictionaries*, Oxford Dictionary Press, accessed March 11, 2015, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/vampire>

⁸⁰ “Undead,” *Oxford Dictionaries*, Oxford Dictionary Press, accessed March 11, 2015, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/undead>

⁸¹ Bodart, *They Suck*, 2–3.

wealthy aristocrats frequently travelling, living in the present and walking undetected among the alive. They are supernatural, dark and moody creatures capable of hypnotizing humans. On the other hand they are also mysterious, seductive and sexual and their bite is erotic and overwhelming.⁸²

The figure of Polidori's vampire protagonist, Lord Ruthven, became a model for a vampire in the English tradition. What seems to be important is the connection between his being an aristocrat, like the vampires of central European legend, and his absolute sexual privilege over his victims.⁸³ Similarly as the nineteenth century aristocracy, "he is dead yet not dead, he requires blood because blood is the business of an aristocracy."⁸⁴ Punter claims that the vampire figure in British culture, in Polidori, Bram Stoker and elsewhere, is antibourgeois figure who is elegant, well-dressed, a master of seduction, a person liberated from prevailing socio-moral codes.⁸⁵

Another example of classical vampire is Sheridan Le Fanu's first female vampire *Carmilla* (1871). It is the first vampire who has to sleep in her coffin on her native soil and is killed by a stake at her heart. After she bites her victim, it takes a time after a victim is changed to a vampire. Who succeeded in blending folkloric and Ruthven elements of vampires setting with those elements in present day was Bram Stoker in his most famous novel *Dracula*.⁸⁶ As this is one of the crucial novels of this paper, the focus will be paid to it in the analytical part.

3.4.2. Devils

The ideas of the devil derive, primarily, from early interpretations of the New Testament, Milton's Satan and the romantic literary tradition of Blake and Baudelaire.⁸⁷ Over the course of time there have been various perceptions of the Devil as well as his representations. In the past Devil's bestial nature was emphasized as he emerged in a wide variety of animal and mixed forms, usually loathly, since he had sacrificed his angelic beauty when he disobeyed and rebelled

⁸² Bodart, *They Suck*, 1–3.

⁸³ Punter, *The Literature of Terror*, 104.

⁸⁴ Punter, *The Literature of Terror*, 104.

⁸⁵ Punter, *The Literature of Terror*, 104.

⁸⁶ Bodart, *They Suck*, 7.

⁸⁷ Luther Link, *The Devil: A Mask Without a Face* (London: Reaktion Books, 1995), 13.

against God.⁸⁸ The figure of Devil appeared graphically in the ninth century but his image has been changing.⁸⁹ Between the eleventh and sixteenth centuries the Devil was represented, for example, as a grotesque beast or a dragon flicking its tongue in between the well-formed buttocks of a naked witch. Sometimes the devils look grotesque, sometimes pitiful or vicious.⁹⁰ Nowadays he usually appears as a charming, cunning man with telltale horns, hooves and tail.⁹¹ The three terms, Satan, Devil and Lucifer, might be said to refer to the Devil. The usage of these three labels, however, varied and various scholars treated them differently at diverse stages of history. Some scholars think that these terms designate a single figure and some believe they should not be used interchangeably.⁹²

As the Devil's main objective is to tempt man and lead him away from God,⁹³ it is often said that the Devil is a personification of evil and deliberate destructiveness, which is confirmed, for example, by Carl Gustav Jung's claim.⁹⁴ He says that "if you regard the principle of evil as reality you can just as well call it the devil."⁹⁵ So whether one perceives the Devil as a supernatural being, or an uncontrollable force arising in the unconscious, or as an absolute aspect of human nature is less important than the essence of the perception, which is that we are threatened by alien and hostile powers.⁹⁶ The Devil usually holds various objects, from prong or pitchfork to grapnel or forked hood, for torturing heretics and criminals, originally deriving from the image of Poseidon. He was given the grapnel to suggest his cooperation with God in torturing the damned which implies that he was not God's adversary but accomplice.⁹⁷ The Dutch philosopher Spinoza (1632 – 1677), for example, thought that "the Devil is the one to whom God hands over the sinners."⁹⁸ So he works for God and is therefore not in conflict with him. Link claims that the possible reason the Devil interests us is because he defines God as surely as

⁸⁸ Ernst and Johanna Lehner, *Devils, Demons, and Witchcraft: 244 Illustrations for Artists* (New York: Dover Publications, 1971), 1.

⁸⁹ Link, *The Devil*, 13.

⁹⁰ Luther Link, *The Devil*, 38.

⁹¹ Lehner, *Devil*, 1.

⁹² Link, *The Devil*, 10–11.

⁹³ Lehner, *Devils*, 2.

⁹⁴ Russel, *The Devil*, 34.

⁹⁵ Russel, *The Devil*, 33.

⁹⁶ Russel, *The Devil*, 34.

⁹⁷ Link, *The Devil*, 13–16.

⁹⁸ Link, *The Devil*, 17.

God defines him.⁹⁹ So it might be said that the figure of the Devil has not always been perceived as a traitor to God and a personification of evil but also as an assistant to God who fights evil.

3.5. “Monstrous” Conditions and Processes

As has been noted many times so far, most of the monsters of this paper are ambivalent. The state of being part good or normal, part evil or monstrous might be said to be a common state of most people. The substantial condition is, however, that these two parts are in the right balance. Under certain conditions, however, people may be transformed and become monstrous. These ‘conditions’ and ‘processes’ of certain monstrous creatures were already revealed by Zimbardo in the chapter about the mentality of monsters. In the following two subchapters they are going to be discovered in more detail.

3.5.1. Duality

The world is a paradise of opposites, not only of good and evil. Such a dualistic, or ambivalent, conception of nature, which constitutes a significant idea of this paper and the very essence of Gothic fiction alone, has been a necessary phase in the evolution of human thought. The concept of duality may be understood as a dichotomous division into two mutually exclusive or contradictory groups or entities, such as light and shade, heat and cold, reality and absurdity, or God and the Devil.¹⁰⁰ An important claim, as discovered in the subchapters above, is related to the duality of personalities claiming that every being naturally consists of good and evil parts. These parts might be, however, differently distributed in an entity and an individual might either live a decent life without evil coming to surface. The problem is when the evil part is outbalanced, which is going to be explored later on.

As already revealed in the chapter about Scottish Gothic fiction, such an exploration of dualism and dual identity is said to be a largely used motif primarily in Scottish literature. This concept, as Jelínková explains, has been called ‘Caledonian

⁹⁹ Link, *The Devil*, 17.

¹⁰⁰ Paul Carus, *The History of the Devil: With 350 Illustrations* (Chicago: Dover Publications, 2008), 1.

antiszygy,' which is a term coined by G. Gregory Smith in 1919 in his book *Scottish Literature: Character and Influence*.¹⁰¹ It is "a conflict between rational and romantic, canny and reckless, moralistic and violent."¹⁰²

3.5.2. Metamorphosis

Zimbardo uses the story of Satan, which was already mentioned earlier, to expand his idea of so called 'The Lucifer Effect' which reveals a way ordinary, good people can be transformed, without the drugs, into being evil or bad. Because Lucifer, God's favorite angel disobeyed God, and then he is expelled out of heaven along with the other fallen angels, Lucifer descends into hell becoming evil devil, and as such the force of evil in the universe begins. In Zimbardo's opinion the transformation of God's favorite angel into the Devil sets the context for understanding human beings who are transformed from good, ordinary people into perpetrators of evil.¹⁰³ The Lucifer effect "really is a celebration of the human mind's infinite capacity to make any of us kind or cruel, caring or indifferent, creative or destructive, and it makes some of us villains."¹⁰⁴

So, as said in the previous chapter about duality of good and evil, the evil part may come to its life, and the good one might be suppressed, sometimes completely, and the evil part might either promptly or gradually empower the individual. This transformation, or change, refers to the process of so called metamorphosis. It is generally a change of one being into another and there are two types of metamorphosis. The first type occurs in nature so it might be called natural. It refers to the biological transformation process of one animal form to another, occurring in case of the inferior forms of life, such as beetles or butterflies. The second type, human, the one that is crucial for this paper, emerges rather in a fantastic world of myths, fairy tales and fantasy. Peprník defines this kind of metamorphosis as a process of sudden transformation of a human into a being of another species, most usually animal. So it is similar to a biological transformation but it is a change of a higher form of life into the lower. The aging process or the transformation of a human fetus, appearing in the real world, however, might be also considered a king

¹⁰¹ Ema Jelínková, "James Hogg and the Caledonian Antiszygy," in *Scottish Gothic Fiction*, 19.

¹⁰² Maureen M. Martin, *The Mighty Scot: Nation, Gender, and the Nineteenth-Century Mystique of Scottish Masculinity* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009), 84.

¹⁰³ Zimbardo, "Philip Zimbardo: The Psychology of Evil."

¹⁰⁴ Zimbardo, "Philip Zimbardo: The Psychology of Evil."

of metamorphosis. Metamorphosis is especially in literature considered rather an irrational phenomenon challenging the certainties of rational conception of ontology of our world referring to something that is not existing in the real world.¹⁰⁵

Although the terms transformation and metamorphosis are often used interchangeably, the transformation is used for the change of impersonal units and systems such as economics, administration or consciousness so it has rather positive connotations. Metamorphosis, on the other hand, has rather negative connotations and it is often connected to the motif of falling. This motif is conveyed on the meaning that the individual is mostly transformed to the hierarchically lower form, demonic, animal or vegetative. Nevertheless metamorphosis does not always operate as the tragic fall of the character and it does not have to end in a darkness of madness. In a Jung's mythological-psychological view, for example, its function may also appear as a descent or a way to something that is different. Psychological approach allows examine metamorphosis as a mechanism of a human consciousness. So metamorphosis might be perceived as a symbolic demonstrative expression of the taboo elements of human consciousness that get shape of a frightening otherness, as in the case of Frankenstein's monster, the Stevenson's figure of Hyde or Stoker's Dracula. Other functions of metamorphosis may be, for example, punishment or award, metonymic substitution, identification, escape or disguise (with an aim to trick the victim and cause it to fall).¹⁰⁶

It might be noted that there are two main types of metamorphosis appearing in literature, that which refers to the transformation of character's mentality or behavior, as Zimbardo suggests, and another referring to the change of the whole body of the character. Such body transformations, as Coelsch-Foisner says, involve, for example, humans that are artificially produced, reproduced and cloned, or apocalyptic and grotesque transformations. What, according to her opinion, guarantees the most spectacular body transformations are killer parasites and noxious bacteria, macabre brain transplantations or gene cocktails mixed in laboratories.¹⁰⁷ So, as Dalrymple claims, the transformation is often effected by a chemical substance, in the modern world it might be alcohol, cannabis or cocaine. Intoxication

¹⁰⁵ Michal Peprník, *Metamorfóza jako kulturní metafora: James Hogg, R. L. Stevenson a George Mac Donald* (Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2003), 8–12. (my translation)

¹⁰⁶ Peprník, *Metamorfóza*, 8–12.

¹⁰⁷ Sabine Coelsch-Foisner, "Metamorphic Changes in the Arts," in *Metamorphosis Structures of Cultural Transformations*, ed. Jürgen Schlaeger (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 2005), 49.

with such chemical substances has an advantage for wrongdoers, as it destroys or prevents the memory from functioning well, so that they can exonerate their acts by saying they cannot feel guilty for acts they do not remember.¹⁰⁸

The process of human-animal metamorphosis, similarly as the world of monsters, has a long history beginning in ancient times in the world of myths. Its traces are also in the Greek philosophy, religious cults or in the area of folk literature, but mainly in the written literature.¹⁰⁹ One of the first and well known examples of metamorphous transformation may be noticed in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, as well as in the case of the figures of Medusa and Lucifer, as discussed already in the chapter 3.2. *Metamorphoses* influenced many later writers, such as Milton, Goethe, Wordsworth or Kafka. In his story, Ovid uses the process of metamorphosis as a means of relating the inner workings of the mind to the workings of nature reconciling the human with the outside-human.¹¹⁰ So the world in the ancient times might be characterized by its relative changeability and instability where Gods could transform into animals or forces of nature arbitrarily. During the Middle Ages and Renaissance, however, this was reversed as the stability and invariance were preferred. Therefore the idea of metamorphosis usually caused fear and resistance. During the Romantic era, metamorphosis appears in oral folk literature, Gothic novel as well as romantic prose and poetry. Romantic writers, protesting against rationality of Enlightenment, discover mythical world of folk literature with irrational alternative to the mechanical model or the world but also the natural ethical order. They are excited by the supernatural which they consider as a human attempt to overreach themselves and be closer to the principles of existence and non-existence.¹¹¹

So, as Gallagher says, metamorphosis is a powerful and versatile concept that can be used in various ways and contexts to achieve different effects and has been adapted from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* to different literary styles and genres. The scientist might associate metamorphosis with scientific phenomena of change that he observes in the natural world, while a religious man may think of biblical stories

¹⁰⁸ Theodore Dalrymple, "Mr Hyde and the Epidemiology of Evil," *New Criterion* 23 (2004): 24–25.

