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Introduction

A lot has changed since the nineteenth century when the literary vampire first appeared in all its glory – ruthless, terrifying bloodsuckers of Polidori and Bram Stoker now co-exist in the literary realm alongside the compassionate, often “vegetarian” vampires of Stephenie Meyer and L. J. Smith – yet one thing remains the same: Anne Rice’s vampire characters still attract the attention of the readers. Correspondingly, Ricean vampires had drawn the attention of many literary critics – especially, but not exclusively – of the close of the twentieth century. These critics had looked at Ricean vampires from many different angles: some considered Ricean vampires to be the descendants of Byronic Hero, 1 others spent time describing their novelty, 2 or religious roots. 3 For the most part, Ricean scholars and literary critics spent their time pondering the brat vampire Lestat, the brooding vampire Louise, or the maniacal, boyish vampire Armand. That they chose to analyze main male vampire characters does not come as a surprise. Lestat and Louis, for example, are present in nearly every one (if not in all) of Anne Rice’s vampire novels, and as such they are the round, main characters who constitute the backbone of most of the stories and are described in the greatest depth. Yet in the now 13-volume (soon to be 14-volume), 4 80-million selling vampire saga 5 other characters live in the shadow of Lestat and Louis. Characters, which – though readers and critics may not always notice them – nevertheless bear an equally significant message about the structure and the kind of fiction world of The Vampire Chronicles universe, as well as about

the creative mindset of the author herself. I am, of course, talking about the minority female vampire and human characters appearing in Vampire Chronicles alongside their well-known male counterparts.

Since the publication of Pandora (1998) and The Vampire Armand (1998) only a handful of papers discussing the female characters of Vampire Chronicles in length have been written; more often, scholars and critics focus broadly on the issues of gender and/or sexuality. In the year 1996 editors and scholars Gary Hoppenstand and Ray B. Browne published a collection of essays called The Gothic world of Anne Rice. The publication focused not only on the Gothicism of Vampire Chronicles, but had also several contributions opening discussions on gender issue – one of them being the paper called “Anne Rice Raising Holly Hell, Harlequin Style” written by Edward J. Ingebretsen. The collection of vampire criticism essays from 1999 called The Blood of Life featured two papers of essence for this thesis – the groundbreaking essay called “New Life for an Old Tradition: Anne Rice and Vampire Literature” written by Martin J. Wood and “Daughters of Lilith: Women Vampires in Popular Literature” by Carol A. Senf. Passing references to Claudia (a vampire child) and Akasha (the ancient vampire) can be found in countless criticism written on Ricean vampires, yet these remarks rarely exceed the length of a paragraph, or two. In other words, only a few of the critics decided to reflect on, in length and in detail, the female characters of Vampire Chronicles. Feminist and gender studies critics are among the ones who, fascinated by the supposed genderless quality of Ricean vampires, seem to repeatedly return to Anne Rice’s vampire novels. Most of them, however, barely look behind the gender and sexuality issues and too many of them nearsightedely interpret only the male/female vampires, thus robbing themselves of the possible, fruitful contrast between the human and vampire characters.

In order to reconstruct the meanings of both human and vampire females of Vampire Chronicles, I draw on a handful of methodological approaches. I first and foremost critically read primary and secondary texts to find out how the literary female characters work within the narrative and how the critics refer to them. In reading and further analyzing of the texts, I make use of postmodern hermeneutical6

6 “Hermeneutical” or “hermeneutic” here stands for the theory and methodology of textual interpretation.
perspective. Literary text is therefore not perceived as being autotelic – a text offering one way of reading which has to be deciphered. Rather, the literary text is believed to be an enigma, or, as Palmer says in his essay “Postmodern Hermeneutics and the Act of Reading”

...the text is doing things it does not realize, that it is leading us down a wrong path, or that it is following laws the interpreter is able to perceive but which are hidden from the author of the text and also from the reader who takes the text at face value.7

Put differently, the text is believed to be slippery, and in need of something similar to a psychoanalysis in which the text itself becomes an analysand, while the interpreter becomes its analyst. The system of interpretation I suggest is therefore deliberately making use of psychology (and especially that of a Jungian psychologist Erich Neumann, a Jungian disciple Toni Wolff and of Carl Gustav Jung himself), gender studies, cultural history, anthropology, and mythology. It might be said that I am inspired by and working in the spheres of archetypal, feminist, psychological and mythological literary approaches. Yet even though I draw inspiration from these critical approaches, I do at specific places narrow or broaden their meanings, and introduce my own terms and/or definitions. All the approaches used in this text are used as the source of possible readings of the female vampire/human characters appearing in Vampire Chronicles, and of the author Anne Rice as a writing subject8 took towards women of The Vampire Chronicles realm.

My belief is that all female characters of Vampire Chronicles are archetypal images of some kind and that these archetypal images repeat throughout the series, thus creating a pattern for which the conception of femininity is of crucial importance. Similarly to Martin J. Wood, I too believe that, though the vampires are

8 I borrow this term from poststructuralism as I want to emphasize that the meaning of text is not fully in the hands of the author. As Roland Barthes says in his famous essay “Death of the Author”, “[w]riting is that neutral, composite, oblique space where our subject slips away, the negative where all identity is lost, starting with the very identity of the body writing.” Barthes, Image-Music-Text (New York: Hill and Wang, 1977), 142. I do not believe that an author has no power over his/her novel; rather, I believe that his/her identity splits and multiplies in ways he cannot fully comprehend. This splitting of identity then causes the text to have multiple meanings at the same Time.
often described (by both the author and the critics as well) as genderless or androgynous due to their inability to have sex,\(^9\) they nevertheless do show inclination to femininity or masculinity in other possible ways. Studying how the features of femininity/masculinity are attributed to female characters (both human and vampire) can therefore help us further understand archetypal and femininity patterns hidden in the text. In order to ensure that the material I analyze has (at least to certain degree) a consistent basic perspective, I have selected for my analyses only vampire novels published between the years 1976-2001.\(^{10}\) As Anne Rice claims that with 2002 she “experienced a new spiritual beginning,” which inevitably influenced and changed her writing,\(^{11}\) I did not include in my study her later Vampire Chronicles novels. Rice creates crossovers between her vampire and witch novels, I do so despite believing that it would be interesting to compare the female characters of the pre-faith era with the female characters of Rice’s post-faith era.\(^{12}\) Finding out whether new archetypal images have appeared in the later novels and how the idea of femininity changed (if at all) is a very appealing task. However, I do not have enough space, nor time for a comparison of such scope. The novels I analyze therefore include only Interview with the Vampire (1976), The Vampire Lestat (1985), The Queen of the Damned (1988), The Tale of the Body Thief (1992), Memnoch the Devil (1995), The Vampire Armand (1998), Pandora (1998), and Blood and Gold (2001).

In the first part of the thesis I focus on Jungian psychology. I first describe Carl Gustav Jung’s objectives while contrasting them with Sigmund Freud’s ideas.

---


\(^{10}\) The novel called Merrick (2000) is not among the selected texts, since it is a crossover between Rice’s Vampire Chronicles series and the Mayfair Witches series and as such further analysis of The Mayfair Witches series would be required to put the characters in context. The novel Vittorio The Vampire (1999) was not selected, since the novel was published in a different series called New Tales of the Vampire and the characters of Vittorio and Ursula have no connection to the characters of The Vampire Chronicles. Though Pandora was also published in the series New Tales of the Vampires, I consider it a part of The Vampire Chronicles canon, as it revolves around the character of Pandora, who gets mentioned in The Vampire Armand for the first time and reappears in Blood and Gold, two of the core novels of The Vampire Chronicles.


Then I comment on the complicated relationship between Jungian psychology and feminism. The following chapter suggests bridging the gap between Jungian psychology and feminism with the use of two distinct theories – the theories of Jungian disciples Toni Wolff and Erich Neumann. The third chapter represents a turn from theory towards practice – here I establish the framework for my further analysis, introducing the synthesis of Jung’s, Wolff’s and Neumann’s works. The chapter provides the reader with a detailed description of female archetypal images, while also debating on the usual use of archetypal literary criticism. The fourth chapter describes the concepts of gender, femininity and masculinity. The point of this chapter is to discuss the different approaches to femininity, masculinity, and gender, in order to later establish a set of definitions used in this study. In this chapter, I also discuss the ways in which critics perceive the genderlessness of Ricean vampire characters. The fifth chapter describes Anne Rice as the writing subject; her identity is decomposed in a number of personas among which we can find for example the identity of a woman, daughter, wife, mother, and writer. These identities are then set into the social, historical and personal context of the era. The sixth and seventh chapter provide a detailed analysis of a set of chosen female characters from Vampire Chronicles. I start the analysis with the selection of female characters. These are then divided into categories according to their function in the narrative; then I try to find an archetypal image corresponding to each character using the before mentioned methodological approaches. Based on the archetypal images I then divide the female characters into categories, which I further link with three categories of femininity (suppressed femininity/neutral femininity/accented femininity). The goal is to find out not only how female archetypes work within The Vampire Chronicles realm, but also how femininity is understood and interpreted with regard to the writing subject and the patriarchal status of Western society.
1. Jungian (Analytical) Psychology

Occultist, Scientist, Prophet, Charlatan, Philosopher, Racist, Guru, Anti-Semite, Liberator of Women, Misogynist, Freudian Apostle, Gnostic, Post-Modernist, Polygamist, Healer, Poet, Con-Artist, Psychiatrist and Anti-Psychiatrist – what has C. G. Jung not been called?

– Sonu Shamdasani

When post-Jungian professor Andrew Samuels asked his students to say the first word that comes up in their minds upon hearing the word “Jung,” he found out that the most common response was “Freud”. Second came the words Anti-Semitism, Nazism, Germany, World War II, and the year 1930; the third association was “mystic”, the fourth was “archetypes”. For many students and for many of Jung’s critics as well, this is precisely who Jung is: a chauvinistic, mystic Anti-Semite from the 1930s, and the author of the concept of the archetypes, who is usually mentioned at least briefly when Freud is being discussed. But there is more to Jung than his link to Freud and his weaknesses. Jung’s vast works in clinical psychology as well as in psychological theory are applicable not only in psychoanalysis, but also – to name at least some areas – in child development studies, brain research, marketing, or literature. Yet, as professor Andrew Samuels rightly notes, in the academic world – and namely in literary criticism – Jungian theory is often being simplified, and misunderstood. This happens primarily because Jungian theory is described to the students over and over as something definite, normative, easily understood and easily applicable. However, Jungian theory is complex; and, moreover, evolves. Nowadays, the talk is of post-Jungian theorists, academics and analysts, and these tend to look at Jung anew; trying to understand the ways in which Jung can, is, and should be read.

Jungian theory, just like the Freudian theory, is a part of both the academic and everyday world even though we might not readily realize it. Jungian theory of

archetypes is complex, rather intuitive than logical, and therefore often vague and misleading. However, in order to understand Jungian and post-Jungian disciples, one has to first attempt to understand Jung himself. Jung laid the foundations for something that grew far bigger than he would probably have expected. The idea of an archetype, often simplified, got translated into our everyday, conscious lives, and bookstores had overflowed with books focusing on modern archetypes directly available to anyone who needs them. From unconscious psychology archetypes shifted into the conscious world of the self-help books. Women and men can now find out what ancient god or goddess they identify with and how their everyday problems can be solved through relation to archetypes taken from mythology. In addition to these, post-Jungian theorists of today elaborate on Jungian theories in order to better understand their impact and possible applications in the modern psychology. In the academic world, Jungian studies has emerged recently as a new possibility for both students and teachers as well. In other words, Jungian theory still blossoms and has a great number of advocates, as well as critics, in the theoretic, academic and public circles.

Just as post-Jungian theorists rework and deconstruct Jung’s theory by drawing in other theorists, so do I in my attempt to construct a useful model of archetypal theory. In order to do so, I first approach Jung and some of his key theories. The following chapters will therefore look at the criticism of and differences between — femininity-wise and women-wise — Carl Jung and Sigmund Freud; I will describe and define the possible readings of certain Jungian concepts such as unconscious, archetype, and archetypal image; and finally I intend to describe the key archetypes. For the discussion on archetypal theories, different sources of interpretation will be used. Among the Jungian disciples I draw on are Toni Wolff and Erich Neumann; I also significantly draw on post-Jungian theorists such as Andrew Samuels, George H. Jensen, Steven F. Walker, James S. Baumlin, and Tita French Baumlin.

1. 1 Jung Versus Freud

In popular perception as well as in the historical field, Jung’s name is so closely bound with Freud that it is hard to even consider Jung without Freud.

– Sonu Shamdasani

Countless studies dealing with the Freud-Jung relation have been published over the years and many of them share in the Freudian and Jungian legends: Freud is described as an innovative father of psychoanalysis, whereas Jung is depicted as a mystic, who left psychoanalysis with the intention of delving into his own discoveries. It is not up to me to decide which legend – if any of the two – bears any truth; similarly, it is not up to me to give a detailed account of the lives of Freud and Jung. A lot that has happened between Freud and Jung took place in the field of clinical psychology, which is not of my concern here. Even more has happened between the two in their private lives. I do not, however, intend to write an exhausting list of all the differences between Jung and Freud. Instead, I will only briefly mention two topics that are of greatest importance for my thesis: Freud’s and Jung’s approach to women; and the ways in which Freud and Jung approach the concepts of masculinity and femininity.

1. 1. 1 A Very Short Account of Jung’s Professional Life

Carl Gustav Jung was born on July 26 in 1875 and is known as one of the founders of modern psychiatry. He decided to specialize in psychiatry during his studies at university; he was particularly interested in word-association tests and complexes, which were used to study personality dissociations. Alongside his interest in


20 Numerous studies focus on the lives and issues of Jung and Freud; their relation is fascinating to many and as such found limitless number of writers willing to immerse themselves in Jung’s and Freud’s personal correspondence, diaries, and other documents concerning their professional, as well as personal lives.


22 Casement describes complexes as “a combination of images and ideas clustered around an emotional centre”; complexes are to be found in the personal unconscious and usually arise due to traumatic experience, or shock. Ann Casement says that complexes became central to Jung’s theories and although he later on called his approach Analytical Psychology, there was a Time in
studying psychosis and neuroses, Jung became early on involved in the occult, and in mythology. During his life, Jung recorded his way of doing analysis and invited other analysts – his colleagues – to learn with him. Later on in his life, Jung turned to the studies of medieval alchemy. He first met with Freud in 1907; they collaborated for seven years until their split in 1913. The two psychiatrists ceased collaborating after Jung began to doubt Freud’s sexual theory and started to criticize Freud’s psychoanalysis. Particularly, Jung did not believe that sexual repression and trauma cause all types of neuroses. Around the time of their split, Jung’s analytical psychology began to take its shape.

1.1.2 Masculinity and Femininity

Throughout the ages the problem of woman has puzzled people of every kind.... You too will have pondered over this question insofar as you are men; from the women among you that is not to be expected, for you are the riddle yourselves.

– Sigmund Freud

In the chapter called “Psychoanalysis on Masculinity”, R. W. Connell describes how Freud over the years grappled with the concepts of masculinity and femininity. Freud is best known for his definition of the (in)famous Oedipus complex: a boy is said to have a desire to sexually be with his mother, that is why he sees his father as a rival and wants him dead. Only later on, when boy’s ego comes into play, does the boy settle for identification with his father, because he realizes that the father figure is stronger than he is. The identification, however, does not resolve boy’s worries which are manifested as fear of castration by the father. The same principle, only vice versa, is described for girls (a girl falls in love with her father) and is called the Electra Complex. In addition, the girl becomes the subject of lack and envy, because she does not have a penis and has to identify with a mother who is also penis-less. The only way for a girl to stop envying a man is for her to become pregnant and bear a child. Based on the Oedipus complex, one can see that Freudian psychology is strongly male-centered, and does not account for women psychology. Even greater


emphasis on male psychology can be seen in Freud’s discussion of passivity and activity, perceived by Freud to be linked tightly to femininity and masculinity. In his writings, Freud believed that active aims, thoughts and behavior are a part of masculinity, while the passive ones belong to femininity. Thus, Freud reinforced the idea that a man is an active object, while the woman is a passive subject. However, whereas he stressed the meaning of the active-masculine-object, he denigrated the passive-feminine-subject as an unimportant phenomenon.\(^{25}\)

Despite initially proclaiming the male psychology a fundamental key to human psychology and neglecting the idea of the existence of female psychology, later in his life Freud became aware – thanks to his many patients – of the variety one can encounter in the human psyche.\(^{26}\) In one of Freud’s best known case studies called “The Wolf Man,” Freud’s subject became Sergej Konstantinovich Pankejeff, an aristocrat from Russia, who suffered from nervous compulsions, depression and intestinal disorders. The lengthy analysis focused on a dream Pankejeff had at the age of four: he saw six or seven white wolves sitting on a walnut tree in front of the window, wagging their long tails; afraid that the wolves might eat him, Pankejeff, screaming, woke up from the dream. Freud believed that the dream was connected to a primal scene in which a one year old Pankejeff saw his parents copulating. Upon seeing this scene, Pankejeff identified with his mother, started to feel the need to sexually satisfy his father, hence identifying with the feminine. Freud called this “a negative Oedipus complex” and later on began to feel that male psychology alone cannot account for all that happens in the human psychology. Accordingly, Freud proclaimed that a man is never purely masculine-active, just like a woman is never purely feminine-passive: “Femininity, too, is always part of man’s character, whether in the form of bisexual object choices, a passive aim in sexuality, or identification with the mother.”\(^{27}\) Freudian idea of bisexuality was considered troubling by many psychoanalytics. Jung’s theory of the Anima and Animus, on the other hand, became quickly popular.

---


\(^{26}\) In this study, psyche is used in the Jungian sense: it is the totality of all psychological processes happening in both the conscious and the unconscious. It is synonymous with an individual’s psychology.

Jungian theory of the Animus and the Anima seemed, at first, to be offering a diversion from Freudian idea of passive femininity and active masculinity. Freud saw masculinity and femininity as two opposites; I  

*Ibid*  

was considered masculine, while the feminine was considered “the other”, a problematic and diverging concept.\(^\text{28}\) Femininity was also perceived as passive and insignificant, while masculinity was considered active and fundamental to the psychology of all humans. In contrast to Freud, Jung took a seemingly less provocative way when he proposed that femininity and masculinity are two symmetrically related concepts. Men were said to have a feminine side to themselves (the Anima), women were said to have a masculine side (the Animus). Suggesting femininity as a complementary concept of men’s psychology and masculinity of women’s psychology seemed progressive at first, since in so doing, Jung restored the image of femininity, but turned out reactionary in the end.\(^\text{29}\) First, femininity was never satisfactorily described by Jung, since he complained that his own Anima fantasies are distorting any information on that matter.\(^\text{30}\) In his descriptions of the Animus and Anima, Jung elevated the Anima as a creative dynamic in men’s life, and degraded the Animus as “hostile and power-driven and especially given to producing irrational opinions…” As Mattoon rightly remarks, “Too little has been written about the positive side of the Animus. …Jung’s view of the Animus, even its strengths, lacks full appreciation of women’s capabilities.”\(^\text{31}\) Second, instead of including the feminine in his theories, Jung actually excludes it, thus further undermining the independence and importance of the feminine principle in psychology. Simply put, the Anima is displaced from women and given to men as “disembodied spirit” that belongs to another realm, the realm of the Other.\(^\text{32}\)

---

\(^\text{28}\) A child, according to Freud, has a bisexual disposition. Masculinity is considered a standard, while femininity is a divergence from this standard. Women are therefore seen as incomplete men.


Where Freud ultimately arrived at the idea of the existence of the independent female psychology, Jung seemed to offer an appealing, yet misleading theory in which the feminine principle became, once again, embedded in men’s psychology as the passive subject closely linked with the unconscious. While Freud reluctantly confessed that femininity and masculinity are puzzling concepts; Jung declared that both concepts exist, but the feminine principle – wholly subjective and reaching to one’s unconscious – cannot be objectively explained by the male analyst. He thus left a window opened for the female analytics and theorists, who later expanded on the theory of the Animus and the Anima, bridging the gap between the feminine and masculine and mending the idea according to which the feminine is the indescribable, passive, and subjective Other.

1. 1. 3 Jung and Women, Freud and Women

Both Jung and Freud are often called misogynist, especially by the feminists; however, the way Jung and Freud viewed women should not prevent the application of their theories in future analyses on femininity and women. It is important to realize that Freud and Jung lived during the era in which feminism was still in its infancy; it could be the case that their ideas were largely based on period thinking. The question therefore lies – and is often discussed – whether Freud (and Jung) were “denigrating women or simply describing their unenviable position in societies where they are still second-class.”

Freud’s main theory was focused on penis envy; women, he said, feel envious, because compared to men they are in lack. The backslash for his theory came not only later on from feminists, but also early on from his own female colleagues. Psychoanalysts such as Karen Horney argued that men can feel the same lack – a lack of a female womb and the ability to procreate. Freud was known to emphasize the father figure, and many theorists argue that what he communicated in his theory – though probably unintentionally – was a careful description of the male dominance in the society. In Freud’s writings, women are seen as inferior to men; their ability to procreate is diminished as it is described merely as a way of getting a penis; and little girls are seen as castrated. In other

---

34 Ibid.
words, in Freudian theories women were robbed of all their power – as mothers they were abandoned, and as wives they had no other choice then to procreate in order to feel whole.  

Freud also put a great emphasis on human body, biology, and sexuality, and was criticized for not paying attention to the social interplay between men and women. Just like Freud is judged harshly because of his essentialist phallocentrism, Jung is accused of rigid essentialism, conservatism and stereotyping.

Similarly to Freud, Jung in his writings and beliefs reflected the general prejudices of his time; he believed women to be better at feelings than at thinking, to have an introverted nature, and to represent the unconscious rather than the conscious. In his theory of the Animus and Anima, Jung assumed that the Animus – a masculine element – has to provide women with objective thinking, logic, and rationality (with the unconscious spirit), since their feminine side is prone rather to feel than think. Yet since Jung himself, as a man, could not “live” the Animus, not many descriptions of the positive pole of the Animus exist. Instead, Jung thrived on describing women possessed by their Animus as unnatural, weird, mysterious and fearsome harpies. Moreover, for Jung, the unconscious is intrinsic to women (feminine), while the conscious is intrinsic to men (masculine). As the Western world is governed by the masculine conscious, men and women live under a set of values described by Papadopoulus as “authority and dominance within hierarchical structures, penetrating and focused assertion and aggression, superiority of linear cognition and detached rationality.” While the conscious is described as an established, ruling side, the unconscious is depicted as the side to be feared by all:

…it followed that the intuitive, elliptical, contextual, and emotionally charged mythopoeic language and imagery of the unconscious shared qualities and associations with those outside the prevailing order: the poets, mystics, dreamers, lunatics, lovers, and women.

---

37 Ibid.
It is apparent that Jung, very much in agreement with the historical approach to women, succeeded in stereotyping women as the mysterious “Other”. Despite the every so often cited reality – in which Jung surrounded himself with powerful female colleagues – Jung’s inner approach to women seems biased, or at least very reactionary. However, just because Jung and Freud lacked progressiveness in their approach to women does not mean that their theories should be forgotten. On the contrary, where Jung and Freud fell behind, theorists of today can take off from. Jung and Freud laid fundamental foundations for a research on femininity and women; it is on theorists of today to acknowledge that and move past them, to a sphere where their foundations are respected, while at the same time modified and adjusted.

1.2 Jungian Theory: Terms and Concepts

Life is a continuous balancing of opposites, like every other energetic process. The abolition of opposites would be equivalent to death.

– Carl Gustav Jung

This chapter provides a summary of some of the Jungian terms and concepts that will be further on useful in the analysis of *The Vampire Chronicles*’ female characters. The chapter is not intended as an exhaustive glossary, but rather as an introduction into the Jungian concepts and their usage in psychology. I have omitted some of the concepts such as the Self or the individuation process, because they are not significant for my thesis. Instead, I have focused on concepts adding depth to the issue of femininity and female characters appearing in *The Vampire Chronicles*: the unconscious, the archetype, the archetypal image, the Animus and Anima, and the shadow.

1.2.1 The Unconscious

A key concept of Jungian theory, the unconscious – similar as in Freudian theory – denotes what is inaccessible to the ego of a person, either because it is repressed or forgotten. Yet where Freud talks of universal unconscious, Jung talks of two different spheres of the unconscious: the personal unconscious and the collective unconscious. The personal unconscious is similar to the Freudian one in that it is

---

individual: it varies from person to person. The contents of the personal unconscious are called “feeling-toned complexes”\(^{39}\) and “they constitute the personal and private side of psychic life”.\(^{40}\) Particularly, the personal unconscious is said to consist of memories, and repressed material.\(^{41}\) Under the layer of personal unconscious lies the collective unconscious which is universal. The material of the collective unconscious is identical for all and comprises three different regions. The first region consists of human emotions and affects, the second and third region comprise that which is hidden in the depths of a psyche, inaccessible to the ego.\(^{42}\) The collective unconscious is understood as a timeless inheritance common to all people, and maybe even to all Animals. Jung also notes that the unconscious is older than the consciousness.

---

\(\text{Figure 1 Human Psyche – Jungian Diagram}\)

As we can see in the diagram, the ego, consciousness\(^{43}\) and unconscious form a whole psyche in Jungian theory.\(^{44}\)

---

\(^{39}\) The complexes arise in one’s life due to some trauma or shock and are said to be only treatable through practical psychotherapy. See Jolande Jacobi, *Psychology of C G Jung* (London: Routledge, 1999), 53.


\(^{42}\) *Ibid.*, 47.

\(^{43}\) Often described as “collective consciousness,” this concept partly corresponds to the Freudian concept of super-ego. It denotes all that is accessible to a human everyday waking consciousness; its center is the ego.

1. 2. 2 The Archetypes

Archetypes are the content of the collective unconscious and are accessible only indirectly through their effects and through archetypal images. They are not themselves inherited images or ideas, but rather “inherited structuring patterns…with potentials for meaning formation and images.”[^45] They are universal, objective, non-personal and not definable, common to people all over the world; they influence how we think, feel, and act. They are stored in the collective unconscious, but that does not mean that they are unchangeable; “[a]rchetypes, which Jung says evolve over time, are constantly being transformed and reinterpreted by the individual’s consciousness, and they are inseparable from language, history, and culture.”[^46] Archetypes themselves are “ideas **in potential,**”[^47] they await **becoming** and they are shaped by a particular historical epoch and culture. As such, they can only be interpreted if we take into account the history and culture in which they manifested. As George H. Jensen rightly says, “it is female archetypes that are most in need of exploration,”[^48] since they were in large part neglected by Jung himself.

1. 2. 3 Archetypal Image

An archetypal image is the visible, cultural representation of an archetype; an archetypal image is linked to an archetype via a metaphorical connection. In other words, archetypal images are creative representations only of a part of a given archetype; they can never account for an archetype as a whole, since they are stored in the collective unconscious. According to Jung, especially fairytales and myths give rise to archetypal images. Archetypes should be carefully distinguished from archetypal images although, as Steven F. Walker notes, Jung (and his disciples) often misleadingly interchanged one concept for another. Since “[t]he archetype is a psychosomatic concept linking body and psyche, instinct and image,”[^49] the content

[^47]: Ibid.
[^48]: Ibid.
of archetypal image is always influenced by culture, history, language, and even one’s body. In other words, the way one archetype manifests itself in the United States of America will be vastly different from the way it will manifest itself in the Czech Republic.

1.2.4 The Animus and the Anima

The Animus and Anima are “two contrasexual intrapsychic elements” located in both personal (shaped by individual’s experience) and collective unconscious. The Anima is the feminine aspect present in men, while the Animus is a masculine aspect present in women. Since both Animus and Anima are archetypes, they precede and condition our very own experience. Both men and women have to integrate the effects and contents of the Animus or the Anima into their consciousness during the process of individuation. Failure to do so results in projections of Animus or Anima on other people. An example of an Animus projection is described by Belfor Ulanov in the study called *The Feminine in Jungian Psychology and in Christian Theology*:

> A woman may project Animus on men: “She is repeatedly disappointed [in men] because the real personality of these men falls short of the projected ideal. No man is ever good enough. Each candidate is weak and incompetent and not really a man as compared with her fantasy partner. If the projected Animus image is negative, a woman sees men as enemies; she fears them and is hostile to them.” (44-5)

In the above description of the Animus projection on men, two negative, excessive types of projection are described. If one projects his/her Anima/Animus onto a real woman or man, they can, via projection, become to feel attracted to each other. In case one’s Animus or Anima gained positive effects and contents from their personal unconscious, one is bound to experience the impossible love. The impossible love

52 *Ibid.*: 44-5.
resembles love at first sight because both the men and the woman fall in love with their projections – with their Anima and Animus – instead of each other. Thus, a woman falls in love with a non-existent ideal she has stored in her unconscious, while a man falls in love with a non-existent ideal he has stored in his unconscious. Since the Animus and Anima are described as a mediator between ego and unconscious, there are also two other possibilities of negative projections. First, if one’s Animus or Anima comes into contact with his shadow, a person “experience[s] that which he [or she] most fears and despises in himself [or herself]”53. Second, a person can fall into his/her Anima/Animus, thus fully identifying with it. There is, however, another type of projection, a healthy projection in which one projects the unconscious potential called by Jung the soul-image. Samuels describes it as follows:

Projection of what is contrasexual is a projection of unconscious potential: ‘soul-image’. Thus the woman may first see or experience in the man parts of herself of which she is not yet conscious and yet which she needs. The man draws her soul (willingly) out of her. And the reverse will apply for a man.54

Despite this positive side of projection, Jung warns before full-on or no projections, urging that one should come to a midway between excessive projection and no projection at all.