¹⁰⁹ Peprník, *Metamorfóza*, 20.

¹¹⁰ David Barry Desmond Asker, *Aspects of Metamorphosis: Fictional Representations of the Becoming Human* (Amsterdam: Rodopi Bv Editions, 2001), 2.

¹¹¹ Peprník, *Metamorfóza*, 22–23.

such as Lot's wife being transformed into a pillar of salt or the transfiguration or resurrection of Christ.¹¹²

Similarly as the concept of duality, metamorphosis is also significant process of Scottish literature. What also seems to be connected with the idea of transformation and metamorphosis is the concept of protean figure. Unlike the characters that undergo the process of metamorphosis, protean figures can change into any form whenever they wish.¹¹³

¹¹² David Gallagher, *Metamorphosis: Transformations of the Body and the Influence of Ovid's Metamorphoses on Germanic Literature in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009), 11.

¹¹³ Encyclopædia Britannica, "Protean Figure," accessed March 13, 2015, <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/479616/Protean-figure>.

4. The Monsters

This chapter is devoted to the analysis of the monsters and monstrosity in the four chosen novels. Before analyzing the novels, there is a short general introduction to each of the novel that contains the context of the individual novels, dealing with, for example, the novel's creation and concise summary. The analysis of the monsters comprises primarily of the monster's creation or history, special abilities, physical appearance and mental capacities. There are also processes of dualism and metamorphosis applied to the novels and its monsters. The fourth subchapter deals with a comparison of the four monsters with an aim to identify the most horrifying monster. The final subchapter focuses on the general findings of the monsters and monstrosity of the 19th century British novels, which is shown on the analyzed novels. At last, the most terrifying monster of this paper.

4.1. The Case of the Human Created Monster: *Frankenstein's Monster*

The novel *Frankenstein* (1818) was written by the English novelist Mary Shelley (1797 – 1851). She composed the story while on a summer trip to Switzerland with her husband-to-be Percy Shelley and their friend Lord Byron.¹¹⁴ *Frankenstein* was firstly written as a short story after the poet Lord Byron suggested his friends each write a ghost story. The story so frightened Byron that he ran shrieking from the room.¹¹⁵ There are various sources that are said to be a crucial contribution to the creation of the novel. Some of them consist, for example, of the fact that Mary gave birth to a daughter who died in two weeks. The main sources of inspiration for Shelley, however, are seen in the scientific explorations of Humphry Davy, who is said to animate a piece of vermicelli, and Luigi Galvani, who revived a dead tissue. Moreover Shelley herself was educated by means of her father who was interested in new scientific thinking.¹¹⁶ As a result *Frankenstein* is often seen to be “rooted in

¹¹⁴ Grace Fleming, “Frankenstein,” *About Education*, accessed March 16, 2015, <http://homeworktips.about.com/od/bookreportprofiles/p/frankenstein.htm>.

¹¹⁵ Jeff Coghill, “Frankenstein,” *CliffsNotes*, accessed March 16, 2015, <http://www.cliffsnotes.com/literature/f/frankenstein/frankensteinat-a-glance>.

¹¹⁶ Jansson, introduction to *Frankenstein*, viii–ix.

authentic scientific ideas of the period.”¹¹⁷ *Frankenstein* became an immediate bestseller, nowadays recognized as one of the first ‘monster stories.’

The novel is a classical Gothic fiction with fatalistic and dark atmosphere. It deals largely with sublime, especially in terms of its setting. There is a Romantic image of nature, mountains and the Alps that evoke the sublime feelings of something huge outside the society that humans cannot grasp, offering free space for the monster. The theme of the novel seems to be a warning to the humanity. Frankenstein’s blind pursuit of knowledge or the fact he keeps his creation as a secret are mistakes that ultimately leads him to his own destruction. The novel argues that any attempt to attain perfection will ultimately end in ruin.

The story is about Victor Frankenstein, an eager scientist, who discovers the secret of life and creates an intelligent but horrifying monster which he repudiates. The monster is unable to find the place in the society and he gradually destroys everyone and everything Victor loves. Victor feels extremely guilty for that but he is helpless in preventing the monster from ruining his life.

What plays an important role in the life of Frankenstein’s monster and his agony is already the way he is created. The moment Frankenstein’s experimental creation comes to life, the gruesome appearance of the monster horrifies Victor and he escapes in terror. When creating a monster so ugly and monstrous, Victor probably does not realize that there is any chance the monster might be the object of human’s affection. So that the monster is discarded to the edge of the society immediately the moment he is created. The fact that there is not a single feminine element in his life and that he is not the product of love between a man and a woman but only a scientific experiment seems crucial. It might be said that he is born both of the natural, as he is made of natural body parts, and supernatural, as the way of his creation is scientifically strange.¹¹⁸ What also contributes to monster’s affliction is the fact the monster has no name and throughout his life he is referred to, by Victor or others, only as ‘creature,’ ‘monster,’ ‘fiend,’ ‘wretch,’ ‘daemon,’ or simply ‘it’. The monster, on the other hand, calls himself “Adam of your labours” or “fallen angel,”¹¹⁹ as will be explained later.

¹¹⁷ Jansson, introduction to *Frankenstein*, ix.

¹¹⁸ Peter Brooks, “What is a Monster? (According to Frankenstein),” in *Frankenstein: Mary Shelley*, ed. Fred Botting (London: Macmillan, 1995), 83.

¹¹⁹ Shelley, *Frankenstein*, 77.

Left alone by his creator, the monster finds his own way to the unknown world but he encounters only negative experience and is attacked by people who are terrified and disgusted by him. In the course of time the monster finds a secret place in a hut near the cottage and he gradually falls in love with its residents. Unfortunately for him, when he finally performs his plan of meeting them, he again encounters only rejection, hatred, violence and despair.

It is mainly his physical appearance that so disgusts everyone and prevents him from being happy in the human society. It might be said that it confirms the Schlegel's claim that despair and pain are the results of ugliness, as written in the theoretical part. His ugliness also prevents him to have any contact with people so no one can learn how he really is in his mind. What is the first problematic difference of the monster is his size and anyone who meets him is shocked by his "gigantic stature."¹²⁰ He is approximately three meters high so his size is evidently unnatural as well as other physical aspects.

His yellow skin scarcely covered the work of muscles and arteries beneath; his hair was of a lustrous black, and flowing; his teeth of a pearly whiteness; but these luxuriances only formed a more horrid contrast with his watery eyes, that seemed almost of the same colour as the dun white sockets in which they were set, his shrivelled complexion and straight black lips.¹²¹

So besides his "terrible size", which seems to "exceed that of man," it is his "deformity" and "unearthly ugliness"¹²² that make him so monstrous. However, although Victor feels horror and disgust upon seeing the inhuman creation of his, there are also certain human 'luxuriances' such as monster's hair or teeth, being in contrast with the inhuman qualities that seem to evoke both sublimity and terror. "While unfinished; he was ugly then; but when those muscles and joints were rendered capable of motion,"¹²³ his being starts to be unbearably hideous. So the fact he is so ugly and monstrous is caused in the moment when this dead body, marked with post-mortem decomposition processes, is brought to life. Therefore it might be

¹²⁰ Anna E. Clark, "Frankenstein; or, the Modern Protagonist," *ELH* 81 (2014): 257–258.

¹²¹ Shelley, *Frankenstein*, 45.

¹²² Shelley, *Frankenstein*, 60.

¹²³ Shelley, *Frankenstein*, 46.

assumed, as stated by Foucault in the theoretical part, that he is a mixture of life and death. Moreover the monster himself is horrified at his own reflection in the lake.

At first I started back, unable to believe that it was indeed I who was reflected in the mirror; and when I became fully convinced that I was in reality the monster that I am, I was filled with the bitterest sensations of despondence and mortification.¹²⁴

From this quote it might be seen that at a moment he sees himself in a reflection of a pool, he becomes aware of his own otherness, ugliness and monstrosity. He even acknowledges this fact and calls himself 'the monster.' So he probably realizes that with this monstrous appearance he cannot live among humans and lead an ordinary life so sometimes he wishes to end his misery by death. He also wishes that Victor never created him. This might be said, moreover, to reflect Jacques Lacan's scenario of the infant's discovery of his reflected self, so called mirror stage. In the monster's case, he sees himself in the pool as in the mirror and discovers that he is different from all the other humans he has met and perceives himself as the violation of the law.¹²⁵

The monster also possesses a few special physical as well as psychical skills or abilities. He is, for example, able to endure great cold temperatures and live in the open nature or in the uncomfortable or unnatural conditions without any great trouble, such as in the ice-caves of the glaciers or on a bed of dried leaves.¹²⁶ He is a possessor of a great strength and power and if he intends so, he could kill, oppose and empower anyone. So he is biologically as well as intellectually superior over humans. He is able to overcome great pain and hunger as he could survive only by eating small fruits such as raspberries.

He is also intelligent as he is able to learn very quickly, study and reflect on classical books. He learns to read and studies three texts among which is also Milton's *Paradise Lost* from which he embraces his own state and, as already said in the theoretical part, compares himself to both Adam and Satan. "Remember, that I am thy creature; I ought to be thy Adam; but I am rather the fallen angel, whom thou drivest from joy for no misdeed."¹²⁷ Although he is a unique creation, as Adam, he is

¹²⁴ Shelley, *Frankenstein*, 88.

¹²⁵ Brooks, *What is a Monster?*, 88.

¹²⁶ Sheley, *Frankenstein*, 112–113.

¹²⁷ Shelley, *Frankenstein*, 77.

rather alone, wretched and helpless as Satan. Moreover, similarly as Satan, the monster undergoes the process of metamorphosis as will be seen later in this subchapter. He even thinks his state is worse than that of Satan as he says that “Satan had his companions, fellow-devils, to admire and encourage him; but I am solitary and abhorred.”¹²⁸

Besides his mental intellect and ability to study literature, his speech seems very polite and elegant too. As the language enables the monster to make a relation with others and experience the human love, he wants to make himself acquainted with it. It offers him “the possibility of escape from ‘monsterism’.”¹²⁹ So when the monster plans to meet his favourite cottagers, he firstly wants to be a master of their language. “I ought not to make the attempt until I had first become master of their language; which knowledge might enable me to make them overlook the deformity of my figure.”¹³⁰ What proves his great intelligence and capability of learning is the fact he becomes able to express himself well, and shows himself to be a great rhetorician, speaking with the highest elegance and logic. As Brooks claims, the monster is ‘the most eloquent creature in the novel.’ So his verbal qualities seem to be the opposite of the monstrous and therefore it might be said that the visual contradicts the verbal.¹³¹ The monster is so eloquently proficient that in spite of the horror Victor feels, the monster is able to persuade him in creating a female companion and to feel compassion. “His words had a strange effect upon me. I compassionated him, and sometimes felt a wish to console him.”¹³² However, Victor is not the only person who is astonished by monster’s speech and eloquence. Similarly the old man de Lacey seems to be touched and sympathizes with the monster until Felix, Agatha and Safie enter the cottage. “I am blind, and cannot judge of your countenance, but there is something in your words which persuades me that you are sincere.”¹³³ As de Lacey is blind, he is the first person who does not scream in disgust and shock when encountering the monster, which pleases the monster.