Although Jung’s explanation of impossible love via Animus/Anima projection became very popular, Jung’s descriptions of the Animus and Anima were little praised, especially by feminists. The Anima, aligned with Eros (relatedness and feeling), is often described as an evil succubus, men’s own creative and spiritual guide (especially in dreams), or the idealized, yet in reality non-existent, woman. The Animus is described as blindly opinionated, critical, argumentative archetypal structure. Since the Animus, containing the masculine logos (reason, spiritual meaning), sees things in terms of objectiveness and reason, a woman possessed by the Animus is likewise prone to become objective, opinionated, and critical. Thus,

54 Ibid.
whenever a woman gets possessed by the Animus, men are feel undermined and discouraged, often even disgusted or irritated. A woman, as the theory of the Animus and Anima implies, has no access to objective reason, and if she does, then the situation has to be corrected. In other words, the Animus implies “that women have an indirect access to reason.” 55 Naturally, women are perceived as meek and submissive, bound to feelings and relatedness to men. Moreover, while the Anima is considered a creative dynamic enriching men’s psyche, “the Animus is seen as a compensatory agency” 56 controlling the woman’s emotional psyche.

According to Jung, people strive for symmetry and integration of their Animus/Anima; the masculine/feminine polarity is therefore understood as a universal structure of the psyche. Connell notes that this idea of natural polarity of masculine/feminine marks a reactionary turn in Jungian theory:

Jung’s treatment of the masculine/feminine polarity as a universal structure of the psyche ... leads to a quagmire. No historical change in their constitution is conceivable; all that can happen is a change in the balance between them. In modern Jungian writing this yields an interpretation of feminism not as resistance to the oppression of women, but as the reassertion of the archetypal feminine. In past history it is not men who have dominated women, so much as the masculine that has dominated the feminine. ...For this approach immediately yields the idea that modern feminism is tilting the balance too far the other way, and suppressing the masculine. 57

Despite Connell’s and feminists’ negative assertion, Jung’s idea of the Animus and Anima is nowadays seen as less problematic. Post-Jungians acknowledge potential can be found in Jung’s theory if one approaches it with an open mind. Jensen, for example, mentions that Jung first created the Animus and Anima as a counterpart to

the concept of persona. Persona is a conscious, social face created by an individual as a reaction to the social world; hence persona is a part of ego. Jensen adds that an integral part of this “social mask” are also gender roles.\textsuperscript{58} Thus, a woman, who had to take on a female gender role in a given society, repressed more masculine characteristics and, consequently, the Animus was formed in her unconscious. “The Animus and Anima are formed, in part, as an unconscious compensation for gender roles,”\textsuperscript{59} says Jensen. If we consider this, the theory becomes more historical, accounting for stereotypes and gender issues in a given culture at a given time. Moreover, attempts have been made to widen the concepts of both Animus and Anima. For example, M. Esther Harding depicted how the Animus functions in different types of women.\textsuperscript{60} In addition, James Hillman argues that as archetypes, the Anima and the Animus transcend biological differences and social role of both men and women.\textsuperscript{61} As a consequence, Hillman says, the Anima can be present in both men and women, just as the Animus can be present in both.

1. 2. 5 The Shadow

Jung uses the term shadow to describe an archetypal structure of unconscious comprising of “morally inferior wishes and motives, childish fantasies and resentments, etc.—all those things about ourselves we are not proud of and regularly seek to hide from others.”\textsuperscript{62} As is usual of archetypes, the shadow has a personal, as well as a collective side. Similarly to the Animus and Anima, a shadow can be projected onto real people (on a personal level), or whole societies (on a collective level). Jung, a systematic and a strong believer in dualism, describes shadow as a counterpart to a persona, which was earlier described here as a social mask – a face we willingly show to the outside world. Just as the persona stands for everything one wishes and is supposed to wish to be (in terms of behavior, social mores, appearance, etc.) in the eyes of a society; the shadow stands for everything one should not, or


\textsuperscript{59} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{60} See Mary Esther Harding, \textit{The Way of All Women} (Boston: Shambhala, 1990).


does not want to become in the eyes of the society. The shadow thus arises with persona, due to the process of human domestication. Jung often describes the shadow as that which is Animalistic, childish, or primitive in men, and hence conventionally tabooed in the society (for example sexuality). In other words, the shadow is not all evil. It is, however, all that is repressed from one’s consciousness.

A shadow of two types is recognized in human psyche: a personal shadow, and a collective shadow. The personal shadow “contains elements repressed from an individual’s ordinary consciousness.” In literature, the personal shadow is often depicted as the evil alter ego of the hero. The collective shadow contained in the collective unconscious, on the other hand, is that which a group of people, collectively, represses. Groups of people sharing similar interests usually have a certain collective shadow, be it a nation, a family, or even just a group of friends. For example, during the Salem witch trials, the collective shadow of the Colonial American nation was everything supernatural. The Victorian England’s collective shadow, on the other hand, was sexuality. According to Jung, a manifestation of the collective shadow is the figure of a trickster – the wise clown; half-Animal and half-divine, who can change shape and loves playing tricks on people. Often, the archetypal image of a trickster is described as being synonymous to a vampire figure. The shadow is never completely incorporated into consciousness, nor it is fully removed, since – as Jung says – “[n]oone stands beyond good and evil, otherwise he would be out of this world.” In other words, the shadow stays within us, always waiting for an opportunity to show itself.

64 Jung nowhere clearly sets the relation between the shadow and the trickster, so that often authors equal the shadow archetype to the trickster archetype. However, I believe the trickster to be the manifestation – an archetypal image – of the collective or personal shadow rather than an archetype in itself.
2. Female Archetypes

This chapter describes two major studies focused on female archetypes and their typologies written by Toni Wolff, and Erich Neumann. Toni Wolff’s essay called “Structural Forms of Feminine Psyche” and Erich Neumann’s works entitled The Great Mother: An Analysis of the Archetype and “The Meaning of the Earth Archetype for Modern Times” are of key importance for this study, because they present a functional, comprehensive typology of female archetypes derived from Jungian theories. Wolff’s typology is further elaborated and popularized in Four Eternal Women: Toni Wolff Revisited: a Study in Opposites written by Mary Dian Molton and Lucy Anne Sikes. Erich Neumann’s works are seminal, since they focus on a psychological development of a woman. Emma and Carl Jung are not discussed here, although they also published essays on female archetypes. However, Carl Jung’s approach to women, female archetypes, and femininity was discussed in previous chapters. Emma Jung’s essay entitled “Animus and Anima” is not a part of this chapter, since it primarily elaborates on her husband’s, male-centered ideas, and does not come up with a female-oriented typology of archetypes.

2. 1 Erich Neumann's The Great Mother: An Analysis of the Archetype and “The Meaning of the Earth Archetype for Modern Times”

Erich Neumann, Jung’s disciple and student, explored the archetype of the Great Mother extensively in a number of texts; he carefully studied the varied archetypal images from art, mythology, etc. hoping to understand the ways in which the mother archetype functions in the culture. He starts The Great Mother with a description of the feminine as it was perceived during paganism; feminine was compared to a vessel (a woman is containing), to water (the woman is a flowing unity, the beginning and end of every life), and finally to the earth (a woman is related to the earth and its clay).66 He writes:

---

The Great Mother who brings forth all from herself is eminently the mother of all vegetation. The fertility rituals and myths of the whole world are based upon this archetypal context.\textsuperscript{67}

Yet the approach towards the feminine, and towards all that is associated with it, changes in Roman, Greek, and Christian mythology. In “The Meaning of the Earth Archetype for Modern Times,” Neumann depicts this separation:

Earth [in the Christian, Jewish, Mohammedan, and Indian sources] is from the beginning fallen and corrupted Earth. And Earth, the Earth Serpent, Woman, and the instinctual world, as represented by sexuality, are evil, seductive, and accursed, and Men, who in virtual of his essential nature really belongs to Heaven, is the one who is only seduced and deceived....Devaluation of the Earth, hostility towards the Earth, fear of the Earth: these are all from the psychological point of view the expression of a weak patriarchal consciousness that knows no other way to help itself than to withdraw violently from the fascinating and overwhelming domain of the Earthly. For we know that the archetypal projection of the Masculine experiences, not without justice, the Earth as the unconscious-making, instinct-entangling, and therefore dangerous Feminine.\textsuperscript{68}

Thus, while the masculine principle (the heaven) becomes connected with the positive, conscious mind during the era of Roman, Greek and Christian mythology; the feminine principle (the earth) becomes connected with the negative, unconscious. Consequently, the Mother archetype experiences a transformation from an overtly positive archetype into a negative one.

\textsuperscript{67} Ibid., 48.
In both *The Great Mother* and “The Meaning of the Earth Archetype for Modern Times,” Neumann enlarges on the motif of the dual mother – the positive and the negative – first depicted by Jung. In a diagram stated in *The Great Mother*, Neumann contrasts two sides of the Mother archetype – The Good Mother, The Terrible Mother – with two types of femininity – the Positive Transformative Character, and the Negative Transformative Character. In *The Great Mother* the duality of the Great Mother archetype is emphasized through the usage of two, contrastive names: The Good Mother and The Terrible Mother. In “The Meaning of the Earth Archetype for Modern Times,” a distinction is made between the Great Mother Earth (the elemental, good Mother archetype) and the Great Terrible Mother, also called the Dark One, or the Goddess of Night. The Good Mother/the Great Mother Earth is associated with harvest, creation, birth, immortality; she is described as generous, and nourishing. Neumann says: “In her elemental character, the Great Earth Mother rules over the collective life of the species, and all individual life is adapted and subordinated to it.”69 The Terrible Mother/the Great Terrible Mother is associated with death, destruction, extinction, and suffering; she is “the possessive, the imprisoning, depriving, and devouring Mother.”70 The Terrible Mother is also often attributed with masculine features such as a beard or the male genitals: “[f]or this reason those attitudes and effects that one generally ascribes to the Masculine—waging war, killing, hunting, etc.—also belong psychologically to the figure of the Great Terrible Feminine…”71 In mythology, “the negative aspect of the mother has been personified in monsters, gorgons, witches, ghouls, who have murdered the sleep of children (and adults) since the dawning of mankind.”72

Although the Mother archetype has both the positive and negative aspect, Neumann marks that “the dark side (in her manifestations) seems to predominate.”73 Neumann explains the predominance of the dark side of the Great Mother as follows:

---

70 Ibid.
71 Ibid., 228.
Regardless how positively and correctly she [mother] behaves personally, the mother of the primal relationship must turn into a witch, for the child’s early bond to her is, of course, a restrictive and consequently ‘witchlike’ power in the child itself, which the child must overcome in favor of its progressive ego-development...  

Inspired by Jung and his theory of mother complex, Neumann believes that a mother, regardless of her goodness, always has to turn into a witch, because otherwise she would prevent her children from self-development. Both girls and boys have to liberate themselves of the Great Mother in order to become a part of the patriarchal culture. Furthermore, the patriarchal society fears the feminine of which the Great Mother archetype is a sole model. Because of this fear, patriarchy does not want to see the woman as a unity, but as polar opposites: “[t]hus woman and the Feminine appear either as negative, downward-pulling force, as swamp woman or water sprite, or as a positive, uplifting force, as angel or goddess.” The Great Mother archetype with its unity of positive (birth, rebirth) and negative (death, change) aspects terrifies men, who, as a result, divide it, so that a fight can be led against its transformative, unconscious power.

Neumann’s study of the feminine and its archetype is far-reaching; in his study of the archetypal images, he proved that a coherent idea of a female goddess existed all over the world and could be further studied. However, Neumann’s writings are in lineage with Jungian thinking and with the beliefs of his age; as a result, most of his writings are descriptive of the male-centered culture he was a part of. Feminists argue that Neumann overtly generalizes when he comprises all women under the Mother archetype, and does not allow for a complex typology of female archetypes. He does not, for example, take into consideration women who have no relation to men or to children. Nevertheless, his studies of the Mother

---

74 Ibid., 243.
75 According to Jung, the male hero has to slay the dragon (the mother) in order to free himself from both her negative and positive aspect.
77 Ibid.
archetype are very powerful and influenced many theorists in the field of religious studies, anthropology, archaeology, and literature. For this study, however, another Jungian disciple is of far more importance: Toni Wolff, Jung’s patient, lover and later on an analyst, who in her paper presented the first typology of female archetypes.

2. 2 Toni Wolff’s “Structural Forms of the Feminine Psyche”

In her short sketch called “Structural Forms of the Feminine Psyche” Toni Wolff created her own typology of female archetypes in order to enlarge Jung’s predominantly male-centered archetypal theory. The typology of Wolff is female-centered, and as such puts emphasis on women and their psychological development and self-realization. Wolff introduces four archetypes – or as she calls them structural forms – structuring the female psyche: the Amazon, the Hetaira, the Medial Woman, and the Mother.

![Figure 2 The Female Psyche – Toni Wolff’s Female Archetypes](image)

This diagram represents Wolff’s structural forms (female archetypes) divided into four quadrants in a clockwise order (represented by an arrow in the middle).

These four archetypes structure the psyche of all women and are arranged in a four quadrant graph similarly as the four functions (thinking, feeling, sensation, intuition)
appearing in Jung’s theory of psychological types. 

Thus, the two opposite archetypes are always the most contrastive in their approach to the world and have the least in common (the Amazon-the Medial Woman, the Hetaira-the Mother). Wolff describes the four archetypes according to the way they relate to men: the Mother and the Hetaira need to relate to men, while the Medial Woman and the Amazon function independently of men. In her strong belief that female psychology is best described through their relation to men, Wolff seems to succumb to the period view of women. It seems, however, that Wolff was aware of the ways in which the male-biased cultural and societal values impacted lives of women. Right at the beginning of the essay, Wolff says:

\[
\text{The outer form of life may be chosen for other than purely constitutional reasons (e.g. influences of time and environment, social circumstances, specific abilities), and more often than not the structural form of the psyche will fit into the outer form of life only with difficulty, resulting in insecurity and conflicts.}
\]

Wolff believes that the psychology of a woman is conditioned by the norms and values of a given culture; if a society does not approve of a certain structural form of a woman, a woman tries to conceal or repress it. Moreover, two of the archetypes – the Amazon and the Medial Woman – are described as the types that are in no need of a relationship to men. Yet, Wolff also believes that a woman’s psyche comprises all four archetypes; although a woman has one archetype “most consistent with her nature,” the rest of the forms are – or should be – gradually integrated into her

78 Jung distinguished between two different attitudes towards the world: an extraverted attitude and an introverted attitude. Although Jung believed that we fluctuate between the two attitudes, he also noted that one is more natural to us than the other. Further on, Jung distinguished between four different functions people use when approaching information and/or decisions: thinking, feeling, sensation, and intuition. By combining the two attitudes with the four functions, Jung created the eight psychological types. These types classify people according to the ways in which relate to the world, as well as to the ways in which they decide on and process information. The famous MBTI (Myers-Briggs Type Indicator) personality test is based on Jung’s findings.

psyche in order to approach the Self. In other words, a woman should always strive to relate to men, even though naturally she disposes of an archetype with no need of relation to men.

Although Toni Wolff’s ideas are still primarily androcentric, her essay is progressive in that it explicitly focuses on female psychology, offering an until then nonexistent typology of female unconscious, and a discussion on the feminine principle. The four archetypes are described only after a short introduction into the problematics of Protestantism. Similarly to Jung, Wolff portrays Protestantism as the religion in which the feminine principle was eradicated, thus robbing women of their essence, their inner life. Wolff bases her ideas on Jung’s distinction between logos (masculine principle of reason, objectivity, thinking, and individuality) and the soul (the psyche, feminine principle of both corporeal and incorporeal experience, of relatedness to others, the inner life). She believes that while the feminine soul strives to understand both the inner and the outer life, promoting the totality of a human being; the masculine principle, logos, strives to exclude the psychic in order to maintain the scientific, objective, and rational. Wolff argues that in the medieval mysticism emphasis was put on the soul; in Protestantism, on the other hand, logos, “the word” became the main principle, and as a result eradicated the feminine altogether. In Catholicism, where believers venerate Mary as the earthly mother, the feminine principle is still present. Even though the ideas sketched in Wolff’s essay are based on a stereotypical view of femininity (the feelings, the corporeal) and masculinity (the the reason, the abstract), Wolff managed to describe the main

81 In her discussion on Protestantism, Wolff undoubtedly draws on Jung, who most of his life struggled with his Protestant religious background. Seeing Protestantism as too patriarchal, Jung turned towards Roman Catholicism, which recognized the female principle in form of Virgin Mary. For a systematic and a dualist, the recognition of both the male and the female principle in a religion was very important, since a missing principle meant that a unity can never be achieved: “Furthermore, the Catholic Trinity now had moved in the direction of becoming a quaternity (for Jung a symbol of wholeness), having added to itself a fourth figure suggestive of the Great Mother as Divine Wisdom: the Virgin Mary as Sophia.” Steven Walker, Jung and the Jungians on Myth (New York: Routledge, 2002), 81.
82 Wolff does not make the distinction between the psyche and the soul, she connects the two terms to mean the same: the psyche, the combination of both conscious and unconscious. This is understandable, since originally psyche is the Greek word for soul.
problem arising in the society throughout the ages: women are perceived as sexual, down-to-earth, mystical beings, and because of that they have to be either persecuted or tamed. In this discussion of the disappearance of the feminine principle from Protestantism, Wolff also effectively suggests that a woman will always encounter difficulties on her way to become the Self; difficulties, which the man will never know, because he lives in a masculine-oriented world.

2. 1. 1 General Description of Wolff’s Structural Forms

In Wolff’s essay, the four archetypes are put at the ends of the two axis forming a four quadrant graph in order to emphasize their relations. Similarly to Jung’s four functions, each two archetypes form opposites: the Amazon is an opposite of the Medieval Woman, the Mother is an opposite of the Hetaira. The opposites are linked by an impersonal relationship. A woman can feel most inclined to embody naturally only one of the four types; however, all types are inherently present in a woman’s psyche. A woman has to learn how to integrate all four archetypes into her psyche, if she wants to approach the Self. The integration is described as gradual and should proceed in a certain manner. A woman first embraces the one archetype that is the most natural to her; then, she integrates into her psyche the clockwise adjacent archetype. The third archetype a woman has to deal with lies on the same axis as the second archetype. The third form, however, “has more of a shadow character and can be less easily reconciled with.”84 The last archetype to be integrated is the opposite of the first archetype. It is the archetype most contrastive to the one that is natural to a woman and therefore “cannot as a rule be lived concretely.”85 As an example, see Figure 3 (below) illustrating the gradual integration of the archetype of the

---

84 Toni Wolff, “Structural Forms of the Feminine Psyche” (Zurich: Students Association, C. G. Jung Institute, 1956), 14.
85 Ibid.
The gradual integration of all archetypes does not follow smoothly. Since each archetype has its positive and negative side (a shadow side), a woman can fall into an archetype, which will, consequently, become negative. This usually happens when a woman cannot, for some reason, integrate the next archetype. If, for example, a woman naturally aligned with the Mother archetype does not proceed to the Amazon archetype, she will fall into the negative archetype of the Mother.

2.1.1 The Amazon

The Amazon is one of the two archetypes, which Wolff portrayed as “independent and self-contained in the positive meaning of the term.”\textsuperscript{86} A female archetype independent of men, the Amazon is described as a woman possessing the stereotypical masculine traits. She is objective, adventurous, goal-directed, resolute, and rational. She deems self-development and accomplishments very important. If positive, the Amazon can become a true friend, an inspiration, and a rival to a man. If the Amazon turns negative, she deals with the outer world in a masculine way: she becomes spiteful as Megaera, one of the furies in Greek mythology, repressing her

\textsuperscript{86} Toni Wolff, “Structural Forms of the Feminine Psyche” (Zurich: Students Association, C. G. Jung Institute, 1956), 9.
personal problems, becoming impatient towards both herself and others, with her eyes fixed upon personal achievements and success. According to Wolff, the negative Amazon disdains male authority, fighting them scornfully as a first-wave feminist may have done it. To this, Molton and Sikes, based on the historical background of the Amazons, add that although the Amazon woman seems powerful and brave, she nevertheless seems to be moving towards a great, almost tragic defeat.

2.1.2 The Hetaira

The Hetaira is also called a companion, because her self-development is closely linked with the psychology of her partner. She is the one “who needs personal relationship beyond marriage.” Ultimately, this does not mean that the Hetaira is a mistress; on the contrary, Wolff says that the Hetaira – one that is aware of her potential – is capable of maintaining a marriage and a relationship outside marriage at the same time, without keeping secrets. The Hetaira needs to establish a close relationship with another being, for she can only grow if she experiences the relationship with all that belongs to it. According to Wolff, the Hetaira is, since early childhood, drawn to the world of men. Fascination with men and an effort to get close to them helps the Hetaira early on in her life to detach herself from her mother.

The Hetaira’s shadow is known for its ability to evoke in the mind of a woman an ideal Anima of a man. Although becoming someone’s ideal woman is a very alluring idea, Molton and Sikes note that it can also become dangerous for both partners. The man becomes disappointed once he realizes a woman merely molded herself into his ideal; just like the nymph Calypso, who detained Odysseus on an island of Ogygia. The woman, on the other hand, exhausts herself, since she is constantly in an act and has no idea who she really is. If the Hetaira does not realize that she plays the role of an ideal Anima, she can end up emotionally, and intellectually drained. Similarly, her partner – driven by the idealistic Hetaira – may end up doing things he would have otherwise never done. In other words, the man is transformed by Hetaira’s charms; Hetaira becomes the powerful sorceress Circe.

---

87 Ibid., 8.
88 As an example, Wolff says that a man could for example “give up his profession to become a ‘creative artist’; he may divorce, feeling that the Hetaira understands him better than his wife, etc.” See Toni Wolff, “Structural Forms of the Feminine Psyche” (Zurich: Students Association, C. G. Jung Institute, 1956), 8.
2.1.3 The Medial Woman

The Medial Woman is an enigma to herself and a mystery to others; she is the mediator, or the medium between the consciousness and the collective unconscious, “immersed in the psychic atmosphere of her environment and the spirit of her period.”\(^8^9\) In her shadow aspect, she has difficulties distinguishing between the contents of her conscious and unconscious, as well as between which psychic contents belong to her and which belong to others. Thus, the Medial Woman can experience conditions in which she, unknowingly, displays that which is a part of her unconscious, and suppresses that which is a part of her consciousness; e.g. displaying her shadow traits, acting as an Animus or an Anima, while suppressing her own Persona. Similarly, she can draw content from others’ unconscious and either project it on herself (e.g. acting as someone’s inner Animus/Anima/Shadow), or, similarly, she can push the other person to make her/his unconscious content conscious. As she does so without any warning or preparation, the shadow Medial Woman can be compared to a bad psychologist; one that knows how to access other people’s inner-selves, but has no idea how to gently lead them towards the self-realization. Due to these unwarranted actions, the Medial Woman often loses herself in others, in their destiny, their thoughts, and ideas; similarly, others can lose themselves in her.

If the Medial Woman knows, or learns how to distinguish between the conscious and the unconscious, she can become a medium for a spiritual/supernatural (as an example, Wolff talks about Christian martyrs or female mystics). Molton and Sikes distinguish between two types of the Medial Woman. The type A as a mediator speaks for “a clearly defined ethereal ‘other,’ a personalized spirit guide, god, or goddess.”\(^9^0\) The type B usually relates to entities, or entity generally not recognized by her culture, or even forbidden. In their distinction, Molton and Sikes take into consideration the type of entity for which the Medial Woman becomes a medium; either the entity is accepted in a given culture (for example, Christianity may accept the figures of God, Jesus, Virgin Mary, etc. as a personalized spirit for which one may become a medium), or forbidden (for example, the figure of Devil is widely

---

\(^8^9\) Toni Wolff, “Structural Forms of the Feminine Psyche” (Zurich: Students Association, C. G. Jung Institute, 1956), 11.

rejected among religious people, thus becoming a medium for the Devil is seen as undesirable by many religions). Molton and Sikes also speak of two types of communications the Medial Woman can hold; she either communicates directly to the entity in question (she sees visions of; or speaks to the entity), or indirectly via stimulus (to receive and decode the messages, she needs to use a crystal ball, tarot cards, etc.). The distinction seems to suggest that – based on the cultural background of the Medial Woman – the Type A Medial Woman stands for a religious martyr, a good witch, or a clairvoyante (as suggested by Wolff herself), while the Type B comes to represent a bad witch. The Type A also seems to be positive, while the Type B seems rather negative.

2.1.4 The Mother

The archetype of the Mother is not very well described in Wolff’s essay, probably because Jung and Neumann were also concerned with this archetype, and so Wolff did not feel the need to describe the Mother archetype in much detail. Wolff depicts the mother as “motherly cherishing and nursing, helping, charitable, teaching”. The Mother is a person who finds fulfillment in caring for others. As the negative aspect of the mother, Wolff states the greatly exaggerated, or anxious mothering of an already independent person, who is apparently capable to care for themselves.

Molton and Sikes enlarge on Wolff’s idea, and describe the effects of the negative Mother. According to them, the negative Mother can have two effects on her child, or the person she nurtures long after there is no need: either the child starts rejecting its mother (usually secretly), or the child unconsciously adapts itself to its mother’s exaggerated caring. The Mother feels complete only if she can take care of others, and feels useless if there is no-one she can attend to. Thus, always surrounded by others, the Mother unconsciously makes herself feel needed, while in the process losing the idea of who she really is when alone.

---

91 Toni Wolff, “Structural Forms of the Feminine Psyche” (Zurich: Students Association, C. G. Jung Institute, 1956), 5.
3. Gender, Femininity and Vampire Chronicles

The following chapter is a brief introduction to the concepts of gender, femininity, and masculinity. Gender is viewed through the lens of social constructionism, although social constructionism does not represent the only way of looking at the complexity of gender. In particular, I am influenced by Judith Butler and her idea of gender performativity, which is described in more detail in the first subchapter. Following is a subchapter on gender in Vampire Chronicles summarizing the ways in which critics approach the so-called genderlessness of Ricean vampires. The rest of the chapter deals with the concepts of femininity and masculinity; emphasis is being put especially on femininity, since I deal primarily with female characters and their relations. The final chapter describes the types of femininities I found to be present in Vampire Chronicles.

3.1 What is Gender?

The concept of gender emerged during the second wave of feminism. In simple terms, gender category was set up to differentiate between a biological sex (genitalia, chromosomes, and/or physical differences) and social constructions (gender identity, traits, roles, etc.) learnt or imprinted upon our sex by the patriarchal society. Gender is therefore not a fixed notion, but is constructed during our social interactions with others. This view of gender – rooted in the theory known as social constructionism93 – stems from sociology, but is also present in anthropology, feminism, and gender studies. One of the recent representatives of the social construction gender theory is Judith Butler, an American feminist, philosopher and gender theorist who “rigorously interrogates the necessity of fixed, immutable gender identities.”94

According to Judith Butler and her theory of performativity first described in Gender Trouble we involuntarily perform gender within the boundaries of heteroreality by impersonating an ideal attributed to our biological sex. Katie Milestone and Anneke Meyer in Gender and Popular Culture explain Judith Butler’s theory of performativity in more detail:

---

93 Social constructionism is a theory according to which meanings are created through social interactions (through the things we say and do when with other people).
Gender is a category that appears natural and permanent, and, as such, independent of individual action, because it is constantly repeated. Or, to put it differently, gender identity is the effect, the outcome of performativity rather than is its cause. Differences between women and men that we may find in our culture, i.e. notions of masculinity and femininity, do not exist because of essential differences that cause men and women to behave in different ways, but are the result of the structural category of gender which produces the scripts of femininity and masculinity that men and women continually re-enact. The performative nature of gender is not something we usually notice because the performativity of femininity and masculinity is so routine and naturalized that it remains invisible.95

As the quotation above indicates, gender can be described as a naturally occurring performative construct which is not linked to one’s sex, but is constructed culturally. Elsewhere, Judith Butler’s idea of gender is explained as “a productive concept,” a relationship producing meanings in a specific culture at a specific time.96 Even though both explanations use different wording (performance versus production), they are nevertheless narrating the same thing: gender is what we do, not who we inevitably are. Yet no matter how appealing this distinction between sex and gender may be, in everyday life, we still live in a world where sex and gender are treated as coincidental and where our identities are shaped by the notions of masculinity and femininity.

---


96 Ibid., 273.
3. 2 Femininity and Masculinity

“The concepts “masculine” and “feminine,” whose meanings seem so unambiguous to ordinary people, are among the most confused that occur in science.”

– Sigmund Freud

While the nature of masculinity and femininity is described and perceived as a significant part of gender studies, both concepts nevertheless oppose a direct, self-sufficient definition and are often described as “elusive and difficult to define.” The definitions of femininity and masculinity, similarly to those of gender, differ with a chosen approach. Theorists distinguish between at least four different theoretical approaches to the definition of masculinity and femininity: essentialist, normative, positivist and semiotic. The essentialist perspective assumes that masculinity and femininity stand for traditional attitudes, norms of behavior, values, and roles of men and women. Both femininity and masculinity are believed to have roots in biology and the physical differences between women and men; therefore women inherently display femininity, while men inherently display masculinity. In contrast to the essentialist perspective, a normative approach views masculinity and femininity as traits men and women should have. Again, women should display only feminine traits, while men should display only masculine traits. However, the normative approach suggests that the femininity and masculinity norms are hardly ever achieved in reality, and that both sexes approach the gender standards to different degrees (i. e. one man can be deemed more masculine than another; the same goes for women and femininity). A positivist approach believes femininity is linked with the lives of women, and masculinity with the lives of men. In other words, femininity is what women do and masculinity is what men do in objective reality. This approach can also be called empirical, because it relies on observation of men and women and is often applied in ethnography and psychology. Finally, a semiotic approach defines masculinity as the opposite of femininity, and vice versa; the approach is relational. Semiotic approach is heavily used in poststructuralism, feminism, linguistics, comparative literature, and Lacanian psychoanalysis. Since none of the above

mentioned definitions of masculinity and femininity is currently perceived as sufficient, theorists usually combine the approaches in order to come up with their own definition.