As for the mental state, in the beginning of his life, it seems that his heart is good without any negative or evil thoughts. He is rather like an innocent and sensitive child who gradually learns and discovers the world. The problem is that he

¹²⁸ Shelley, *Frankenstein*, 100.

¹²⁹ Brooks, *What is a Monster?*, 86.

¹³⁰ Shelley, *Frankenstein*, 88.

¹³¹ Brooks, *What is a Monster?*, 83–84.

¹³² Shelley, *Frankenstein*, 113.

¹³³ Shelley, *Frankenstein*, 103.

has no support or assistance. From the beginning, the monster has an undeniable desire to integrate into the common human life, but it always fails because of his terrible appearance. As the monster himself claims, he wanted to be a good person, but his greatest desire is to be loved, which is an urge he cannot and does not get.

Believe me, Frankenstein: I was benevolent; my soul glowed with love and humanity: but am I not alone, miserably alone? You, my creator, abhor me; what hope can I gather from your fellow-creatures who owe me nothing? They spurn and hate me.¹³⁴

Monster's good deeds are not sufficient for any human to suppress the disgust evoked when seeing the monster. So as the monster cannot find anybody to love him, he wishes Victor to create him a female creature as ugly and monstrous as himself with whom he could spend his life. However, as his desire of a companion is not fulfilled and because he is constantly met with people who reject him, he becomes disappointed by the whole humanity and promises the war against all humans, but primarily revenge to his creator. So when Victor as well as the cottagers, whom he loved, abandon and hate him, and later, when Victor destroys the female monster that the Monster wished him to create, his soul changes towards hatred and he starts to commit evil. He murders, for example, Victor's little brother William, Victor's best friend Henry Clerval and his great love and wife Elizabeth which also results in death of Victor's father. These are, however, the evil acts in the name of revenge as Victor becomes his main and only enemy. Monster's suffering seems to be finished with the death of Victor. After that the monster chooses to self-destruct himself. Monster's death, however, is not present in the book so it might be only assumed that he really performs it.

From what has been said about his mentality, his evil side was not part of his being in the beginning, firstly his only desires were love, compassion and company. So the monster becomes evil because of the circumstances that he experiences. This is claimed by Roth, as well as Russell, in the subchapter about the psychology of monsters. They say that environmental influences are very important especially in the early stages of people. The fact that the monster was not given any good example

¹³⁴ Shelley, *Frankenstein*, 78.

in his early 'childhood' by upbringing or moral education, it might be the reason he has become the evil murderer.

So it might be said that the monster is transformed from good to evil. Therefore he undergoes a mental transformation or metamorphosis, as claimed by Zimbardo and Peprník earlier. He does not change his appearance neither he undergoes human-animal metamorphosis, but his 'good' mind changes towards 'evil.' The monster himself sees his transformation as there might be seen his understanding of change from a good Lucifer to 'malignant devil,' Satan.

When I run over the frightful catalogue of my sins, I cannot believe that I am the same creatures whose thoughts were once filled with sublime and transcendent visions of the beauty and the majesty of goodness. But it is even so; the fallen angel becomes a malignant devil.¹³⁵

The circumstances causing the metamorphosis in this monster's case are mainly social as well as familial, as he is driven to commit evil due to the fact that the society does not accept him, apparently mainly because of his appearance. Moreover he also does not have any family who could provide him sufficient education, refuge and also the feeling of love and safeness. So it might be said that who is to blame for his evil is the society as well as Victor Frankenstein who, as a creator or the 'father' of his monster, does not provide him what his creation, 'child,' or a new member of the society needs. Moreover, in terms of Freud's Oedipal complex, the mother here represents an essential lack for the monster, as written above. So the monster's primal erotic experience here is directly Oedipal censored from the beginning. Therefore it might be said that father has forbidden the son to have the mother as an erotic object. The monster strives to find another woman object throughout his life, but all censored at the root, his erotic drives turn to death drives, to sadism.¹³⁶

So it seems that the sources of evil in case of the monster are his ugliness, his creator who left him, upon whom he retaliate himself and the society. The monster is indisputably monstrous due to his ugly and inhuman appearance which is asymmetric and deformed, which causes him to transform into an evil revengeful being committing many evil crimes.

¹³⁵ Shelley, *Frankenstein*, 168–169.

¹³⁶ Brooks, *What is a Monster?*, 90–91.

4.2. The Case of the Sinner in the Hands of a Devil: *Robert Wringhim*

The novel *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner* (1824, hereafter *The Private Memoirs*) by Scottish novelist James Hogg (1770 – 1835) was not so successful at a time of its publication but was rediscovered in 1940s. The novel extensively uses the context of the Scottish history, mainly the extraordinary social, political and doctrinal tensions are perceptible making it a very ‘Scottish novel.’¹³⁷ As already written in the theoretical part, the dualism in the Scottish literature is largely used, and Hogg’s *The Private Memoirs* is not an exception. The novel is, however, also seen as a satire of the Church, featuring psychotic discourse to examine the madness, split personality and sociopathic behavior of the main character by means of the Scottish Gothic.¹³⁸

The novel follows the story of Robert Wringhim who under the influence of a strict religious family and a mysterious stranger, later discovered to be Satan, commits a series of murders. From the beginning, the story seems as a description of political, familial and religious conflict, but there are, however, some mysterious events, especially the appearance of a dark stranger, that allude to the supernatural intrigues. With psychological accuracy the novel illustrates what effects a religious fanaticism may have on a person.

The fact that Robert’s half-brother George with whom he has the same aristocratic and infidel father, Laird of Dalcastle, is living with his father a rich and godless life, seems to provoke envy and hatred in Robert. He, on the other hand, is brought up by his religiously fanatical mother and reverend Robert Wringhim, which contributes to his similarly fanatical mentality. From the beginning he heard by his fanatical family “only evil spoken of his reputed father and brother.”¹³⁹ And, moreover, he is taught by his reverend father that, as one of the Elect, he has a secured place in Heaven, no matter what he does on earth. This seems an important aspect in his life as he thinks he has a power to do anything without being responsible or punished. So the way he is brought up appears to be significant. As said by Roth in the theoretical part, his childhood experience and the environment he

¹³⁷ David Blair, introduction to *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner*, by James Hogg (London: Wordsworth Editions, 2003), viii.

¹³⁸ Scott Brewster, “Borderline Experience Madness, Mimicry and Scottish Gothic,” *Scottish Gothic Studies* 7 (2009): 79.

¹³⁹ James Hogg, *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner* (1997; London: Wordsworth Editions, 2003), 15.

grows at, primarily the fact his real father disapproves of him and the fanaticism that surrounds him, influences him as in the future.

He gradually starts to pray against his 'wicked' brother and father and he also wants them to be carried into hell. His hatred, however, expands as he also wishes to purify the world of all the infidel wicked people. "I felt great indignation against all the wicked of this world, and often wished for the means of ridding it of such a noxious burden."¹⁴⁰ This may be considered a moment when his evil thoughts are beginning to empower Robert. So he begins to dishonour and punish everyone that seem not 'morally good' or pious enough. What appears to be important is the fact that he likes and even enjoys punishing people and transgressing. When he gets into a trouble, he also lies a lot. He himself claims that he can "hardly describe the joy that it gave to my heart to see a wicked creature suffering."¹⁴¹ As said in the theoretical chapter about the psychology of monsters, his joy in lying and making victims suffer make him a very evil person, a psychopath, who probably also does not feel any compassion or empathy. Nevertheless his thoughts and acts might be rather claimed to be contradictory to what a religiously devoted person should do or think. He also says that every sin and lie lead to another. However, as he is sinning more, he seems to be also more confused and starts to be afraid of losing God, the one he truly worships.

I got into great confusion relating to my sins and repitances, and knew neither where to begin nor how to proceed, and often had great fears that I was wholly without Christ, and that I would find God a consuming fire to me. I could not help running into new sins continually.¹⁴²

What is a great turn in his life is a moment he meets a dark stranger, Gil-Martin, who might be considered a Protean figure as he is capable of transforming his physical appearance whenever and to whatever he wishes. Although Robert's mother and reverend father, assume that Gil-Martin is "an agent of the Devil,"¹⁴³ Robert does not attribute a great importance to that. Even though Gil-Martin seems not to pray and even disapproves of it, Robert considers him a very righteous man who, similarly as he, wants to purify the world of the wicked. Peprník claims that it

¹⁴⁰ Hogg, *The Private Memoirs*, 69.

¹⁴¹ Hogg, *The Private Memoirs*, 75.

¹⁴² Hogg, *The Private Memoirs*, 74.

¹⁴³ Hogg, *The Private Memoirs*, 83.

is reverend Wringhim who calls the demon from the hell by his blasphemous statement that no power of darkness could remove Robert from God's hands. By Robert's side, Gil-Martin, with his well-placed compliments, tempts Robert to transgress even more than before.¹⁴⁴

Gil-Martin compels Robert to kill a preacher which firstly shocks Robert but even though he hesitates to do that, he eventually shoots and kills his first victim anyway. Robert also seems to disapprove of Gil-Martin's suggestion of killing his brother and father but due to his eloquence, he convinces Robert that after their death he might be a possessor of all their wealth, which satisfies him. So Robert begins to persecute and mentally torture his brother and with a guidance and help of Gil-Martin he ultimately kills also his brother which leads to a death of his father. These acts of torturing, terrorizing and killing contribute to Robert's evil characteristics. Without Gil-Martin, however, it seems that Robert would not perform these evil acts as he, primarily when he is without Gil-Martin, full of 'sinful doubts.' His doubts might be a trace of human compassion and empathy which seem to be, however, gradually destroyed by Gil-Martin who always persuades Robert that everything he does is right. So it might be said that he is partly a victim as he is only blindly following Gil-Martin's exhortation thinking he is doing it for the good of his religion.

There is not much what might be noted about Robert's good side. The only point might be his presumably good intentions behind his religion. However, no matter how hard he might try to be a good person and to be truly faithful to God, the results of his actions, mainly his hatred and vengeance on the infidel, are often negative making him rather an evil and mad fanatic and murderer, as the narrative of the editor confirms. From the beginning of his confessions, he describes his life as miserable, full of sorrow and vengeance which chases him throughout the whole life. Even though he, after the deaths of his father and brother, becomes the Laird of Dalcastle, his state is even worse. He says that "with my riches, my unhappiness was increased."¹⁴⁵ His final 'reward' for his efforts to purify the world of the wicked is his damnation and eventually also his suicide.

¹⁴⁴ Peprník, *Metamorfóza*, 75.

¹⁴⁵ Hogg, *The Private Memoirs*, 126.

An interesting fact is that Robert often speculates that he has a ‘second self,’ his own likeness, the feeling as if he is ‘bewitched.’

I generally conceived myself to be two people. When I lay in bed, I deemed there were two of us in it; when I sat up I always beheld another person, and always in the same position from the place where I sat or stood, which was about three paces off me towards my left side.¹⁴⁶

Moreover he says that it seems to him he has no power over his reasoning and mind and that he rarely conceives himself to be any of these two people. It might be therefore said that his self is accompanied by the devil who becomes the real possessor of his being and Robert is only a ‘puppet in the hands of a devil.’ This reasoning might be also confirmed by what has been said in the theoretical part that the devil might be an uncontrollable force in the unconscious. Botting argues similarly when he claims that the strange double persecutes Robert and he is tortured by terrible voices and hideous, nightmarish fiends to the extent he no longer possesses any sense of self.¹⁴⁷ Dalrymple says that Gil-Martin is the universal double suggesting that the devil is within all of us, which confirms the statement of both Zimbardo and Russel from the theoretical part that evil is in every man. Robert, however, mistakes his double for a theological and moral guide.¹⁴⁸ So the devil is Robert’s second self who guides him to commit evil and Robert cannot do anything to change it as the devil is part of his mind. When Gil-Martin appears firstly to the Robert, he looks like Robert which might suggest that he is his ‘other self.’ So Gil-Martin becomes his ‘shadow’ who haunts Robert, his devilish outside, but at the same time he is part of Robert. It might even seem that they are almost like a single being as Robert says that he “could not live out of his society.”¹⁴⁹ Moreover Gil-Martin confesses that they are almost like one person when saying that “our beings are amalgamated, as it were, and consociated in one, and never shall I depart from this country until I can carry you in triumph with me.”¹⁵⁰ So this duality of Robert, which is very apparent in this novel, confirms the usage of dualism in this novel.