The definition of femininity and masculinity I use in my thesis is influenced by the normative approach, semiotic approach, and by the cultural approach emphasizing gender relations, as suggested in Connell’s study on masculinities. I believe femininity and masculinity to be gender-related processes embedded in a given society and its culture at a given time.\textsuperscript{99} I do not believe femininity and masculinity to be tied to one’s biology because that would “rule out the usage in which we call some women ‘masculine’ or ‘feminine’, or some actions or attitudes ‘masculine’ or ‘feminine’ regardless of who displays them”.\textsuperscript{100} Despite not believing that femininity and masculinity are determined by biology, the concepts are still recognized as two relational opposites working alongside a masculine-feminine scale, which are, to a large extent, capable of distinguishing between gender traits most likely found in women (femininity) or in men (masculinity). In other words, on the feminine-masculine continuum, femininity is believed to be most likely, or in larger measure, manifest in women; masculinity, on the other hand, is believed to be most likely, or in larger measure, manifest in men. I believe that in order to study femininities, one should follow in the steps of Connell’s study of masculinities: identify different types of femininities and their relations first, and examine the relations between femininities and masculinities as a second step. However, as I do not focus on masculinities versus femininities in this study, the relations between masculinities and femininities will be only briefly mentioned. What I emphasize in my thesis instead are the relations between different femininities found in Vampire Chronicles and their relations to the prevailing femininity as it exists in reality.

\textsuperscript{99} Applying this definition of masculinity and femininity in the fantasy world of Vampire Chronicles can seem rather complicated, since there is no real society, or culture, and if there is, then we are allowed to see only a small fragment of it. Thus, I believe that the femininities found in the literary universe have to be related to the real world as it existed during the origin of the novel, as well as to the life of the author of the novel.

\textsuperscript{100} R. W. Connell, \emph{Masculinities} (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2005), 69.
3. 3 Prevailing Femininity

“Femininity was constituted as a “problem” in second-wave feminism. For many feminists, feminine values and behaviour were seen as a major cause of women’s oppression.”

– Joanne Hollows

When we talk about femininities, we can scarcely avoid talking about gender stereotypes. Gender stereotypes are common, oversimplified understandings of the differences between males and females. As Linda Brannon says, “[g]ender stereotypes are very influential; they affect conceptualizations of women and men and establish social categories for gender.”102 Every day, stereotypes are inevitably shaping our judgments of other people and of ourselves as well. To a certain degree, we are capable to cast aside gender stereotypes with age, but “the tendency to rely on the stereotype is always present”103 to at least some extent, even when we are old enough to know better. Stereotypical femininity – the ways in which it was influencing the lives of women – was heavily criticized especially during the era of second-wave feminism.

Second-wave feminism movement – happening between 1960 and 1979 – questioned the definitions of femininity and its consequences for women’s lives. Femininity, seen as passive, inferior to masculinity, submissive and dependent, was claimed to be one of the key problems at the core of women’s oppression. It was argued that femininity and feminine roles were being mapped onto women based on biological differences.104 In other words, second-wave feminists believed that femininity oppressed women because it prescribed them with a feminine social role strongly embedded in the patriarchal system. Thus, liberation was possible only if women rejected femininity and the feminine ideals of the time – being a mother and/or a wife. Today, theorists talk rather about plural masculinities and femininities. The idea is that there are countless types of masculinities and femininities which can

be studied; stereotypical femininity/masculinity is only one possibility among many others.

Stereotypical femininity, sometimes also called the ideal femininity, differs across time and space; nevertheless, an individual always – consciously or subconsciously – aligns their femininity with the prevailing femininity. Carrie Paechter in her study called *Being Boys, Being Girls: Learning Masculinities and Femininities* suggests understanding the term *femininity* as an ideal, typical version of femininity of a particular society at a particular time.\(^{105}\) In comparison, Paechter defines *femininities* as the ways in which individuals construct their own femininity. During constructing her own femininity, a woman, most usually, relates to the ideal version of femininity, while a man relates to the ideal version of masculinity. At the same time, the individual starts developing and understanding their own femininity/masculinity and the ways in which it differs from the ideal femininity/masculinity. In this paper, I see such distinction as confusing. Although ideal femininity, as well as stereotypical femininity, are very strong types of femininities, they should not be considered their own category reigning above other femininities. Therefore, I use the term *femininities* as an umbrella term for all possible femininity types there are – be it national types (e.g., Chinese femininities), cultural types (e.g., sport femininities, Hollywood femininities), stereotypical types of a given era (e.g., the stereotypical femininity of 1950s in different countries), etc. I also understand stereotypical and ideal femininity type to be the same since what is for one a desirable femininity type (a type they strive to achieve) does not have to be desirable for another individual. In other words, what is considered an ideal for a society does not have to become an ideal for an individual, yet he or she cannot escape it; hence the term *prevailing femininity* is being used instead of ideal/stereotypical femininity.

As the prevailing femininity and masculinity became an issue in the early 1960s, theorists started to research it in order to understand how men and women believe masculinity and femininity should look like. Unsurprisingly, men and women of the early 1960s showed a strong acceptance of gender stereotypes. According to

the research from Rosenkratz et al. (1968) quoted in Brannon, the stereotypic traits of prevailing femininity of the 1960s included being religious, being aware of feelings of others, being gentle, being tactful, being quiet, being neat in habits, having strong need for security, and not using harsh language. As Brannon points out, most of these stereotypic feminine traits have been here since 1800 when the so-called Cult of True Womanhood became popular during the Victorian era. Even with the 1960s prevailing femininity we can talk of four cardinal virtues influencing women’s lives: being pious, submissive, domestic, and pure. To these virtuous traits, college students of the 1960s added being talkative, worldly, and able to talk freely with men about sex. With the change of social roles of men and women between the late 1960s and 1990s, both genders started to display more egalitarian/feminist attitudes toward women. Gender stereotyping, however, did not disappear. Prentice and Carranza’s research on gender stereotypes from 2002 shows that being sensitive, friendly, warm to others and interested in children is still considered feminine, while being decisive, ambitious, assertive, and risk-taking is considered masculine.

Women are still judged harshly if they are being stubborn, rebellious, cynical, promiscuous, arrogant, or controlling (i.e. if they are showing masculine traits), whereas men can show these traits without penalty. Physical appearance and occupations also affect judgments about women and men. Long hair, gentle facial features, high-pitched voice, slenderness, and smoothness of the body are considered the ideal for a woman. Being a stay at home mother who takes care of children, manages the house and cooks is still considered an ideal occupation for a woman in the United States of America. In other words, stereotypic feminine traits and prevailing femininity are very much alive and influence women of all kinds just as strongly as they did in the past. The only difference is the ways in which women of

---

106 Research was held among college students of both genders.
109 Ibid.
today react to the prevailing femininity: some try to deconstruct it, others want to embrace it.

While many third-wave feminists call for women to embrace the prevailing femininity in order to become equals to men, others believe deconstruction of femininity is what needs to be done. In many pro-femininity texts, women are invited to “actively play with femininity” and become part of the girl power.\textsuperscript{111} Openly pro-sex and pro-femininity, the feminists behind these texts understand the second-wave feminist rejection of femininity as obsolete and meaningless. The other group of feminists – let us use the term \textit{dissidents} suggested by Aurora Linnea in her article on feminism called “Reclaiming femininity, crippling feminism” – argues against such idea. According to them, prevailing femininity should not be embraced, but deconstructed, since by embracing it women merely trap themselves in the stereotype.\textsuperscript{112}

Although feminists no longer declare femininity a patriarchal fabrication, they nevertheless show reluctance when dealing with the concept of femininity. Many unwillingly confess that even the phrase “being a woman” is hard to define clearly. In other words, what feminists struggle with is not only the concept of femininity, but also the terms \textit{womanhood} or \textit{woman}. When Anne Rice declared in 1996 that “[w]hat it means to be a woman is something we’ve barely begun to scratch the surface of”\textsuperscript{113} she made a statement that went beyond time. Feminists are nowhere closer to defining and understanding femininity than they were in the 1990s, the same applies to general public. Prevailing femininity is still perceived as harmful and as such is advised to be altered: either through embracement, or through deconstruction. Yet the question of whether such alternation is helpful or not still stands and will apparently not be solved for quite some time.

3. 4 Prevailing Masculinity

Masculinity, just like femininity, is a complex concept approached differently by various theorists; here, however, I will discuss mainly the influential concept of

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{113} Michael Riley, \textit{Conversations with Anne Rice} (New York: Ballantine Books, 1996), 54.
\end{flushleft}
hegemonic masculinity as it was suggested by Raewyn Connell. Similarly to femininity, masculinity offers itself for typologization through gender theory. Among the best known typologies of masculinity is that of an Australian sociologist Raewyn Connell. Connell suggests that masculinity should not be defined as an object, but rather through processes and relationships within a given society and culture.\textsuperscript{114} It is gender relations – “the relations among people and groups organized through the reproductive arena”\textsuperscript{115} – that give rise to both masculinity and femininity. Thus, masculinities and femininities can be understood as processes – rather than something an individual can possess – which are being produced and reproduced in a given culture and society. If we focus on the gender relations among men and women, we will recognize that there is more than one kind of femininity and masculinity.\textsuperscript{116} Yet understanding that there are different types of femininities and masculinities is, according to Connell, only a first step. The important thing is to understand how different masculinities relate to each other; the same applies to femininities.\textsuperscript{117} Based on these ideas, Connell distinguishes between four different relations among masculinities: hegemony, subordination, complicity, and marginalization. I will not go into details of all, because not all types of masculinities concern us here. However, one gender relation among masculinities is of key importance for this study: hegemony. Connell defines hegemonic masculinity as follows:

Hegemonic masculinity can be defined as the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women.\textsuperscript{118}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{115} Ibid., 72.
\item \textsuperscript{116} Ibid., 76.
\item \textsuperscript{117} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{118} Ibid., 77.
\end{itemize}
Gender hegemony – and out of this gender relations arising hegemonic masculinity – is the reason why men have the dominant position in the society. If there are at least some men embodying hegemonic masculinity, women are always considered subordinate. Since its origin, the concept of hegemonic masculinity found a wide use. The concept was used in criminology, media representation studies, organizational studies, geography, laws, gender’s politics, etc.\(^\text{119}\) Yet where some theorists acclaimed the concept, others critiqued it saying it is ambiguous, blurry, and negative. Thus, in December 2005 Connell decided to evaluate the criticism and reformulate the concept of hegemonic masculinity in a study entitled “Hegemonic Masculinity, Rethinking the Concept.”

Gradually answering all of the critiques, Connell came up with a renewed model of hegemonic masculinity. Where critics argued that hegemonic masculinity is a static, overlapping and above all blurry concept, Connell emphasized its historicity, saying that hegemonic masculinity is a changeable model of an idealized definition of masculinity “based on practice that permits men’s collective dominance over women to continue.”\(^\text{120}\) Following this argument, Connell added that the hegemonic masculinities of a certain time and place “express widespread ideas, fantasies, and desires. They provide models of relations with women and solutions to problems of gender relations.”\(^\text{121}\) Thus, Connell emphasized that hegemonic masculinity is a subject to change over time and place. Consequently Connell added that hegemonic masculinities “[does not have to] correspond closely to the lives of any actual men”.\(^\text{122}\) In other words, there may be a very small number of men embodying hegemonic masculinity; hegemonic masculinity is not perceived as something static and belonging to an individual, but rather as a process, or a dynamic perceivable within a society. Some men can embody it only partially, others may only partake in it for a certain amount of time. Connell did not, however, disprove that hegemonic masculinity is basically negative – after all, it is a process considered to play a key role in permitting dominance of men over women. She did, however, regret the fact

\(^{120}\) Ibid., 840.
\(^{121}\) Ibid.
\(^{122}\) Ibid., 838.
that in the research on masculinities, many theorists omitted the relations between masculinities and femininities. Since “women are central in many of the processes constructing masculinities” Connell believes that the interplay of masculinities and femininities needs to be further questioned and researched.

Connell’s hegemonic masculinity closely corresponds to what I call the prevailing masculinity. Prevailing masculinity – also an ideal, stereotypical masculinity – elevates men above women: masculinity is considered more than femininity, and, consequently, men are the ones who should hold power, are paid better, and enjoy more freedom sexually and otherwise. The prevailing masculinity is dictated to us by our societal and cultural norms. As Brannon points out, prevailing masculinity seems to be more stable and more extreme than prevailing femininity. Among the stereotypic traits of prevailing masculinity count being strong, aggressive, competitive, unemotional, dominant, self-confident, ambitious, direct, and feeling superior to women. Some of these traits are perceived as positive (for example being strong and self-confident), others are perceived as negative (being dominant and feeling superior to women). Just as the prevailing femininity is applied to all women in a given cultural context, the prevailing masculinity is applied stereotypically to the male sex population of a given culture. It is not a fixed entity which one can fully embody in real life, but rather a collection of ideas and norms instilled into our minds about the way masculinity should be understood and practiced in our society.

---

123 Connell notes: “[a]ll forms of femininity in this society are constructed in the context of the overall subordination of women to men. For this reason, there is no femininity that holds among women the position held by hegemonic masculinity among men.” The asymmetrical counterpart to a hegemonic masculinity is therefore called emphasized femininity, and is said to comply to patriarchy. R. W. Connell, *Masculinities* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2005), 187.


3. 5 Ricean Vampires: Genderless or Androgynous?

“I’ve never really understood why my characters are androgynous or why they are gay.”

“When I consider them truly wise, and truly powerful, and truly possessed of many options, those characters are almost always androgynous. They’re almost never fully stereotypical males or stereotypical females. I don’t see the perfection of gender as a route to superiority or to capability or to power. On the contrary, I see surrendering to a kind of blending of the sexes as extremely important for characters to discover their vulnerability and to go with it.”

“I really see the vampires as transcending gender. If you make them [vampires] absolutely straight or gay, you limit the material. They can be either one.”

– Anne Rice

Gender and sexuality are themes many critics and interviewers get gladly back to when talking about Vampire Chronicles, since the author herself says her vampires are gay and androgynous, while – in one breath – also claiming that she has no idea why that is. But while many critics tried to resolve the mystery of Ricean vampires’ sexuality, only a handful decided to grapple with the issue of their genderlessness or, as the author calls it, androgyny.

The small number of essays written on Vampire Chronicles and gender contradicts themselves; some offer explanations for genderless nature of vampires, others argue against it. For example, Edward J. Ingebretsen in his paper called “Anne Rice: Raising Holy Hell, Harlequin Style” argues that “Rice’s vampires parodically

127 Ibid., 62.
129 Anne Rice often uses gender-related terms without further discussing them, thus unintentionally misleading her critics in their analyses of vampire characters. Often, Anne Rice confuses – or rather merges – gender with sexuality when talking about her writings; similarly, she confuses the terms from genderqueer group of gender identities. Sometimes, Rice talks about androgynous vampires, while at other Times she mentions vampires transcending gender and heterosexual orientation. This inconsistency has most probably brought about the term genderless which later on started to appear in most of the critical essays written on Vampire Chronicles. But while androgyny means blending of femininity and masculinity to such extent that a person seems to emanate both feminine and masculine traits at the same Time, genderlessness is a term describing a person having no gender. Often, critics uncritically accept the terms genderless or androgynous and fail to notice that although Ricean vampires are sexless they nevertheless show noticeable gender traits. As a result, their criticism gets entangled in the ambiguity of the undefined gender-related terms.
reenact gender conventions and their customary politics.” For Ingebretsen, gender is still very much visible in Vampire Chronicles and the term genderless is considered useless; androgyny is not mentioned in his work at all. Michelle Hobbs, on the other hand, perceives The Vampire Chronicles realm (namely analyzing the first three vampire novels Interview with the Vampire, The Vampire Lestat, and The Queen of the Damned) as a world in which the patriarchal (Christian) system is carefully replaced by a matriarchal system, allowing for an equality of genders unseen in vampire novels of the nineteenth century. Hobbs believes that Rice’s female vampires are strong, independent, and – although the term is not being used – androgynous:

Rice rejects ... [the] male concept of femininity and constructs instead,
an image of the ideal woman as one who embraces her duality, the
masculine and feminine aspects of her personality.

Both Ingebretsen and Hobbs accept the suggested terms – genderless or androgynous – without further discussing them. Martin J. Wood, on the other hand, in his essay called “New Life for an Old Tradition: Anne Rice and Vampire Literature” suggests that to understand the issues of gender and sexuality in Rice’s vampire literature, readers must first learn to read them anew.”

According to Wood, when dealing with the vampires of Vampire Chronicles “[a]ll notion of gender, even of genitalia, is obsolete,” because vampires choose their victims without regard to gender. With nonfunctional sexual organs, vampires are said to be prone to experience – and express – a so-called non-genital eroticism towards other vampires and human victims as well. Thus, a common reader believes
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131 Michelle Hobbs, Reshaping the Archetype: Mythmaking and Matriarchy in Anne Rice’s Vampire Chronicles (MA Thesis; Memorial University of Newfoundland, September 1996), 75.
132 Wood suggests that in reading Vampire Chronicles, readers have to apply the so-called new codes of reading stemming from Rice’s texts. Martin J. Wood, “New Life for an Old Tradition: Anne Rice and Vampire Literature,” in The Blood is The Life (Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1999), 73.
Ricean vampires are homosexual. Wood, however, claims that such reading is wrong and suggests we should rather talk about “...an example of sex without gender,” because “...in novels where none of the main characters, male or female, have functioning sexual organs, that label [homosexual] is slightly absurd.” What Wood seems to suggest is an interesting take on gender essentialism: when one is deprived of their functioning sexual organs, they also automatically lose a gender linked to their sexual organs. In other words, once a human male becomes sexless due to a transition into a vampire, he also has to become genderless. Because gender and sex distinctions are thus blurred, Wood believes that readers of Vampire Chronicles can learn to cast away what they know about sexuality and gender and learn to accept the other gender and the other sexuality.

Although Wood’s theory seems the most plausible of all presented here, it is based on an impression and hope for a possible meaningfulness of the genderless term rather than on a careful reading of The Vampire Chronicles. At least some of the vampires in The Vampire Chronicles did not choose their victims without regard to their gender. In Interview with the Vampire, the vampire child Claudia meets Madeleine, a woman who sews little dolls resembling her dead daughter, and later demands of Louis to turn Madeleine into a vampire. She does not choose a man, but a woman, for a very simple reason: she craves a mother figure and a mother figure, at least according to her, has to be female. Similarly, in The Vampire Lestat, Magnus, one of the ancient vampires, is looking for an heir; a mortal he could turn into a vampire. But Magnus does not search for just any heir – he looks for a specific person of a certain personality traits and of certain looks. During the first few times when Magnus approaches Lestat, he compliments Lestat on his bravery, strength, and his looks. “You’re perfect, my Lelio, my Wolfkiller,” Magnus says and then in a poetical voice continues, “Sunlight in the hair … and the blue sky fixed forever in your eyes.” Later, after Magnus had turned Lestat into a vampire and killed
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136 Gender essentialism believes that biological dispositions of people determine their gender dispositions. According to gender essentialism a man is inherently masculine and a woman is inherently feminine. See also chapter 4. 2 Femininity and Masculinity.
himself in a fire, Lestat roams the corridors of the tower in which Magnus lived. He smells a stench of corpses and is lead to a prison cell in which he finds “a heap of corpses in all states of decay, the bones and rotted flesh crawling with worms and insects.” He further describes the sight:

There was something important here, something terribly important, to be realized. And it came to me suddenly that all these dead victims had been men – their boots and ragged clothing gave evidence of that – and every single one of them had yellow hair, very much like my own hair. The few who had features left appeared to be young men, tall, slight of build. And the most recent occupant here – the wet and reeking corpse that lay with its arms outstretched through the bars – so resembled me that he might have been a brother.

Magnus, who could have chosen anyone as his fledgling, decides to hunt for a blond, blue-eyed, strong, brave person, and in a process leaves behind a cell full of rotting bodies, which hauntingly reminds the reader of heaps of bodies Hitler, fixed on the idea of Aryan race, left behind. The important thing is that Magnus does not search only for a person with Aryan features; he search specifically for a man. This, once again, proves that Wood’s theory is based on an effort at justification of the genderless term used by Rice herself rather than on truth.

---
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4. Anne Rice

RILEY: Given what you’ve said about the difficulty of being a woman, about hostility toward women not only from men but even from other women, was there a struggle for you to like being a woman, or perhaps a dislike of what you understood being a woman to mean?

RICE: I remember perceiving very early, in almost a raw way, that if people didn’t find women seductive, they generally regarded them with disgust. ... I didn’t particularly want to be perceived either way, either with disgust or as seductive. So obviously that must influence my writing. I don’t like to deal with that aspect of life. I don’t like going around in a book being somebody who has to either be seductive or face people’s disgust. I haven’t resolved all my feelings about it, so it’s easier to write from the male point of view.

– Anne Rice

Anne Rice, named after her father Howard Allen O’Brien, was born on October 4, 1941 in New Orleans, Louisiana. Anne was the second of four daughters to be born into the family of Katherine Allen and Howard O’Brien, two practicing Catholics of Irish background. Her sisters were named Alice (born 1939), Tamara (born 1947) and Karen (1949). Upon her arrival to the school for the first time, Howard Allen had decided to change her name to Anne. Similarly to her sisters, Anne had changed her name several times during her adolescence before finally settling for Anne. Anne’s parents, who thought that their four girls should be treated like small adults rather than children, did not mind the name changes. Anne’s mother Katherine, or Kay, as she was called, was a woman full of contradiction: she was a great storyteller, a palm reader, an avid movie and literature fan, but also a devoted Catholic who believed purity was the utmost goal of one’s life. She came from a respected Irish family and early on in her marriage decided that her children should get a liberal, yet also strictly Catholic education. Anne’s father Howard also had a keen interest in literature, music, and creative writing and continued to encourage his daughters in their literary efforts. Thus supported by both their mother and father, Anne and her sister Alice started writing stories and plays, which they later on performed in the family circle.

While Anne’s mother introduced her children to many literary and movie classics and encouraged them to be self-aware, curious, and goal-oriented, she also

set limits to their creativity and growth. In *Prism of the Night* Anne recollects that “[t]here were all kinds of things we couldn’t see or read… My mother’s idea of being a genius was to be like G. K. Chesterton. Art existed for God’s sake.”\(^{141}\) Except for the religious limitations, the O’Brien house was a place of freedom: daughters were encouraged to join in with the adult conversations, could ask any possible questions, and called their parents by their first names. Moreover, Katherine taught Anne and her sisters that nothing in the whole world is unachievable for both men and women alike. However, when Katherine started drinking, the O’Brien’s home had changed from a safe place into a place of fear, guilt, and anxiety. Ramsland describes how Anne and her sisters were constantly anxious about their mother, who upon Howard’s leave for the navy would drink in secrecy behind the closed doors of her bedroom. Although Howard was positive about Katherine’s ability to battle her alcoholism, she died when Anne turned 15. While Howard mourned the death of his wife Anne, only a teenager at that time, had to learn how to take care of the household and her little sisters. The situation was tiring and stressful for everyone, and so Howard decided to move out of the house and into a small apartment with his daughters. Still, Anne was unhappy with the situation, from a teenager she had to turn into a mother-like figure sweeping the floors and washing the clothes. Finally, the dismal situation caused Howard to send all his daughters to a boarding school.

In *Prism of the Night* Anne recalls the school: “It was like something out of *Jane Eyre* … a dilapidated, awful, medieval type of place. I really hated it and wanted to leave.”\(^{142}\) Meanwhile, Howard had met a woman who was to become his second wife. Upon their arrival from the boarding school, Anne and her sisters had learnt that they are about to move to Texas with Howard and his new wife; needless to say that they were heartbroken – she loved New Orleans and considered it her home. Although Texas was nothing like New Orleans, it allowed Anne to step into the world of new possibilities. Richardson, the school she attended in Texas, was public and Baptist, and it was less strict than any of the Catholic schools she had attended before. In a journal class at Richardson, Anne first met Stanley Rice, the editor of the high school newspapers, and fell in love with him immediately. But


\(^{142}\) *Ibid.*, 53.
while Anne went around Richardson proclaiming she loves “Spanish rice, fried rice and Stanley Rice,” Stan had showed little interest in her. Thus, after completing her education at Texas Woman’s University, Anne left for San Francisco with her friend Ginny. The moment Stan discovered Anne was gone from Texas for good, he started to realize he has feelings for her. In 1960 Anne and Stan began exchanging letters; a year later Stan proposed to Anne in a telegram. They got married in 1961 in Texas, moved together to San Francisco and began attending courses at San Francisco University.

Early on in 1963 Stan became popular over his poetry; in 1966 Stan’s poetry was published. Meanwhile, Anne studied Political Science as an undergraduate, switching to Art History in her graduate program, and later on to German and English. In 1966, Anne gave birth to her daughter named Michelle. Among studying and taking care of the child, Anne wrote fervently on her typewriter towards her goal: to become a published author. In 1970s, Michelle got diagnosed with leukemia; Stan and Anne tried different experimental drugs and treatments, but their daughter slowly withered away. Michelle died of leukemia at the age of six, leaving behind two desperate and grieving parents. Around the time of Michelle’s death, Anne started drinking heavily, thus following in the footsteps of her mother. In 1973, Anne rewrote a story from 1969 called “Interview With the Vampire” into a novel in just five weeks. Interview With the Vampire was published in 1976 and became the cathartic novel in which Anne Rice battled all her fears, questions, and traumas, as well as an iconic vampire novel which many writers of fantasy would consider their model in the future.

4. 1 Anne Rice and Femininity

In a novel-length interview with Michael Riley, Anne Rice opens up about the ways her own femininity and experience with femininity has had an impact on her writings. Talking about Taltos, Rice for example says that the main character Ash could never have been a woman since she [Anne Rice] “couldn’t have made the novel revolve around a female in that way.” Rice then adds: “[i]t was something

---

about that person being a male and being able to slip in and out of life and have certain problems resolved from the very beginning that gave the character its momentum.”

The idea Rice talks about – that a male character is an active hero who makes things happen, while the female character is a passive heroine to whom things happen – is central to feminist critique of male writings and is tackled in Pam Morris’s literary study Literature and Feminism. Whether Anne Rice realizes it or not, her unconscious choice of a male main character could be the doing of a patriarchal society teaching her that a man can have his own story, while a female can only be the man’s associate on his adventures.

In a similar way, Anne Rice shows concern with the critics’ and audience’s response to female-male romance:

When I write about men, even if they are gay men, the critical response has tended to be better than to relationships with women. I can present a highly romantic relationship between two men, and the book isn’t perceived as just a romance, but that’s exactly what happens if one of the people is a woman. They’re spoken of pejoratively as “just a romance.” When I first started writing, I was very conscious of this. I remember being conscious with Louis and Lestat that if one of them had been a woman, the novel would have received harsh criticism. A scene like the one where Lestat makes Louis a vampire would have been put down as a cheap Gothic romantic scene [italics mine].

Here, Anne Rice voices the problematic approach of male critics (and readership) to female literature as described by feminists: “For them [the critics] literature written by women is always ‘female literature’; literature, which one needs to understand and judge as a special manifestation of female sex. Male literature is, in short, literature.”

As a female writer, Rice is self-conscious of her unequal position

---
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and as a result alters her novels to suit the taste of the critics. Her doing is very similar to that of the female writers of the 19th century, who turned away from realistic novels and started writing romance in order to have more artistic freedom.\textsuperscript{150} Yet another reason why Rice does not like writing about females and heterosexual relationships stems from her own experience with how femininity was perceived during the 1950s and 1960s when only the state of a seductress was considered plausible in a woman, every other state was harshly disregarded.\textsuperscript{151} Since these stereotypical “bad” femininity traits were something Rice wanted to avoid in her books, she decided rather to write from male’s point of view.\textsuperscript{152}

According to Ramsland, Anne started questioning femininity and the place of women in the 1950s society early on in Texas, upon her arrival at Richardson. In Ramsland’s biography, femininity is described as something Anne, understandably, desired, yet condemned at the same time, feeling that femininity is what limits women not only in their appearance, but also in their behavior. According to her college friend Ginny, Anne worried that she was not considered enough feminine. Ramsland writes:

Anne and Ginny talked about sex and attracting men. Anne confessed that she had been told since she was young that her mannerisms and desires were inappropriate for a girl, and that she was too aggressive and direct. She had also noticed how other girls had developed into women, leaving her behind and making her feel different. She had read in an opinion column that small figures were not sexy and had taken the idea seriously. “She worried a lot about her femininity,” said Ginny, “I always thought she was bright and attractive, and I never could figure
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\textsuperscript{149} My translation into English from Czech translation: “Literatura psaná ženami je pro ně [pro kritiky] vždy „ženskou literaturou“, kterou je třeba chápat a hodnotit jako zvláštní případ projevu ženského pohlaví. Mužská literatura je prostě literatura.”
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out why she worried. She had dark hair on her arms and legs, and she worried about that. She made jokes about being a spider.”

It makes sense that Anne was concerned about her femininity, since during the 1950s and 1960s, femininity was emphasized as that which makes a woman a woman. It was believed that even though a woman is born female, she has yet to learn how to be feminine, and, consequently, how to become a good wife and a good mother. As Catherine Gourley writes in *Gidgets and Women Warriors*, being not enough feminine was a girl’s biggest nightmare:

> Without femininity, a girl could not attract a boy. She might never marry nor have children. Without femininity, she might discover her husband was having an affair with another woman, who was so feminine that she made him feel like a king. Femininity was a girl’s key to popularity and happiness. At least, that was the message in hundreds of books, magazine articles, and movies of the times.¹⁵⁴

Despite growing up in a supportive environment instilled by her bohemian mother, who taught her daughters that their sex should not be an obstacle on their way to success, Anne soon learnt that many of her manners were considered inappropriate for women of the 1950s and early 1960s: drinking alcohol, being an aspiring writer, a student at university, and being direct, goal-oriented, and competitive were all characteristics considered masculine, not feminine.