¹⁴⁶ Hogg, *The Private Memoirs*, 106.

¹⁴⁷ Botting, *Gothic*, 72.

¹⁴⁸ Dalrymple, “Mr Hyde and the Epidemiology of Evil,” 25.

¹⁴⁹ Hogg, *The Private Memoirs*, 89.

¹⁵⁰ Hogg, *The Private Memoirs*, 130.

What seems worth noticing is that after meeting Gil-Martin, Robert's mother as well as reverend say that, similarly as Gil-Martin is capable of transforming his appearance, Robert seems transformed too. It might suggest that in the hands of this devil, Robert becomes truly evil and he undergoes, similarly as Frankenstein's monster the process of mental metamorphosis, as he does even more evil crimes than before. Later in the story, Robert himself is recognized as a devil so it could be remarked that he undergoes also a physical transformation. In the beginning, his physical appearance, even though 'repulsive,' is more or less normal and not terrifying. As for his physical strength, he is rather a coward because when encountering his opponents, mainly George, he does not feel embarrassed to beg for mercy. "Spare my life, dear, good brother! Spare my life!"¹⁵¹ Moreover he often bleeds from his nose which is rather connected to a cowardice. Robert's change in appearance is noted mainly by Mrs Calvert, who investigates with Mrs Logan George's death and she describes Robert as a being that is 'altered to the worse' and he looks like a devil.

I never in my life saw any human being, said Mrs. Calvert, whom I thought so like a fiend. If a demon could inherit flesh and blood, that youth is precisely such a being as I could conceive that demon to be. The depth and the malignity of his eye is hideous. His breath is like the airs from a charnel house, and his flesh seems fading from his bones, as if the worm that never dies were gnawing it away already.¹⁵²

By others he is similarly perceived as looking like a demon as he is, for example, called "a monster of nature" or "an incarnate devil."¹⁵³ Later when he stays overnight at weaver's house, for example, both he and his wife "are alarmed at my looks,"¹⁵⁴ the weaver being convinced he is the Devil. He himself gradually feels terrorized about his own existence and he even does not dare to look in a mirror "for I shuddered at my own image and likeness."¹⁵⁵ The fact he changes not only inside but also in the outside is confirmed by Botting who claims that Hogg's novel performs two strategies. First strategy examines the mental deterioration from the inside, the other from the outside. So the renderings of the uncanny are internally presented with

¹⁵¹ Hogg, *The Private Memoirs*, 32.

¹⁵² Hogg, *The Private Memoirs*, 64.

¹⁵³ Hogg, *The Private Memoirs*, 144.

¹⁵⁴ Hogg, *The Private Memoirs*, 146.

¹⁵⁵ Hogg, *The Private Memoirs*, 157.

the attention on doubles and mirrors, and externally objectified as cases of criminal or psychological degeneration.¹⁵⁶ The main function of the metamorphosis, as stated by Peprník in the theoretical part, is here to cause Robert's fall. Robert's metamorphosis, as Peprník claims, might be said to be gradual as he changes from a smug, lofty but also feckless character, followed by both mental and physical desintegration, to a person not only possessed by a devil but thereafter also becoming a devil.

Above that Peprník claims that Robert's personality goes through three stages, a shadow, a phantom and a zombie. He becomes a shadow because, similarly as Gil-Martin haunts and destroys Robert, Robert haunts and destroys his brother George. The stage of a phantom refers to the moment when George sees Robert in a fog on the top of a mountain in Edinburgh. George's friend explains this as a natural optical phenomenon while Robert in his narrative implies that it might be one of the Gil-Martin's enchantments in order to divert George's attention so that Robert could come closer unnoticed. His third stage, a zombie, refers to the physical metamorphosis as recognized by Mrs Calvert and Mrs Logan.¹⁵⁷ Another fact that seems to contribute to Robert's metamorphosis is when Gil-Martin gives to Robert his clothes to escape from angry mob of people who are outraged thinking that Robert has done the murders, as it is from this moment he starts to be recognized as a devil.

What seems to be the devil's true aim, to lead Robert to damnation away from God, might be said to be implemented as he is gradually destroyed and driven to commit suicide.

It was in vain that I reasoned on the sinfulness of the deed, and on its damning nature; he made me condemn myself out of my own mouth, by allowing the absolute nature of justifying grace and the impossibility of the elect ever falling from the faith, or the glorious end to which they were called; and then he said, this granted, self-destruction was the act of a hero, and none but a coward would shrink from it.¹⁵⁸

Moreover, it is possible to argue that at the end Robert is eventually led to damnation. He is, however, presumably not fully dead as when his grave is dig many

¹⁵⁶ Botting, *Gothic*, 73.

¹⁵⁷ Peprník, *Metamorfóza*, 62–68.

¹⁵⁸ Hogg, *The Private Memoirs*, 161.

years after his death, his body seems still ‘fresh,’ which only supposedly might refer to Robert’s stage of zombie, as claimed by Peprník above.

As for the monstrosity of Robert, he is firstly monstrous only in his mind due to his evil acts and murders but later he becomes monstrous also by his appearance as he looks like and is recognized as the Devil so after that he becomes monstrous both mentally and physically. The main source of cause of Robert’s metamorphosis seems to be his narcissistic nature and his fanatical religion that makes people blind and its absurd ideas summon the devil who punishes Robert. So, as stated by Dalrymple, particularly Robert’s belief in his election predisposes him to commit evil but he is as well evil by his nature as he was born envious, arrogant and hypocritical. It is therefore necessary to claim that Robert is temperamentally predisposed to the doctrine of election by predestination and he probably uses it as a ‘convenient mask for his own unscrupulousness.’¹⁵⁹ So what plays an important role in Robert’s monstrosity is his childhood and the environment in which he is brought up. Because he is not taught properly what is good and what is not, as Elbert claims in the chapter about the psychology of monsters, he becomes an evil criminal who enjoys it. Moreover he does not really realize the evil he has committed and does not learn or progress. He rather assumes that his main sin was a lack of faith in his own election and failure in his great mission of purifying the world.¹⁶⁰ This makes him even more evil and monstrous.

4.3. The Case of the Human Double: *Mr. Hyde*

The story of *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886, hereafter *The Strange Case*) written by a Scottish novelist Robert Louis Stevenson (1850 – 1894) met with a similar success as *Frankenstein* with thousands of copies sold in the first half year after its publication. Stevenson claims that the main idea for this story came to him in a dream and the first draft was written in only three days. Nevertheless since Stevenson’s wife complained about its reliance upon Gothic conventions, he threw it into the fire and rewrote it again in three days of a feverish industry.¹⁶¹ As

¹⁵⁹ Dalrymple, “Mr Hyde and the Epidemiology of Evil,” 26–27.

¹⁶⁰ Peprník, *Metamorfóza*, 79.

¹⁶¹ Dr Tim Middleton, introduction to *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, by Robert Louis Stevenson (Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 1999), ix.

Botting claims, the novel's duality of good and evil echoes the dualities in the story of a *The Private Memoirs*.¹⁶² This dualism is central in the novel and is connected mainly to the principle of 'good vs. evil,' corresponding to Dr Jekyll and Mr. Hyde respectively. The novel has various kinds of other interpretations. According to Freud's psychoanalysis, for example, Jekyll might be seen as an embodiment of the rational and conscious ego while Hyde as the unconscious and instinctive id. Or, the double life of Jekyll and Hyde can be also seen as parallel to 'the necessarily double life of the Victorian homosexual.'¹⁶³

This short novel, or novella, features a London lawyer named Utterson who investigates a strange case of his old friend and respectable doctor Jekyll who transforms himself into a savage and evil murderer, Edward Hyde. Later Hyde empowers Jekyll and his evil doing finally leads to the destruction of both.

Dr Jekyll, "a large, well-made, smooth-faced man of fifty, with something of a slyish cast perhaps, but every mark of capacity and kindness."¹⁶⁴ This is a description of Jekyll that clearly suggests that he is a decent, respectable and well established man. Nevertheless, there is also something 'dark' about him as his behavior might be also recognized as hypocritical, and he has hidden immoral thoughts and needs for which he feels guilty. He realizes that and wants to deprive himself of this burden. However, although he wants to enjoy his vices, he knows his status of a respectable doctor would be shaken. So while considering the way of solving this conflict, he becomes to be convinced about the possible duality of a human personality and he intends to separate his being into good and evil side. He hopes that splitting his personality would help him and that "life would be relieved of all that was unbearable" so that "the unjust might go his way, the just could walk steadfastly and securely on his upward path, doing the good things in which he found his pleasure."¹⁶⁵ When dreaming of such a state of his, he gradually becomes to be persuaded that he is able to do it.

With every day, and from both sides of my intelligence, the moral and the intellectual, I thus drew steadily nearer to that truth by whose partial

¹⁶² Botting, *Gothic*, 90.

¹⁶³ James Campbell, "The Beast Within," *The Guardian*, accessed April 3, 2015, <http://www.theguardian.com/books/2008/dec/13/dr-jekyll-mr-hyde-stevenson>.

¹⁶⁴ Robert Louis Stevenson, *Dr Jekyll and Mr. Hyde with The Merry Men and Other Stories*. (Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 1999), 14.

¹⁶⁵ Stevenson, *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, 43.

discovery I have been doomed to such a dreadful shipwreck: that man is not truly one, but truly two.¹⁶⁶

After a couple of scientific experiments, he finally succeeds in mixing a drug which he drinks and he brings to life his evil side, “the monster” called Edward Hyde. Jekyll then has “two characters as well as two appearances, one was wholly evil, and the other was still the old Henry Jekyll.”¹⁶⁷ Jekyll’s evil side is brought to life only for the purpose of entertainment and committing crimes as a means to release repressed instincts of a man trapped by conventions of a time. It might be stated that it is not the chemicals that create the evil in Jekyll but they only release it from the chains in his virtue that has imprisoned it. Once he gives in to the attractions of evil, he decisively changes the balance between good and evil within him.

It is hard to characterize Hyde’s personality as he is the mirror of a common man’s lowest lusts. His recklessness and roughness do not relate only to his being, but also to Jekyll where they are intermingled with the positive part of his character. Jekyll shares with Hyde his body, consciousness and memory and in the beginning he acknowledges Hyde as a natural part of his being. The observation that Hyde is “in many points identical”¹⁶⁸ with Jekyll occurs early in the story. Mr. Hyde is, however, different from Jekyll in many aspects. Not only Hyde’s psyche is different from Dr. Jekyll but also his body is grotesque and deformed. He is a small, deformed and pale man with “displeasing smile”, hoarse and silent voice, being both timid and bold at the same time. Mr. Enfield, as well as many others who encounter him, claim that Hyde evokes disgust, and is a person of degraded and primitive roots.¹⁶⁹ “I never saw a man I so disliked,” confesses Enfield, “and yet I scarce know why.”¹⁷⁰ So there is also something inconsistent in his character as it is not easy for people to describe him. This might be caused by the fact he is a strange mixture of human and animal characteristics. His impurity, formlessness, and incompleteness suggest he is similar to an animal. “It wasn’t like a man, it was like some damned juggernaut,”¹⁷¹ which might be defined as something that is “extremely large and powerful and cannot be

¹⁶⁶ Stevenson, *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, 42.

¹⁶⁷ Stevenson, *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, 45.

¹⁶⁸ Stevenson, *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, 22.

¹⁶⁹ Stevenson, *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, 11–12.

¹⁷⁰ Stevenson, *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, 7.