Since Anne acquired many traits considered masculine, she had to deal with a number of gender-based obstacles as she proceeded on her way to become a published author. In San Francisco, Anne “learnt that, as a woman, she would not be allowed to contribute anything to the school newspaper.”¹⁵⁵ Moreover, “[s]he

listened to her male friends talk about how dumb and shallow women were, how they did not do things like read Dostoevsky or think for themselves.” The society was shaped by the prevailing feminine and masculine stereotypes and these affected Anne as well as other women of that age. Even Stan’s friends, when Anne and Stan got married, did not accept Anne and her efforts at becoming an author. They strongly believed that a woman’s place is at home, where she encourages her husband, while he is out there, getting a career and providing for a family. Anne’s anger over the way women and femininity were treated resulted in a gender confusion of hers described in her own words in Ramsland’s biography: “I think I have a gender screw-up to the point that I don’t know most of the time what gender I am, in terms of anybody else’s thinking.”

Slowly, Anne transformed her thinking and started claiming that androgyny is an ideal for any man or woman, an ideal form that transcends all gender biases. Androgyny became an ideal for Anne for many reasons: it blended both femininity and masculinity, and there were also no stereotypical traits assigned to it. An androgynous character in her writing could be both masculine and feminine without feeling guilty about it. Androgyny also allowed Anne to treat sexuality differently: both heterosexuality and homosexuality appear in her works. If Anne’s androgynous characters were considered interesting and novel, her pornographic and erotica novels were often considered outrageous. Feminists of the early 1960s considered pornography to be a form of discrimination, but Anne felt differently. She thought that feminists were over-generalizing and that pornography should be open to both men and women alike: “The feminists, she felt, were no better than the repressive men that they were battling: they were telling women what they should feel.” Women, according to Anne Rice, should have been allowed “to express themselves sexually.”
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Despite writing countless novels, some of them even with the female leading character, Anne Rice has always receded back to her male heroes. In *Prism of the Night*, Anne Rice explains why male characters will always be her first choice:

“I’ve always felt very uncomfortable in the role of being a woman,” she [Anne] said. “I feel like intellect is masculine, or androgynous.” Lisa was for her too humorless. “I don’t know why the tendency is to make the female characters dark. It could be that the feminine side of me is suffering. And the masculine side is always the one with the sense of humor. The woman invariably turn out like Claudia or Marianna or Marie.”

It is apparent that Anne Rice, despite all her efforts, fell victim to the 1950’s and 1960’s stereotypical treatment of men and women. Since Anne did not agree with the way the society paired femininity with women and masculinity with men, nor did she agree with the idea of femininity being a core of a woman, and masculinity a core of a man; she developed characters who could display both femininity and masculinity. In *The Vampire Chronicles*, these androgynous characters were most likely to have male physique; the physical difference between female and male therefore remained visible. Although the androgynous characters were supposed to blur the clearly demarcated difference between masculinity-men and femininity-women typical of the 1950s and 1960s, they, in fact, emphasized Anne Rice’s weak spot: femininity and women. Looking at the female characters in *The Vampire Chronicles*, one has to marvel at the way they are described and handled. The female hero – a humorous, intellectual counterpart to the male heroes – is very scarcely to be found, while the man and his character are always in the spotlight. Yet the more Anne Rice avoids discussing femininity and women in her writings, the more they seem to crystallize. Katherine Ramsland was right when she remarked in *Prism of the Night* that “[t]he female would slowly emerge” in Rice’s writing. What she did not know, however,

---
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was that it was emerging secretly, in the shadow of the androgynous characters, since the very beginnings of *The Vampire Chronicles*.

4. 2 The 1950s and 1960s Role of Women in the USA

After World War II, women were freed from duty and returned home to their families. Thus, despite proving themselves as capable workers during the war, women of the 1950s were forced to come back to the traditional way of life perceived as suitable for them. This meant getting back to the wife/mother role: cooking dinners, cleaning the house, and raising children. Many women were dissatisfied with the situation; their independence may had been short-term, but the effects it had on women were far-reaching. The return to the conformity of the 1940s seemed almost impossible, yet it took another ten years to finally break the still waters of the American society and its perception of women.

The ideal roles for women – being a mother and a wife – were still firmly embedded in the subconscious of the 1950’s American society. Most of the women left their jobs after the war ended, but as the years went by, a high percentage got back to work: “[b]y 1956, 35 percent of an adult women were members of the labor force, and nearly a quarter of all married women were working.”\(^{162}\) However, women were paid less than men, and were often pressured by the society, as well as their families, to stay at home. Media such as television, film, magazines, and advertisements reinforced the idea of the ideal roles for women with their depictions of happy housewives and satisfied mothers. College education was considered another step in the preparation of a woman for her devoted domestic role. While men were studying towards their career, women were studying towards becoming good mothers and intellectual wives. During the 1950s, many women also dropped out of college before graduating in order to get married.

The 1960s were a turbulent decade full of changes for women; birth control became available, feminists started to be heard, and more and more women took jobs and attended colleges; nevertheless, becoming the domestic ideal of the 1950s – a mother and wife – was still considered significant. Birth control played an important part in the liberation of women, because it allowed them to carefully plan

their parenthood, or even avoid it. Feminist movement helped women to fight sexism on many levels; sex discrimination in businesses was outlawed in 1964, and the Equal Pay Act from 1963 abolished the disparity between female and male wages. However, women were still expected to balance their career/education aspirations with their domestic duties, and the traditional, ideal roles still shaped their everyday behavior and thinking. Prevailing masculinity was still being assigned to men, while the prevailing femininity was being assigned to women; in other words, two firmly demarcated sets of stereotypical gender traits were considered to be the core of a good man and a good woman. Freeing oneself from these gender roles and gender expectations was not easy, since not only the society, but often also the family and friends deemed them true.
5. Female Characters of The Vampire Chronicles

Critics and my readers have been kinder to my male characters than to my female characters. They say my female characters are not as good as my male characters, that they’re not as real, that I don’t bring the female characters to life as much.

– Anne Rice

Most of Rice’s women are distant, unemotional, and unhappy. Most of them desert, betray, or deliberately remain remote from their children. Most of them are caught up in the surge of events and respond passively to what happens instead of creating their own stories through action; that is, they react instead of acting.

– Jennifer Smith

The following analysis focuses on the connections between the dominant archetype, femininity, and identity of the female characters. The first sub-chapter explores the physical appearances of the female characters and, consequently, the types of femininities found in The Vampire Chronicles. After distinguishing three types of femininities and discussing their relation to the babyface ideal appearance, I proceed to the analysis of the human and vampire female characters. The purpose of the chapter is to find out what archetypal and gender differences, if any, are to be found between the two groups of the female characters.

5. 2 Three Femininities of The Vampire Chronicles’ Female Characters

The appearances of all female characters of The Vampire Chronicles – both human and vampire alike – are strongly stereotypical; their looks conform to the idea of the highest level of attractiveness in women of the 1960s and 1970s. Anne Rice lived through the era in which a voluptuous female figure became undesirable and a slender, almost prepubescent body with kittenish features became a new ideal. Instead of the curvy Marilyn Monroe, media of the late 1950s and of the 1960s presented the public with the slender, and often childlike actresses such as Audrey
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Hepburn, Brigitte Bardot, Jane Fonda, and Mia Farrow. With these actresses, features such as big, round eyes; small and slender figure with long and shapely legs and arms; small breasts; tender and soft voice; oval or round face; and pouty lips became the ideal female type. But while the slender, often almost boyish figure with long legs and arms, small breasts, and long neck were deemed attractive solely in the 1960s, today the childish facial features are still considered attractive. In 2002, the German University of Regensburg in their online experiments concerning
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attractiveness dedicated a part of their research to the so-called “babyfaceness hypothesis” which states that a woman with childlike features is deemed more attractive by men. Their results confirmed that childlike features are preferred in both female and male faces. Thus, while the slender figures of Ricean female characters are typical of the 1960s, their faces possess a beauty surpassing time and space.

**Figure 5** Slender Figures of the 1960s.
Brigitte Bardot in the upper left corner; Jane Fonda in the upper right corner. At the bottom from the left: Mia Farrow, Audrey Hepburn
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The unified looks of the characters seem a good fit for vampire novels in which characters often move through different centuries, however, they also give evidence of Rice’s unwillingness, or inability to look past the ideal of her age. The females of the 18th century, as well as those of the Ancient Mesopotamian or Egyptian times, share the features with those born in the 20th century. As a result, all female characters of *The Vampire Chronicles* seem to blend into just one person: the ideal woman.

Although all female characters of *The Vampire Chronicles* conform in their looks to the prevailing femininity of the 1960s, thus creating an illusion of a single, ideal female figure, they nevertheless do not partake in the same femininity type. Ricean female characters seem to be characterized by at least three different types of femininities: distinctive femininity, common femininity, and withdrawn femininity.

The distinctive femininity has the most in common with the prevailing femininity; however, it is not a prescriptive femininity, and as such the distinctive femininity does not prescribe women with patterns of behaviors, looks, or personality traits. The distinctive femininity is that which is consciously a part of a woman’s personality; yet the distinctive femininity in itself does not repress, or define a woman. Society would perceive the distinctive femininity as the most healthy one since women who have it behave in ways that are stereotypically perceived as feminine: relationships with others are established and cherished, and feminine professions, as well as behaviors, are taken on. In terms of Wolff’s female archetypes, the distinctive femininity can be most commonly perceived in the Good Mother and in the Hetaira types. The common femininity, typical especially of the Medial Woman, can be
found in women who do not deem their femininity important. These characters seem
to be indifferent to their femininity; often, they get immersed in certain areas of their
life other than those considered feminine, usually a career, or another personal
interest. The importance of femininity in the eyes of those possessing common
femininity is lessened. Thus, female characters who express common femininity
often forget about their femininity altogether and have to be reminded of it by other
characters. The last type of femininity present in *The Vampire Chronicles* is the one
titled withdrawn femininity. Typical of the Terrible Mother and the Amazon, the
withdrawn femininity is “the least feminine” of all. The women with withdrawn
femininity are consciously working against their own femininity and the prevailing
femininity of the era either by transforming their look, or by wearing their femininity
as a mask not unlike that described by the feminist Mary Ann Doane in her theory of
masquerade. Femininity is perceived as intrusive, or undesired because the goals,
behaviors, or actions of the characters are deemed masculine. As a result, femininity
has to be either rejected, or used as a weapon.

All female characters of *The Vampire Chronicles* are feminine in their looks,
thus ensuring that they will be at once perceived as true women; however, their
complex, and often contrasting femininities speak against such stereotypical, fixed
classification. The unified looks of the characters are misleading – not all female
characters of *The Vampire Chronicles* are the ideal women on the outside as well as
on the inside. Behind the flawless facade, the women often lead a coveted war with
their femininity. Thus, female characters seem to be given their feminine looks as
patients of the psychiatry ward are given a straightjacket: to soothe them, to make the
forget urges, which do not correspond to who they are in the eyes of the society.
Rice, just as Toni Wolff, seems to realize that almost every century forbids the
woman to be truly herself, true to her archetypes. Thus, a woman is made to keep her
feminine looks, and only behind this feminine mask can she fight against that which
is generally believed: that there is but one type of a woman – the wife and the
mother.

**5.3 Analysis of Human Female Characters**

In the following chapter, four human female characters will be analyzed, namely:
Babette, Jesse, Bianca, Gretchen, and Dora. Although Bianca and Jesse both
transition into a vampire later on in the story, for most of the novels, they are human. Bianca becomes a vampire in Blood and Gold, but throughout The Vampire Armand she is a mere human; Jesse’s story practically ends with her transformation into a vampire, since no additional information are given about her vampire personality. The character of Babette from Interview with the Vampire is not mentioned here, as her description is not sufficient for a detailed analysis.

Not much has been written on the human female characters of The Vampire Chronicles, partly because most of the human female characters are either flat and/or serve as narrative devices or foil characters to the main male characters, and partly because they live in the shadow of their vampire, female counterparts such as Akasha or Gabrielle. Babette, Bianca, and Dora are usually not discussed by literary critics and scholars at all. Jesse, on the other hand, is usually mentioned briefly in a discussion on Maharet, the ancient vampire and her ancestor. Gretchen, probably the most intriguing character of all mentioned in this chapter, similarly does not attract attention of the critics, particularly because her encounter with Lestat is very brief, episodic, and her character seems to be rather static and flat.

5.3.1 Jesse

Jesse, a flat character from The Queen of the Damned, represents a woman with a dominant Medial Woman archetype. A matrilineal descendant of Maharet, Jesse early on in her childhood learns that she is a powerful psychic. Her parents die in a car accident when Jesse is just a baby, and so Maharet steps in and brings Jesse into
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173 In order to distinguish between the characters discussed, I use the typology of E. M. Forster, who draws a line between flat and round characters. Flat characters “are constructed round a single idea or quality” (103-4), they are easily recognizable and memorable, and “[t]he really flat [ones] can be expressed in one sentence.” (104) Flat characters seldom surprise the reader through either their actions or thoughts (they seem rather static, Forster talks of types and caricatures). Forster says of flat characters, “flat characters ... never need reintroducing, never run away, have not to be watched for development, and provide their own atmosphere.” (105) Round characters, on the other hand, are complex in their personality and they are capable of developing surprising, unexpected personality traits; to use Forster’s words, round character “waxes and wanes and has facets like a human being.” (106) Forster further warns that the surprising quality of a round character has to be convincing, otherwise “it is a flat pretending to be round.” (118) According to Forster, characters can smoothly pass from flat to round and vice versa. See E. M. Forster, Aspects of the Novel (NYC: RosettaBooks, 2002).

174 For example, Gretchen, a narrative device and a foil character, reminds Lestat about the pains and joys of mortal life; Dora, as a narrative device, serves to create a discussion with Lestat on God and the probability of his existence.
the Great Family – the family comprising of all matrilineal descendants of Maharet. Maharet becomes Jesse’s friend and mentor, although they merely exchange letters and Jesse does not meet her until later in life. Jesse is surrounded by the Great Family; she gets to travel to her relatives all over the world and studies archeology and art. During adolescence, Jesse starts developing her psychic powers: she can tell whenever people lie to her; moreover, she sees ghosts of buildings and people.\footnote{Anne Rice, \textit{The Queen of the Damned} (London: Time Warner Books, 2005), 173.} In one of the letters, Maharet instructs Jesse to stop paying attention to the spirits as their existence is meaningless and would only waste Jesse’s time. Jesse does as Maharet says, and her powers seem to go dormant. However, once an article on haunted houses quoting Jesse gets published, the Talamasca – a secret organization exploring paranormal occurrences – contacts her with a job offer: Jesse can become a psychic detective investigating paranormal cases. Jesse forgets her promise to Maharet and starts exploring her powers while working for the Talamasca. In a few years, Jesse becomes fully absorbed in her powers, and consequently, also in her most dominant archetypal pattern: the Medial Woman.