¹⁷¹ Stevenson, *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, 5.

stopped.”¹⁷² Moreover he is also described as a devilish creature with “a Satan’s signature upon a face.”¹⁷³

Dalrymple implies that evil is an alien force over which we have no control, to what Stevenson replies that if we make a habit of indulging to evil, our capacity for it will be indefinitely enlarged, until it overwhelms us utterly. So as Jekyll enjoys being Hyde, and by a time he acts as Hyde for too long, the transformative chemicals begin to lose their power, and have to be taken in even larger doses before they both lose their efficacy altogether leading to the fact that Jekyll becomes fully and permanently Hyde.¹⁷⁴ It seems, however, that both Jekyll and Hyde need each other at a first place as Jekyll uses Hyde to enjoy the pleasures in the guise of Hyde. And Hyde, on the other hand, uses Jekyll to escape the rebuke and punishment.¹⁷⁵ So soon Jekyll ceases to refer to his other self in the first person and begins to use the third at a time when Hyde has already established the dominance over Jekyll. Jekyll’s indulgence of Hyde leads to a gradual recession of Jekyll and prosperity of Hyde.

Hyde commits evil by, for example, menacing society at night, trampling a girl in the street or murdering Sir Danvers Carew. Hyde conducts crimes without any possibility of regulation. As Peprník claims, he is an embodiment of everything that Victorian society regards as evil, inhuman and animal as well as characteristic of frightening atavism from the mists of time.¹⁷⁶ Jekyll himself is aware of his state when claiming that he “was the common quarry of mankind, hunted, houseless, a known murderer, thrall to the gallows.”¹⁷⁷ So Jekyll eventually recognizes his fatal mistake and admits that the good and evil are contradictory as well as complementary qualities that cannot exist separately. Jekyll is finally helpless to change his state or prevent Hyde from destroying his whole personality, so he commits suicide to prevent Hyde to commit other crimes. By committing a suicide, he kills both Jekyll and Hyde.

Therefore it might be said that Jekyll, not Hyde, undergoes a process of metamorphosis. The transformation happens inside the self of Dr. Jekyll who longs

¹⁷² “Juggernaut,” *Merriam-Webster*, An Encyclopædia Britannica Company, accessed April 4, 2015, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/juggernaut>.

¹⁷³ Stevenson, *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, 9–12.

¹⁷⁴ Dalrymple, “Mr Hyde and the Epidemiology of Evil,” 27.

¹⁷⁵ Botting, *Gothic*, 92.

¹⁷⁶ Peprník, *Metamorfóza*, 103.

¹⁷⁷ Stevenson, *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, 51.

for something that is impossible ultimately reaching self-destruction.¹⁷⁸ So he experiences similar metamorphosis as suggested by Peprník because part of Jekyll changes from a human-like decent person to an animal-like creature. It is, however, different in the fact that Jekyll is still alive and at first he has control over his transformation but later he is becoming gradually fully Hyde, as written above. So Jekyll is a manifestation of human regression to a primitive evil monster. Jekyll's transformation is noted, for example, by his servant, Mr. Poole, who proclaims almost the same statement as was said about Robert Wringhim above that he has "altered for the worse."¹⁷⁹ Jekyll realizes his transformation, for instance, when looking at his own hand which is originally "professional in shape and size; it was large, firm, white and comely." The hand he sees now, however, which belongs to Hyde, is "lean, corded, knuckly, of a dusky pallor, and thickly shaded with a swart growth of hair."¹⁸⁰

So Hyde is monstrous due to the fact he commits a lot of evil crimes and he is also deformed physically so he is monstrous both physically and mentally. The source of evil might be, however, attributed to Dr. Jekyll as he creates the evil in himself. The initial external force is also the society that so much restrains Jekyll in doing what he likes and therefore when "the devil had been long caged, he came out roaring."¹⁸¹ So after Jekyll releases Hyde from his 'prison,' he becomes exceedingly evil.

4.4. The Case of the Vampire: *Dracula*

The novel *Dracula* (1897) was written by an Irish novelist Bram Stoker (1844 – 1912). The original title of the novel was *The Un-Dead* and the decision to call it *Dracula* was made at a last minute.¹⁸² Nowadays the novel is widely considered as one of the best horror stories in English literature. It took Stoker six years to write it and when it was finally published, the novel sold well almost immediately both in England and later on the Continent. The novel has had a great impact on twentieth

¹⁷⁸ Maria Antonietta Struzziero, "The Possible Sources of the Other," *Dualism and Dualities*, accessed April 4, 2015, <http://www.scientificoatripalda.it/dualism/jekyllHydeThemes2.php>.

¹⁷⁹ Stevenson, *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, 27.

¹⁸⁰ Stevenson, *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, 47.

¹⁸¹ Stevenson, *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, 49.

¹⁸² Miller, *A Dracula Handbook*, 72.

century popular culture and inspired more than two hundred and fifty vampire movies. The inspiration for much of his plot Stoker took from an anonymous German story translated into English as *The Mysterious Stranger*. He also incorporated the erotic elements from Le Fanu's "Carmilla". Stoker, however, also relied on non-fictional texts, his brother's *With the Unspeakables* (1878) or Emily Gerard's *The Land Beyond the Forest* (1887).¹⁸³

Gerard's text introduced Stoker to the real-life fifteenth-century prince Vlad the Impaler, also known as Dracula, whose notorious reputation for staking his enemies to death served Stoker as a model for his vampire.¹⁸⁴ So Dracula is best remembered in Romanian history as a leader in the medieval struggle against the Turks. He might be perceived as a mass murderer as he tortured and murdered many citizens but also a national hero as he kept Walachia safe from invasion by the Ottoman Turks.¹⁸⁵ Dracula's family history is full of tribal migrations and conquests. His militaristic, warrior past is characterized by values of both blood and honour.¹⁸⁶

The novel is written in epistolary form with a distinctly modern cast, in shorthand but also by phonograph and typewriter. Its modernity is also signalled by a professional status of the men, Van Helsing, Mr Morris and Jonathan Harker, who unite to fight Dracula. They are the combination of aristocratic lawyers, doctors and scientists at the centre of Victorian commercial life.¹⁸⁷ So Stoker partly modernizes the tradition of the Gothic genre by these methods as well as by placing most of the plot into modern London but its dark, mysterious and horror atmosphere still remains.

The novel is about Count Dracula, a vampire, who possesses supernatural powers. He moves from his home castle in Transylvania to modern London to seek new victims whose blood he could suck. His solicitor, Jonathan Harker, whose wife Mina and their friend Lucy are then sucked by the Count, was kept prisoner on the castle and mistreated by Dracula. Jonathan with a help of a group headed Dr. Van Helsing then fights Dracula and after an exhaustive hunt they succeed in destroying him.

¹⁸³ David Rogers, introduction to *Dracula*, by Bram Stoker (Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 2000), v-x.

¹⁸⁴ Rogers, introduction to *Dracula*, x.

¹⁸⁵ Arie Kaplan, *Dracula: The Life of Vlad the Impaler* (New York: The Rosen Publishing Group, 2012), 4.

¹⁸⁶ Botting, *Gothic*, 95.

¹⁸⁷ Botting, *Gothic*, 96.

Even though it is generally known that a vampire becomes one when bitten by another vampire, in case of Dracula there is nothing that would suggest he was bitten by another of his kind. It rather seems that he learned his supernatural powers at a Devil's school, so called 'Scholomance,' that existed in Transylvanian mountains.¹⁸⁸ "He dared even to attend the Scholomance, and there was no branch of knowledge of his time that he did not essay."¹⁸⁹ At this school the devil taught secrets of nature, the language of animals and all other magic spells and charms.¹⁹⁰ So as Miller says Dracula might be perceived as a person who sold his soul to the devil for his knowledge, power and partly also immortality.¹⁹¹

Compared to the desolate home of Dracula in Transylvania, London offers more chances of acquiring blood. For this reason Dracula decides to buy a few properties there through the company for which Jonathan Harker works. It is Jonathan who horrified by Dracula describes him as first.

His face was a strong – a very strong – aquiline, with high bridge of the thin nose and peculiarly arched nostrils; with lofty domed forehead, and hair growing scantily round the temples, but profusely elsewhere. His eyebrows were very massive, almost meeting over the nose, and with bushy hair that seemed to curl in its own profusion. The mouth, so far as I could see it under the heavy moustache, was fixed and rather cruel-looking, with peculiarly sharp white teeth; these protruded over the lips, whose remarkable ruddiness showed astonishing vitality in a man of his years. For the rest, his ears were pale and at the tops extremely pointed; the chin was broad and strong, and the cheeks firm though thin. The general effect was one of the extraordinary pallor.¹⁹²

This exhaustive description indicates that his stature is contradictory, as he seems vital, strong and massive on one hand but also pale and old age on the other. His vitality and overall pale image may suggest his 'un-dead state' and the fact that he is a vampire might be manifested by his teeth which are 'peculiarly sharp' and longer than is usual. Harker mainly notices Dracula's "marked physiognomy"¹⁹³ which might be connected to his criminal behavior, as written in the theoretical part. His

¹⁸⁸ Miller, *A Dracula Handbook*, 42.

¹⁸⁹ Stoker, *Dracula*, 251.

¹⁹⁰ Emily Gerard, "Transylvanian Superstitions," *The Nineteenth Century* 18, (1885): 136.

¹⁹¹ Miller, *A Dracula Handbook*, 42.

¹⁹² Stoker, *Dracula*, 16–17.

¹⁹³ Stoker, *Dracula*, 16.

characteristics signify that he is a supernatural being but most of his figure might be recognized as human. So his physical appearance might not be said to be so monstrous as usual people may have similar features. This refers primarily to his paleness, as due to certain kind of disease or natural whiteness, for example so called Porphyria known as a vampire disease, people might be similarly pale but they are not vampires or monsters. Porphyria refers to a growing collection of disorders in which there are abnormalities in the enzymes involved in heme production. These people are often referred to as vampires and similarly as them, they are extremely sensitive to sunlight so that they prefer darkness.¹⁹⁴ It might be said that such a person may be perceived to be similarly monstrous and prospectively dangerous as a vampire. So from Harker's description of Dracula the observer might not get an impression of monstrosity in the same way as someone having an experience with the vampirism, or Porphyria.

Dracula is a very strong creature and he could oppose anyone. His strength is mentioned many times in the book and he is said to be as strong as twenty men.¹⁹⁵ He possesses many supernatural powers, such as the ability to paralyze and immobilize humans, read their minds and command animals. So he has hypnotic and seductive powers. He is also able to change his form. He can, for example, shape-shift into a fog and slip through every gap, move along a vertical wall with the agility of a lizard or to be a bat or a wolf. He also cannot be seen in the mirror which gives him a power to empower his victim stealthily. He is not becoming older but his vitality changes according to the blood income which is his only food as he does not eat or drink anything else. The more blood he sucks, the healthier and stronger he is. He also cannot be killed easily, he has to be stabbed by a wooden stake and then his head needs to be cut off. His companions are rats and wolves, whom he calls "the children of the night."¹⁹⁶

When considering all his great abilities and powers, Dracula seems almost invincible, he, however, has also a couple of weaknesses. He loathes garlic and is afraid of the crucifix and holy water. He cannot come to the house when he is not invited. He is also bound to his native soil so when moving to England, he takes fifty cases of the soil in which he sleeps during the day. In the day time he is limited to the

¹⁹⁴ Peter W. Kujtan, "Porphyria: The Vampire Disease," *A Research Guide for Students*, accessed April 6, 2015, <http://www.bydewey.com/drkporphyria.html>.

¹⁹⁵ Stoker, *Dracula*, 169.

¹⁹⁶ Stoker, *Dracula*, 17.

human capabilities therefore he prefers to rest at that time. It is not said in the book, however, that the sun would kill him when he goes out during the day but his powers are definitely weakened. Moreover, when he is not at a home place, he can change himself only at noon, sunrise or sunset.¹⁹⁷ Bearing in mind these limitations of his, the brave group of Van Helsing chooses to destroy Dracula's places of safety, boxes with native soil and kill him in his lair. Even though it seems that Dracula is impossible to defeat, their hunt is at last effective as he is killed by their knives.

Dracula also possesses a few 'positive' characteristics which are connected mainly to his past. During his long life, for example, has not idled but he educated himself in many disciplines. As written above, thanks to his "mighty brain" he has not learnt only supernatural powers but also English, the politics, the law, the finance, the science¹⁹⁸ and has read a lot of books. So he is very clever and cunning. As for his feelings, he does not seem to be 'as cold as stone' because when he, accused by his three women companions of not being able to love, says in a soft whisper that "I too can love; you yourselves can tell it from the past."¹⁹⁹ So it seems there is still something human in his body. In his non-monstrous past, he was a "most wonderful man," he was "a soldier, statesman and alchemist" and his heart "knew no fear and no remorse."²⁰⁰ So he was "no common man" as "he was spoken of as the cleverest and the most cunning as well as the bravest of the son of the land beyond the forest."²⁰¹

As an example of a classic vampire, Dracula is not only a bloodthirsty monster, but his manners might be also civilized and refined. The sophistication with which he empowers his victims is surely a sign of intellectual component but his 'refined manners' might only mask his slyness and true intentions to get hold of his victims more easily. He has a clear disregard for human life which can be felt from the following quote stated by Dracula when he escapes from the trap planted by Van Helsing.

My revenge is just begun! I spread it over centuries, and time is on my side. Your girls that you all love are mine already; and through them you and others shall yet be

¹⁹⁷ Stoker, *Dracula*, 199.

¹⁹⁸ Stoker, *Dracula*, 267.

¹⁹⁹ Stoker, *Dracula*, 34.

²⁰⁰ Stoker, *Dracula*, 251.

²⁰¹ Stoker, *Dracula*, 200.

mine – my creatures, to do my bidding and to be my jackals when I want to feed.
Bah!²⁰²

It seems that he wants to be ‘a king of all creatures’ and, if he chooses to, he might destroy anybody anytime. If he feels threatened or anyone opposes him, as Van Helsing and his crew do, he is very revengeful. So from this quote it is clear that he does not only want to satisfy his need of blood and to survive but also to govern and to have as many slaves as his power allows.

Besides his inhuman powers, abilities and knowledge, he also commits various evil crimes. He murders several people, such as the crew of the *Demeter* ship, Renfield or he transforms Lucy into a vampire, which leads to her death. Anyone who dies of his bite soon returns from the grave, and if their head is not cut and their chest punctured by a wooden stick, they commit crimes among the residents by sucking their blood. The act of blood sucking itself is connected to the life threat and usually also ends with either its complete loss or vampirism of the victim who was sucked. The disgust towards vampires can be therefore attributed, in terms of ethics, to the ‘criminal behavior.’ From human perspective, these acts seem to be monstrous themselves but from the vampire’s point of view, these actions can be justified in a manner of their own survival. Van Helsing, however, claims that “as he is criminal he is selfish; and as his intellect is small and his action is based on selfishness, he confines himself to one purpose. That purpose is remorseless.”²⁰³ Moreover, in many aspects, Dracula is only ‘a selfish child.’ So as written in the subchapter about psychology of monsters, Dracula behaves like a criminal and feels no compassion or empathy. It might be also said that his bloodsucking needs could be related to his military history, as similarly as the soldiers in Kongo, he wants to see his victims suffer and his bloodsucking needs might be said to be extended as he now requires not only shed the blood but also feed on it.

Therefore the character of Dracula might be, similarly as other monsters in this paper and most vampires, said to be ambivalent as he hold not only negative but also a few positive characteristics. He is both a brave, erotic and seductive man but also an evil and dark murderer. Dracula crosses the boundaries by returning from the past and tyrannizing the present. He straddles the borders between life and death,

²⁰² Stoker, *Dracula*, 255.

²⁰³ Stoker, *Dracula*, 285.

East and West, civilization and barbarity, as well as reason and rationality. He is the dark double of the brave men who destroy him. So his duplicity is multiple representing mirrors the Victorian masculinity.²⁰⁴ He hates goodness and is very evil while at the same time he is almost charming, similarly as psychopaths, as also written in the chapter about the psychology of monsters.

Dracula might be also considered an instance of the metamorphic transformation due to the fact that, as already mentioned above, he changed from a brave warrior to a bloodsucking monster arousing terror. Dracula's race was great and noble, until the times when they "had dealings with the Evil One."²⁰⁵ His great qualities, iron nerve, subtle brain, brave heart are 'symbolic of good.' After that Dracula began his studies at Scholomance, as written above, and his 'good heart' changed towards evil. It is terrifying to claim that "he that can smile at death" who "can flourish in the midst of diseases and kill off" thousands of people "was to come from God, and not the Devil."²⁰⁶ During his vampire years, however, he is referred to as the devil and he stands for treachery, evil and Satan. This is confirmed by the fact that the word Dracula in Wallachian language means 'the devil.'²⁰⁷ His metamorphosis is, however, different from that of previous three monsters as in the novel he appears only after his metamorphous change so his metamorphosis is not happening in the book. It might be also said that he is polymorphous, referring to various shapes he assumes²⁰⁸, or as said in the theoretical part, he might be also considered a Protean figure. It is also worth mentioning that in the book Dracula is compared to Medusa, as his "folds of the flesh were the coils of Medusa's snakes"²⁰⁹ as if to suggest that as Medusa was transformed from a beautiful goddess to a monster who kills anyone who looks at her, Dracula is also transformed from a great warrior to a monster who kills by sucking blood.

The monstrosity of Dracula's character does not depend so much on the physical ugliness but stems rather from his immoral evil acts and powers contrary to the values recognized by the human community. He is scary due to the fact he is so supernatural and strong and he can kill anyone without using any weapons.

²⁰⁴ Botting, *Gothic*, 97.

²⁰⁵ Stoker, *Dracula*, 200.

²⁰⁶ Stoker, *Dracula*, 267.

²⁰⁷ Miller, *A Dracula Handbook*, 65.

²⁰⁸ Botting, *Gothic*, 97.

²⁰⁹ Stoker, *Dracula*, 176.

4.5. Comparison of the Monsters

All monsters in this paper might be said to be ambivalent, or dual, as their characters are both human and supernatural, their characteristics is not only evil but also good and moreover they might be said to not only scare but also amaze. The monsters' ambivalence is also apparent on the fact their characters might be said to consist of 'better' and 'darker' selves. Robert has a double in another person, Gil-Martin, who is his darker self, and they gradually become 'one.' Jekyll, on the other hand, separates his person to two, Jekyll being the better and Hyde the darker side of his self. It might be also said that Frankenstein's monster is the darker self of Victor and Dracula of the crew hunting him.

With regards to the human and supernatural aspects of monsters, two of the monsters, Frankenstein's monster and Hyde are the products of a scientific experiment so their creation is both natural and supernatural. Then, their appearance is both human and monstrous. The difference between them might be the fact that Frankenstein's monster is individually acting person and Mr. Hyde is part of Jekyll still connected to him. So they might be called 'the monstrous human products' made by human. Both Jekyll and Victor, the creators of these monsters, cross the borders of the established morals of the society risking not only their social status but also their life and the lives of others. So both Jekyll and Victor are punished for their temerity to 'play God' which ultimately leads to their destruction. The other two monsters, Robert and Dracula, are or become to be the supernatural creatures, belonging to a specific identifiable 'monstrous group.' Robert is led astray by his monstrous demonical companion who causes his damnation and as they become 'one', Robert also could be claimed to become the representative of the devils. Dracula wants to be a powerful, strong, knowledgeable and immortal so he 'sells his soul' to the devil, learns the supernatural powers and becomes a representative of the vampires. They both were human creatures and they become monsters after the metamorphosis they undergo. After that, however, they still possess a few human characteristics. Therefore they might be called 'the supernatural human monsters.'

Monsters' metamorphosis is a very important aspect in their lives as they all undergo mental or physical transformation to some extent. Frankenstein's monster is born as tabula rasa and becomes evil throughout his life. Primarily due to his ugliness, that is part of his being since he is 'born,' he is prevented from being able

to establish himself as a part of the society. He is a goodhearted monster who, due to the consequences and environment, is transformed into an evil monstrous killer so his metamorphosis is primarily mental. Mr. Hyde is not born but created by metamorphosis by Jekyll who wishes to divide his being into two contradictory good vs. evil parts. Hyde, however, becomes rather Jekyll's 'parasite' as he gradually harms Jekyll and commits too evil acts that Jekyll is unable to stop. With his creation, Hyde is monstrous both in his physical and mental appearance. So Jekyll-Hyde's metamorphosis happens inside of Jekyll and it happens at a moment he drinks the drug. So in Hyde's case, it is not 'the monster' who undergoes the metamorphosis but his better self and his creator, Jekyll. Robert, on the other hand, is born as a usual person, except for his envious, arrogant and hypocritical behavior, but during his life, due to the consequences and Gil-Martin who makes him to commit evil, he changes mentally but also physically. Dracula also has a non-monstrous past as he was a brave warrior with a good heart. At a moment he changes towards a monstrous vampire, he undergoes both physical and mental metamorphosis.

Concerning the physical monstrosity of the monsters, the most ugly and hideous monster is Frankenstein's monster due to the fact he is created from dead bodies, is huge and his stature is asymmetric. Therefore his appearance terrifies everyone. Robert's appearance is more or less of a usual man until he meets Gil-Martin who haunts and later also becomes Robert's self and therefore he changes to look like a devil. He is said many times to look like a demon, by Mrs. Calvert for example. As Frankenstein's monster, he is also described as death. Similarly as Frankenstein's monster, Hyde's body is also deformed and he evokes disgust. His body is formless or asymmetrical and he is said to look like an animal. Robert and Hyde, however, do not terrify and scare the characters of the books as much as Frankenstein's monster. Dracula's overall stature is pallor and his physiognomy is marked. The main difference of his physical appearance is his sharp teeth. So Robert, Dracula and Frankenstein's monster might be said to be the mixture of both life and death.

All four monsters are monstrous mentally as they commit crimes primarily by killing other people but the external sources that cause them to be evil and commit crimes are different. Frankenstein's monster kills mainly to take revenge on Victor for leaving him as he kills primarily the people Victor loves and due to the hatred

and violence he gets from people he meets. So the main external sources that make Frankenstein's monster turn evil is Victor, as he wants to determine the secrets of life and death and then he abandons his creation, the society and environment. Hyde kills because it is the desire of Jekyll to commit evil crimes which is caused mainly due to his secret hypocritical and evil thoughts that the society makes him unable to release as his reputation of a professor would be destroyed. So it is primarily the restrictions of the society residing on Jekyll and then Jekyll himself that act as the external sources of Hyde's evil. Robert kills and commits crimes due to his fanatical religion which makes him think that, as the elected person, he should eradicate the world of the infidel people. Another source of his evil is Gil-Martin who makes him commit even greater evil. Dracula kills by sucking the blood of people to survive as the blood is his food but he also seeks his victims for his selfish reasons and spreads evil where he can to govern the world. In his case, there is rather no external source that would lead him to turn evil and to be monstrous as the stimulus to sell his soul to the devil, learn the supernatural powers and govern the world comes from his own being. So in Frankenstein's monster, Hyde and Robert's case it might be said that there is an external source that lead them to their metamorphosis that causes them to be evil, primarily the society and their creators. In Dracula's case the force making him evil is only selfish, which makes him different and more monstrous in comparison to the other three monsters.

Most monsters also possess a few special or supernatural skills and powers. The most endowed in this aspect is Dracula who is a very strong, educated and clever creature. His abilities are, for example hypnotizing, shape-shifting or partial immortality. On the other hand, he also has a couple of weakness such as garlic, crucifix, holy water or his limitation during the day. The troublesome fact about Dracula is that he is so educated, strong, powerful and the most supernatural of all monsters that makes him almost unbeatable. The second most able-bodied and powerful monster is Frankenstein's monster as he is also very strong and he can overcome great pains and adverse temperatures. In Robert's case, it is his 'darker self,' Gil-Martin, his driving force who possesses supernatural powers and shape-shifting abilities. Hyde, on the other hand, does not seem to possess any supernatural powers or skills.

Worth noticing is also the fact that they are all men which might be caused by the fact that, as written in the chapter about the psychology of monsters, because of

the biological evolution primarily the men have the feeling of satisfaction when hunting. Moreover, all four monsters are compared to the Satan or the devil for which the reason might be that the devil is, as written in the theoretical part, a personification of evil and destructiveness which means that these monsters are embodiment of evil.

As regards the monsters' good side, it is Frankenstein's monster who seems the most good-hearted as he is born innocent with no evil thoughts like a child until he is transformed. Robert might be also said to have been born good but he soon becomes a fanatic believer strictly devoted to his religion assuming that everything he does is for the good of his religion. Dracula's positive characteristics might be his ability to love or his civilized and refined behavior. His good side, however, is connected rather to his life before he is transformed to a vampire. Hyde is the darker and evil side of Jekyll, who might be said to be 'better double' so Hyde alone does not seem to possess any good characteristics. What is interesting about these monsters is the fact that most of them are very clever, educated and eloquent. Dracula and Frankenstein's monster seem to be the most intelligent, clever and cunning monsters. Dracula learned at a devil school Scholomance but he is also able, as Frankenstein's monster, to study on his own. Robert, in comparison to his brother George, is also very clever and good at school. Hyde is the only monster who does not appear to be particularly able in this aspect.

As for the destruction of the monsters, Robert is the only one who commits suicide as he is driven to it by Gil-Martin. Hyde also commits suicide but it is rather Jekyll who destroys them both. Frankenstein's monster arguably also commits suicide, but it is not clearly stated in the novel. Dracula, on the other hand, is the only one who does not feel any urge to destroy himself but he is killed by Van Helsing and his crew. The overall results of the monsters' comparison are going to be summarized in the following subchapter.

4.6. Findings of the 19th Century British Monsters and Monstrosity Analysis

The four novels of 19th century British literature that have been analyzed share the same genre, Gothic fiction. It is caused mainly because of their dark, terrifying and supernatural tone and the focus on the evil monsters. Although the novels were written in the 19th century, the first two novels, *Frankenstein* and also *The Private Memoirs*, however, are partly different from the other two. They might be claimed to partly imitate the 18th century Gothic literature tradition due to their sublime atmosphere, castle and natural settings but there is also modernization visible, mainly in case of *Frankenstein*. *The Strange Case* and *Dracula*, on the other hand, are much more modernized and their setting is largely the town. An interesting fact is that all four novels are written in a form that creates an impression of truthfulness. Two of them, *Dracula* and *Frankenstein*, are written in an epistolary form, *The Strange Case* also contains letters and *The Memoirs* has the form of the editor and memoir of the sinner. The impression of truthfulness might serve as a means to create greater terror in the readers as they think that these stories really happened.

Based on the findings in this paper, it might be said that two types of monsters appear in the 19th century British literature. The first are ‘the monstrous human products,’ the monsters created by a mixture of the supernatural and scientific experiments which makes them monstrous. Their essence is, however, also human. In this paper the representatives of such monsters are Frankenstein’s monster and Hyde. The second type of monsters is ‘the supernatural human monsters’ who are the supernatural devils and vampires whose representatives are primarily Dracula but also Robert Wringhim. When considering what has been said by Foucault in the theoretical part about the monsters in the 19th century, these monsters might be said to be ‘human monsters’ as they violate the laws of society and nature, provoking violence and, except for Dracula, also pity. It should be noted, however, that Foucault does not focus on the supernatural monsters but on the abnormal individual.

As for the summary of the comparison of all the characteristics, qualities, powers and appearance of the monsters, it might be said that all monsters are both physically and mentally monstrous. The most physically monstrous and ugly monster is Frankenstein’s monster while the least monstrous in this aspect seems to be Dracula. When considering their mental monstrosity, it is again these two monsters

that are on the edges of the scale as Frankenstein's monster might be said to be the least evil mentally and Dracula the most. Their sources of evil are mainly their creators and the society, as in the case of Frankenstein's monster and Hyde, religion as in the case of Robert or selfishness as in the case of Dracula. These evil sources lead to their metamorphosis that leads to their monstrosity. Frankenstein's monster changes from a good-hearted monster to the evil revengeful murderer, Robert is transformed from a fanatic religious man to a murderer and crazy devilish monster, Jekyll is changed from a respectable professor to a hideous murderer named Hyde and Dracula changes from a warrior to a killing vampire. With respect to their abilities, it might be said that in comparison to Dracula who has the greatest supernatural powers and abilities, Frankenstein's monster has only a few but also great abilities, Robert gains powers only through his double Gil-Martin and Hyde does not possess any powers. Due to Dracula's greatest mental monstrosity as well as supernatural skills and powers, he might be said to evoke the greatest fear in the protagonists of the book as well as its readers. He is the only one who is hunted and then also killed by the protagonists of the book. In case of Frankenstein's monster, he also evokes fear and disgust, primarily due to his ugliness.

To sum up and declare the main aim of this thesis, the most monstrous and terrifying monster of this paper, it should be said that Dracula is considerably different from the other monsters. In order to scare, he does not necessary need to suffer from a physical defect. Frankenstein's monster has a great power and strength too, but he cannot change forms or gain strength with the victims he gets or the food he eats. Frankenstein's monster, Hyde and Robert are the products or victims of other people or the environment which drives them to be evil and they might be, to a certain extent, pitied. So the readers might therefore feel compassion for them as they might be partly said not to be personally responsible for their acts. Dracula, on the other hand, only scares and terrifies and readers rather do not feel any compassion towards him, mainly due to his selfish reasons of his evil. Even though Dracula's appearance seems to be the most 'human' and not very ugly, it is the fact he is so scary, supernatural and powerful that make him so monstrous. To conclude, Dracula seems to be the most evil and monstrous mentally and Frankenstein's monster physically. It could be said, however, that murdering and mental evil is worse and more dangerous than ugliness and hideousness so that Dracula might be claimed to be the most monstrous and horrifying monster of this paper.

5. Conclusion

To conclude this paper, it is convenient to summarize both the theoretical and analytical part. The main aim of this master thesis was the analysis of monsters and monstrosity in 19th century British literature and the detection of the most monstrous and horrifying monster out of the four literary monsters, Frankenstein's monster, Mr. Hyde, Robert Wringhim and Dracula. The paper largely focused on the physical appearance of the monsters, which was supplied by an examination of their skills, powers and their possible weaknesses. On the other hand, monster's mental characteristics were also analyzed with the attention to their evil but also positive aspects. Another aim of this thesis was the analysis of monster's metamorphosis and their duality. With a help of all these aspects, monster's features and their lifestyle, the most terrifying monster was discovered.

To sum up the theoretical part, the basic terminology for the analysis was defined. It covers the chapters two and three from which the second chapter clarifies the term Gothic and primarily the genre of the novels, Gothic fiction as well as the Gothic emotions, namely horror and terror. The third chapter is devoted to defining the terms monsters and monstrosity. It was elucidated how the terms monsters and monstrosity were perceived throughout the history, and how it developed until the nineteenth century, as it is the primary era of this paper. On two myths, namely on Medusa from Greek mythology and Satan from the Christian mythology, it was showed how the world of monsters came to being. It was also stated that these myths were the source of main inspiration for many later writers of monster stories. After that the characteristics of monsters were delimited, namely their psychology and physicality. Consequently, the two definable types of monsters, primarily devils and vampires, were identified. At the end of the theoretical part, monsters' duality and metamorphosis were explained.

The analytical part was devoted to detecting the monstrosity and other aspects of monsters, as written above. It consists of the chapter four in which the four monsters were individually analyzed and then they were compared with an aim to find the most monstrous and terrifying monster. The novels and the general findings of the monsters and monstrosity in the 19th century British literature were analyzed and investigated. Finally, the most evil and horrifying monster was identified.

Using arguments and various features of monsters stated in the theoretical part and the analysis, it was concluded, that the most evil and terrifying monster of this paper is Dracula. The three monsters, Frankenstein's monster, Mr. Hyde and Robert, whose main source of evil is external, might be said to be the victims of their creators, the society or religious fanaticism. So due these reasons for their evil, the readers might feel compassion for them as these creatures might be said not to be responsible and cannot be blamed for their acts. Dracula's source of evil is, on the other hand, primarily selfish so he is not the subject of compassion. Dracula is the most cunning, clever, strong and he possesses the greatest supernatural powers and characteristics. Even though his physical appearance is not so monstrous and ugly, he might be said to be the most monstrous and evil monster in terms of his mentality who therefore evokes the greatest terror in the books' protagonists as well as its readers.

Resumé

Tato diplomová práce s názvem *Monstra a zrudnost v britské literatuře 19. století (Monsters and Monstrosity in 19th Century British Literature)* se zabývá čtyřmi nestvůrami s hlavním cílem zjistit monstrum, které je nejděsivější a je ztělesněním největšího zla. Romány, které byly vybrány pro analýzu této práce jsou *Frankenstein* napsaný Mary Shelleyovou, *Vyznání ospravedlněného hříšníka (The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner)* od Jamese Hogga, román *Podivný případ Dr. Jekylla a pana Hyda (The Strange Case Of Dr. Jekyll And Mr. Hyde)* napsaný Robertem LouiSEM Stevensonem a *Dracula* od Brama Stokera.

Tyto romány, které se řadí mezi ty nejlepší příběhy o nestvůrách, mají spoustu podobností, ale i rozdílů. Sdílí především zlé monstrum, které komplikuje životy ostatních hlavních postav z románů, jejich duševní a fyzické vlastnosti jsou však odlišné. Tyto podobnosti a rozdíly zrud, Frankensteinova monstra, Roberta Wringhima, pana Hyda a Draculy, především jejich duševní, fyzické vlastnosti a další schopnosti, jsou zkoumány a následně porovnány. Dalším cílem této práce je také analýza fyzické a psychické metamorfózy, kterou stvůry procházejí, jejich dualita, stvoření či historie.

Práce je rozdělena do dvou hlavních částí, teoretické a praktické. Teoretická část obsahuje druhou a třetí kapitolu a představuje především terminologii pro analytickou část. Druhá kapitola objasňuje termín Gotika, ale především žánr románů, Gotický román, a také Gotické emoce a pocity, a sice teror a horror. Třetí kapitola se věnuje definování termínů, které jsou podstatné pro tuto práci, především ‚nestvůra‘ a ‚zrudnost.‘ Dále tato kapitola objasňuje, jak tyto termíny byly vnímány v celé historii a jak se rozvíjely do 19. století, což je doba podstatná pro tuto práci. Na dvou mýtech, a to na Meduse z řecké mytologie a Satanovi z křesťanské mytologie, jsou ukázány počátky nestvůr. Je zde také řečeno, že tyto mýty byly zdrojem hlavní inspirace pro mnoho pozdějších spisovatelů Gotických románů a příběhů o nestvůrách. Poté tato kapitola vymezuje psychické a fyzické charakteristiky a identifikuje dva definovatelné typy monster, především upíry a ďábly. Závěrem teoretické části je podkapitola o dualitě monster a metamorfóze, kde jsou tyto dva aspekty také vysvětleny.

Praktická část se věnuje zjištění zrudnosti a dalším aspektům zrud, jak již bylo napsáno výše. Tato část se skládá pouze ze čtvrté kapitoly, kde jsou vybrané

nestvůry jednotlivě analyzovány a poté porovnány s cílem odhalení nejstrašnější stvůry. V této kapitole jsou poté zanalyzovány vybrané romány a vytvořeny závěry o monstrech a zřůdnosti v britské literatuře 19. století. Nakonec je identifikováno to nejděsivější monstrum, které je ztělesněním největšího zla.

Na základě zjištění této práce lze se říci, že v britské Gotické literatuře 19. století se objevují především dva typy monster. První typ jsou „Monstrózní lidské produkty,“ které byly stvořeny směsí nadpřirozena a vědeckého experimentu, což je dělá monstrózními. Jejich podstatou je, nicméně, také lidská charakteristika. Zástupci těchto zřůd jsou v této práci Frankensteinovo monstrum a pan Hyde. Druhý typ monster jsou „Nadpřirozeně lidské zřůdy,“ v této práci především nadpřirození ďáblové a upíři, jejichž zástupci jsou zejména Dracula, ale také Robert Wringhim, který se postupně podobně jako jeho tajemný společník Gil-Martin, stane zatraceným a zlomyslným ďáblem.

S použitím argumentů a rysů monster, které byly zjištěny v teoretické části a analýze nestvůr, bylo usouzeno, že nejděsivější monstrum je Dracula. Ve srovnání s ostatními monstry, Frankensteinovým monstrem, panem Hydem a Robertem, kteří páchají zlo v důsledku různých okolností, které je obklopují, lze říci, že jsou spíše oběťmi jejich prostředí, rodinných problémů či náboženského fanatismu. Čtenář proto může s těmito zločinci a nestvůrami soucítit. Zdroj zla v případě Draculy je, na druhou stranu, primárně sobecký, proto tedy většinou není předmětem soucitu čtenářů. Dracula je navíc nejvíce mazaná, chytrá a silná stvůra a má největší nadpřirozené schopnosti a vlastnosti. I přesto, že jeho fyzický vzhled není tak ošklivý, jako například v případě Frankensteinova monstra, dá se říci, že je nejvíce zlý a děsivý, a to především pokud jde o jeho mentální charakteristiky a jeho zlé činy.

Bibliography

- Abrams, M. H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. USA: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1999.
- Arie Kaplan, *Dracula: The Life of Vlad the Impaler*. New York: The Rosen Publishing Group, 2012.
- Asker, David Barry Desmond. *Aspects of Metamorphosis: Fictional Representations of the Becoming Human*. Amsterdam: Rodopi Bv Editions, 2001.
- Asma, Stephen T. *On Monsters: An Unnatural History of Our Worst Fears*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Barret, Charlotte. "Introduction to the Victorian Gothic." *University of Oxford*. Accessed March 7, 2015. <http://writersinspire.org/content/introduction-victorian-gothic>.
- Bodart, Joni Richards. Introduction to *They Suck, They Bite, They Eat, They Kill: The Psychological Meaning of the Supernatural Monsters*, xix–xxxii. Plymouth: Scarecrow Press, 2012.
- Botting, Fred. *Gothic*. 1996. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Blair, David. Introduction to *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner*, by James Hogg, vii–xxiv. London: Wordsworth Editions, 2003.
- Brewster, Scott. "Borderline Experience Madness, Mimicry and Scottish Gothic," *Scottish Gothic Studies* 7 (2009): 79–86.
- Brady, Emily. *The Sublime in Modern Philosophy: Aesthetics, Ethics, and Nature*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Brooks, Peter. "What is a Monster? (According to Frankenstein)," In *Frankenstein: Mary Shelley*, 81–106. edited by Fred Botting. London: Macmillan, 1995.
- Bruhm, Steven. *Gothic Bodies: The Politics of Pain in Romantic Fiction*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994.
- Callaghan, Madeleine. "Shelley and Milton," In *The Oxford Handbook of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, edited by Michael O'Neill and Anthony Howe, 478–494. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

- Campbell, James. "The Beast Within." *The Gurdian*. Accessed April 3, 2015.
<http://www.theguardian.com/books/2008/dec/13/dr-jekyll-mr-hyde-stevenson>.
- Carus, Paul. *The History of the Devil: With 350 Illustrations*. Chicago: Dover Publications, 2008.
- Coghill, Jeff. "Frankenstein." *Cliffnotes*. Accessed March 16, 2015.
<http://www.cliffsnotes.com/literature/f/frankenstein/frankensteinat-a-glance>.
- Coelsch-Foisner, Sabine. "Metamorphic Changes in the Arts," In *Metamorphosis Structures of Cultural Transformations*, edited by Jürgen Schlaeger. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 2005.
- Colle, Phillip. *The Myth of Evil: Demonizing the Enemy*. Westport: Praeger, 2006.
- Clark, Anna E. "Frankenstein; or, the Modern Protagonist," *ELH* 81 (2014): 246–38.
- Dalrymple, Theodore. "Mr Hyde and the Epidemiology of Evil," *New Criterion* 23 (2004): 24–28.
- Eason, Cassandra. *Fabulous Creatures, Mythical Monsters, and Animal Power Symbols*. London: Greenwood Press, 2008.
- Elizabeth Miller, *A Dracula Handbook*, Indiana: Xlibris, 2005.
- Fahy, Thomas. *The Philosophy of Horror*. Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 2010.
- Foucault, Michel. *Abnormal: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1974-1975*. London: Picador, 2004.
- Flajšar, Jiří. "Gothic Fiction Revisited," In *Scottish Gothic Fiction*, 5–13. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2012.
- Fleming, Grace. "Frankenstein." *About Education*. Accessed March 16, 2015.
<http://homeworktips.about.com/od/bookreportprofiles/p/frankenstein.htm>.
- Gallagher, David. *Metamorphosis: Transformations of the Body and the Influence of Ovid's Metamorphoses on Germanic Literature in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009.
- Gerard, Emily. "Transylvanian Superstitions." *The Nineteenth Century* 18, (1885): 128–44.
- Greer, John Michael. *Monsters: An Investigator's Guide to Magical Beings*. 2001. Woodbury: Llewellyn Publications, 2011.

- Hogg, James. *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner*. 1997. London: Wordsworth Editions, 2003.
- Ingebretsen, Edward J. *At Stake: Monsters and the Rhetoric of Fear in Public Culture*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago, 2001.
- “Juggernaut.” *Merriam-Webster*. An Encyclopædia Britannica Company. Accessed April 4, 2015. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/juggernaut>.
- Jansson, Dr Siv. Introduction to *Frankenstein*, by Marry Sheley, vii–xx. London: Wordsworth Editions, 1999.
- Jelínková, Ema. “James Hogg and the Caledonian Antisyzygy,” In *Scottish Gothic Fiction*, 19–23. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2012.
- Jurschick, Karin. “Lidský mozek – Kde sídlí zlo?.” *YouTube* video, 52:33. 2012. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=drDipK_bjtg.
- Kean, Margaret. Contextual Overview of *John Milton's Paradise Lost: A Routledge Study Guide and Sourcebook*, 5–11. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Kujtan, Peter W. “Porphyria: The Vampire Disease.” *A Research Guide for Students*. Accessed April 6, 2015. <http://www.bydewey.com/drkporphyria.html>.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Lehner, Ernst, and Johanna. *Devils, Demons, and Witchcraft: 244 Illustrations for Artists*. New York: Dover Publications, 1971.
- Link, Luther. *The Devil: A Mask Without a Face*. London: Reaktion Books, 1995.
- Lombroso, Cesare. *Criminal Man*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.
- Martin, Maureen M. *The Mighty Scot: Nation, Gender, and the Nineteenth-Century Mystique of Scottish Masculinity*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009.
- Middleton, Dr Tim. Introduction to *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, by Robert Louis Stevenson, vii–xx. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 1999.

- Missing, Sophie. "The Castle of Otranto by Horace Walpole." Accessed March 5, 2015. <http://www.theguardian.com/books/2010/mar/14/castle-of-otranto-horace-walpole-review>.
- Newlyn, Lucy. "Paradise Lost and the Romantic Reader," In *John Milton's Paradise Lost: A Routledge Study Guide and Sourcebook*, edited by Margaret Kean, 72–74. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Peprník, Michal. *Metamorfóza jako kulturní metafora: James Hogg, R. L. Stevenson a George Mac Donald*. Olomouc: Palacký University in Olomouc, 2003.
- "Protean Figure." *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Accessed March 13, 2015. <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/479616/Protean-figure>.
- Punter, David. "Scottish Gothic", In *The Cambridge Companion to Scottish Literature*, edited by Gerard Carruthers and Liam McIlvanney, 132–144. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Punter, David. *The Literature of Terror. A History of Gothic Fictions from 1765 to the Present Day*. 1980. London: Longman Group Limited, 1996.
- Radcliffe, Ann. "On the Supernatural in Poetry." *New Monthly Magazine* 16 (1826): 145–52.
- Rogers, David. Introduction to *Dracula*, by Bram Stoker, v-xix. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 2000.
- Russel, Jeffrey Burton. *The Devil: Perceptions of Evil from Antiquity to Primitive Christianity*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1987.
- Schlegel, Friedrich Von. *On the Study of Greek Poetry*. New York: State University New York Press, 2001.
- Stevenson, Robert Louis. *Dr Jekyll and Mr. Hyde with The Merry Men and Other Stories*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 1999.
- Struzziero, Maria Antonietta. "The Possible Sources of the Other." *Dualism and Dualities*. Accessed April 4, 2015. <http://www.scientificotripalda.it/dualism/jekyllHydeThemes2.php>.
- "Undead," *Oxford Dictionaries*, Oxford Dictionary Press, Accessed March 11, 2015. <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/undead>.
- Unterthurner, Gerhard, and Erik M. Vogt. Preface to *Monstrosity in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and Philosophy*, 7–17. Wien: Turia and Kant, 2012.

- “Vampire,” *Oxford Dictionaries*, Oxford Dictionary Press, Accessed March 11, 2015, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/vampire>.
- Warwick, Alexandra. “Victorian Gothic,” In *The Routledge Companion to Gothic*, edited by Catherine Spooner and Emma McEvoy, 29–37. London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2007.
- Werblowsky, R J Zwi. *Lucifer and Prometheus: A Study of Milton’s Satan*. 1999. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Wright, Angela. “Scottish Gothic,” In *The Routledge Companion to Gothic*, edited by Catherine Spooner and Emma McEvoy, 73–82. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2007.
- Wright, Alexa. *Monstrosity: The Human Monster in Visual Culture*. London: I.B.Tauris, 2013.
- Zimbardo, Phillip. “Philip Zimbardo: The Psychology of Evil,” YouTube video, 23:11, 2008, http://www.ted.com/talks/philip_zimbardo_on_the_psychology_of_evil#t-78181.

Annotation

Name: Eliška Filipová

Department: Department of English and American Studies

Title of the Thesis: Monsters and Monstrosity in 19th Century British Literature

Thesis Supervisor: Mgr. Ema Jelínková, Ph.D.

Page Numbers: 67

Key Words: Gothic literature, British literature, 19th century, monsters, monstrosity, Frankenstein's Monster, Robert Wringhim, Jekyll and Hyde, Dracula

This master thesis deals with the analysis of monsters and monstrosity in 19th century British literature with an aim to state the most monstrous and terrifying monster. The monsters chosen for this paper is Frankenstein's monster, Mr. Hyde, Robert and Dracula. The primary texts from which these monsters come are *Frankenstein* by Mary Shelley, *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner* written by James Hogg, *Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* by Robert Louis Stevenson and *Dracula* by Bram Stoker. The paper largely focuses on the physical appearance, supplied also by their skills, powers and their possible weaknesses. It also analyses the monsters' mental characteristics with focus on their evil but also positive aspects. Another aim of this thesis is the analysis of monsters' metamorphosis and their duality. With a help of all these aspects, the most terrifying monster is discovered.

Anotace

Příjmení a jméno: Eliška Filipová

Katedra: Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Název práce: Monstra a zrůdnost v britské literatuře 19. století

Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Ema Jelínková, Ph.D.

Počet stran: 67

Klíčová slova: Gotická literatura, britská literatura, 19. století, zrůdy, zrůdnost, Frankensteinovo monstrum, Robert Wringhim, Jekyll a Hyde, Dracula

Tato diplomová práce se zabývá analýzou monster a zrůdnosti v britské literatuře 19. století, se zaměřením na zjištění nejděsivější zrůdy, která je ztělesněním největšího zla. Zvolená monstra této práce jsou Frankensteinovo monstrum, pan Hyde, Robert Wringhim a Dracula. Romány, ze kterých tyto nestvůry pocházejí jsou *Frankenstein* napsaný Mary Shelleyovou, *Vyznání ospravedlněného hříšníka* od Jamese Hogga, román *Podivný případ Dr. Jekylla a pana Hyda* napsaný Robertem LouiSEM Stevensonem a *Dracula* od Brama Stokera. Práce se z velké části zaměřuje na jejich fyzický vzhled, doplněný analýzou jejich dovedností a jejich případnými nedostatky. Zabývá se také jejich duševní charakteristikou s důrazem na jejich zlé, ale i pozitivní aspekty. Dalším cílem této práce je analýza metamorfózy monster a jejich dualita. S pomocí všech aspektů uvedených v teoretické a analytické části je odhaleno to nejděsivější monstrum.