Jesse’s fall into the Medial Woman archetype is mirrored in her looks as well as in her actions; the Medial Woman takes over her life completely. “Jesse read[s] the works of all the great psychic detectives, mediums, and mentalists,”\footnote{Ibid., 199.} moreover “[s]he becomes addicted to the excitement, even the secrecy”\footnote{Ibid.} of the Talamasca tasks. She focuses on work only, abandons her visits to the Great Family, and whenever disturbed, becomes restless. She has some love affairs, but they either end badly, or become unimportant compared to Jesse’s job. Her looks change, too, as the job consumes her and Jesse stops paying attention to her looks; at the age of thirty she becomes “fragile-looking…with her curly red hair parted in the middle and kept long so that it would fall behind her shoulders and leave her alone.”\footnote{Anne Rice, \textit{The Queen of the Damned} (London: Time Warner Books, 2005), 199.} In addition, Jesse wears “no cosmetics, perfume, or jewelry,” and her favorite attire becomes “a cashmere blazer…along with wool pants, or jeans.”\footnote{Ibid.} Maharet tries to discourage Jesse from the Talamasca job, sending her a letter in which she writes “I hope for

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{Anne Rice, \textit{The Queen of the Damned} (London: Time Warner Books, 2005), 173.}
\item \footnote{Ibid., 199.}
\item \footnote{Ibid.}
\item \footnote{Anne Rice, \textit{The Queen of the Damned} (London: Time Warner Books, 2005), 199.}
\item \footnote{Ibid.}
\end{itemize}
your sake that you tire of the Talamasca – and return to the real world – very soon,” but her efforts are pointless. Jesse’s life revolves around paranormal: she becomes the Medial Woman communicating with the spirits, just like Maharet and Mekare when they were alive. Instead of proceeding to the next archetypal form in order to fully embrace herself, Jesse locks herself in the Medial Woman archetype and forgets to live in the real world. The situation becomes even worse when Jesse gets assigned to a vampire case.

When David Talbot, the head of the Talamasca order, assigns Jesse to the vampire case, she is utmost skeptical – she does not believe in the existence of the vampires – despite her disbelief, she takes up the assignment and soon finds herself following up the research in an old house, which once belonged to Lestat, Louis, and Claudia. At one point, Jesse finds Claudia’s secret room and some belongings of hers – a diary, a doll, and a rosary – she also starts having apparitions of Claudia and the period furniture of the now vacant house. Jesse panics, and is pulled off the assignment. The decision of the Talamasca angers her, since she feels as if “she had glimpsed something of inestimable importance only to have it locked away.”

Jesse, who has only once spent time with Maharet, starts realizing that the Great Family and Maharet somehow fit into the vampire scheme. Nevertheless, she leaves for India to work on cases of reincarnation and forgets about the vampires altogether. When she returns to the States for a family visit, she finds that a new book, *The Vampire Lestat*, has been published, and reads it in a frenzy. Immediately, she connects all the information and decides to go and see Lestat at the rock concert for herself; the meeting, however, turns fatal for Jesse, who suffers major injuries and is eventually turned into a vampire by Maharet.

Rice does not follow Jesse’s story after her transformation; however, we are given glimpses of Jesse’s human life in which she resembles no other female character of *The Vampire Chronicles* so far. Jesse is a woman of the 1985; instead of becoming a wife and a mother, she follows a career path: she goes to a university, and later on starts working as an archeologist. Alongside her career, Jesse builds strong relationships with her family all over the world; she even considers marrying

---

her cousin. She seems to be on a good path to fully embracing her psyche. However, once a journalist calls her a powerful psychic and the Talamasca order approaches Jesse, everything changes. Jesse gets in touch with her prominent archetypal form – the Medial Woman – and learns how to become a medium. Maharet, fully aware that psychic powers can threaten to fully absorb the witch, pleads with Jesse to avoid such vocation, but Jesse perseveres: she becomes one of the psychic detectives and gives herself up fully to her vocation. Though she learns how to distinguish between the conscious and unconscious material of the world, Jesse has problems drawing a line between her own consciousness and unconscious.

Despite the many possibilities the 1980s represented for a psychological development of a woman, Jesse gets locked in her unconscious, becoming an enigma to herself. Obsessed with her psychic powers, Jesse prevents herself from ascending to the next archetype. As a result, her Medial Woman archetype turns inwards and threatens to devour her. The unconscious becomes a substitute for Jesse’s consciousness. Her withdrawn femininity coincides with her fall into an archetype; femininity is cast away as something unnecessary, even irritating, and all relationships are abandoned. Instead of seeking to become a balanced psychological whole, Jesse seeks to become one with the Medial Woman. This reversed development ceases as soon as Jesse is brought to a vampire life, because her psychic powers vanish: a Medial Woman archetype does not represent a possibility for a vampire. It would be interesting to see what fate awaits Jesse – the vampire. As she resembles Maharet and Mekare in her looks and in her vocation as well, one may suppose that her unconscious would move towards the next form, that of the Great Mother, and that she would take a place next to Maharet, helping her follow the matrilineal progress in the Great Family line of descendants. However, all this is merely a speculation, as the further fate of Jesse is unknown.
5. 3. 2 Bianca

Bianca is described as one of Botticelli’s paintings; a detail of the face of Botticelli’s famous Venus from *The Birth of Venus* illustrates Rice’s descriptions of Bianca’s appearances.

Bianca, a minor female character, appearing in *The Vampire Armand* and in *Blood and Gold*, who establishes a hetairic relationship with the vampire Marius and his new fledgling Armand. In *The Vampire Armand*, Bianca Solderini is introduced as the renowned Venetian courtesan, not unlike the Bianca from Shakespeare’s tragedy *Othello*. Described as “a porcelain princess” who “looked as lovely as a human swan,” Bianca charms Armand – at the time still human – just as she had charmed Marius many years before when he settled in Venice. Her “childlike voice, girlish face” and “fierce blue eyes” combined with personality traits such as cleverness,
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invincibility, generousness, kindness, and gracefulness “devoid of pride and bitterness,”\(^{187}\) remind Marius of the Botticelli paintings:

That Botticelli hadn’t painted her was a mere accident. Indeed he might well have done so. She looked so very like his women that all other thoughts left my mind. I saw her oval face, her oval eyes, and her thick wavy blond hair, interwound with long strings of tiny pearls, and the fine shape of her body with exquisitely molded arms and breasts.\(^{188}\)

Although Bianca resembles the angelic women of Botticelli, Marius senses something “sordid and evil… behind her recent fortunes.”\(^ {189}\) He tries to read her mind, but then abandons the idea, saying, “I wanted to see this woman as she wanted me to see her—young, infinitely kind, yet utterly well defended—a companion for the night’s cheerful gatherings, mysterious mistress of her own house.”\(^{190}\) Bianca’s distinctive femininity prevents Marius from unveiling her secrets; although he realizes that Bianca does not equal her looks, he chooses to believe it for a prolonged period of time, if only to preserve the idea of her angelic beauty being combined with a similarly angelic personality.

Both Armand and Marius exploit Bianca’s deep femininity and her closeness to the Hetaira archetype; she becomes their private sanctuary, their own beautiful courtesan who consoles, advises, and cares for them at appropriate times. Armand often comes to Bianca’s place and talks to her; at one point he describes their relationship as one in which “she [Bianca] was a mirror in which [he] could study [his] reflection and thereby judge [his] own growth.”\(^{191}\) It is apparent from this quote, that Bianca is the Hetaira; she guides the men, listens to them, and nurtures them; through her, they come to understand themselves better. Bianca’s contact with the Hetaira archetype results in her craving an open, equal relationship with both Marius and Armand; in exchange for a relationship, she offers them both her body and her

\(^{187}\) Anne Rice, *The Vampire Armand* (London: Arrow, 1999), 133.
\(^{189}\) Ibid., 156.
\(^{190}\) Ibid., 156.
\(^{191}\) Anne Rice, *The Vampire Armand* (London: Arrow, 1999), 289.
mind. At one point, Armand abuses this relationship and rapes Bianca. At another, Marius and Armand treat Bianca as their doll; they bring clothes to her and dress her as a boy, “[w]e both dressed her in blue leggings and tunic and doublet. I pulled her belt tight, and Marius caught her hair up in a soft velvet hat.”192 Then they give her a sword and take her to the worst places, where no woman ever goes. Further on in the story, Bianca shows her devotion to the two men when she rushes to Marius’ house in order to take care of Armand, who got wounded by his mad lover. The wound, however, is too deep and Armand cannot be cured; as a result, Marius turns him into a vampire. Once the transformation is finished, the hetairic relationship, firmly established between Bianca and human Armand, becomes impossible to hold, as Bianca, a mere human, cannot become a guide, a counselor, and a lover to a vampire.

In Blood and Gold, Rice returns to the story of Bianca, yet instead of developing the character, she moves further away from her personality, locking her in a flat stereotype. Shortly after the transformation of Armand, the young fledgling is taken away by a mob of fanatic vampires from Paris. Marius, trying to save Armand, is burnt badly in the sun. To help him, Bianca offers to become a vampire luring victims to Marius’s hiding place in order to supply him with blood. After Marius is partially healed by Bianca’s blood, they both go to the Shrine of Akasha and Enkil; Marius drinks Akasha’s blood, then he offers his wrist to Bianca. When she drinks, an image of Pandora appears in her mind. Through blood, Marius creates a tracking device from Bianca; she becomes the bloodhound searching for Pandora:

“I have planted in her mind the image of Pandora, haven’t I?” I whispered, “so that wherever she [Bianca] goes with me she will search. And from her angel mind, Pandora cannot fail to pluck my image. And so we may find each other, Pandora and I, through her. She [Bianca] doesn’t dream of what I’ve done. She thinks only to comfort me with her listening...”193

192 Anne Rice, The Vampire Armand (London: Arrow, 1999), 298.
In contrast to the Bianca from *The Vampire Armand*, who addresses Marius “the magician” and has no idea vampires exist, the Bianca from *Blood and Gold* knows everything, since Armand told her. Altering Bianca’s knowledge allows Rice to continue her story. Nevertheless, Bianca’s knowledge becomes fatal for the character development. From the strong, independent Hetaira Bianca transforms into a weeping caricature of a lover, who follows Marius around as he searches for his only true vampire love: Pandora.

5.3.3 Gretchen

RILEY:...In Queen of the Damned Maharet says that in the flesh all wisdom begins, beware the thing that has no flesh, beware the gods, beware the idea, beware the devil. Was Stan saying that to you?
RICE: Absolutely. That was Stan. ...I had grown up under a tradition that said exactly the opposite. It said that not only does all wisdom exist only when you conquer the flesh, but that virgins and people who have never known physical passion can attain levels of wisdom the rest of us can’t.
—— Anne Rice

Gretchen, the diminutive of Margaret, is a name Rice’s nun from *The Tale of the Body Thief* shares with Gretchen of Goethe’s *Faust*; moreover, the two women share a similar plot. Gretchen’s appearances, as well as her vocation, represent an exception among the females of *The Vampire Chronicles*. Gretchen is described twice as “a Grecian woman painted by Picasso.”
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These paintings of Grecian Women done by Picasso during his neoclassicism period illustrate Rice’s idea about Gretchen’s appearances.\(^{196,197}\) Lestat portrays her face as large-boned and fair, her body sturdy, and her eyebrows “dark and perfectly drawn;”\(^ {198}\) her dark blond hair reminds him of “the hay which the princess spun into the gold in the tale of Rumpelstiltskin.”\(^ {199}\) In other words, Gretchen is nowhere close to the highly feminine, babyfaced ideal present in the rest of the female characters of *The Vampire Chronicles*. Moreover, Gretchen’s story reminds one of the story of Faust and Gretchen. In the *Tale of the Body Thief*, Lestat finds David Talbot, the head of the Talamasca order, reading Goethe’s *Faust*. Lestat, desperately trying to understand David, inquires him about the play:

“Why the *Faust* play, David? Am I Mephistopheles?” I asked. “Are you Faust?”

He shook his head. “I may be Faust,” he said finally, taking another drink of the Scotch, “but you’re not the devil, that’s perfectly clear.”\(^ {200}\)

And on the next page, David adds:

“...I’m no scholar in the conventional sense, never was. Nevertheless I am like Faust in the play. I’m old, and I haven’t cracked the secrets of the universe. Not at all. I thought I had when I was young...”\(^ {201}\)

Although Lestat would apparently like to see himself as the devil, this time he takes on the role of Faust for a considerable part of the novel; it is not David, who makes a deal with the devil, and it is not David, who leads a virgin into temptation— it is Lestat. First, Lestat closes a deal with Raglan James, a talented psychic capable of
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\(^ {200}\) *Ibid.*, 60.

switching bodies with others. Lestat exchanges his body for that of Raglan James only to learn that he had forgotten all about mortals over the centuries roaming the world as a vampire. Due to being barely clothed and walking through a snowstorm, Lestat falls ill and ends up in a hospital. Gretchen, a nun volunteering as a nurse, takes care of him for several nights, and finally decides to take him to her house. In a fever, Lestat depicts his whole vampire life to Gretchen, who patiently listens.

In Lestat’s eyes, Gretchen is one with her vocation; he does not see a woman called Gretchen, but a nun called Gretchen. She seems to represent the ideal female stereotype: a virgin, who, according to Neumann, is bound “via an intuitive connection to a transpersonal spiritual force,” here namely to Jesus, and who completely “forfeit[s] her individual life that also has earthy, maternal, and other qualities that ought to be developed,” as a result becoming “the ‘Woman without a Shadow’ who is unfruitful because she has split herself off from her earthly, shadow side.”202 Being forty years old, Gretchen has never known a man. Yet, instead of becoming proud of her chastity — as a stereotypical virgin might — Gretchen begins to feel that it stands in her way of becoming one with her vocation. She believes that depriving herself of her sexual urges does not make her a perfect woman, but rather a coward. She tells Lestat, “I had an abhorrence for my virginity—of the sheer perfection of my chastity. It seemed no matter what one believed, to be a cowardly thing.”203 As a result, Gretchen decides to take a leave of absence from her mission in Brazil with a single thought on her mind — to finally know a man — and as this man, she chooses Lestat. In a paradoxical twist, Gretchen, the virgin, becomes the seductress of Lestat, the vampire in a human body; yet, she does not tempt him to sin, rather, she leads him to redemption and selflessness. While Faust seduces Gretchen, the innocent maiden, with the help of Mephistopheles, in The Tale of the Body Thief Gretchen determines to seduce Faust. She chooses Lestat because she is not afraid of him, not as she is afraid of other men.204 After a brief sexual intercourse, Lestat and Gretchen continue to discuss their life choices. The dialogues between the two resemble a discussion between Faust and

204 Ibid., 236.
Mephistopheles turned upside down: here we have the self-spoken devil, Lestat, being talked into becoming a selfless mortal again, into redeeming himself for all his sins, by Gretchen, the atheistic nun.

Gretchen is the very opposite of Lestat; she believes that earthly pleasures are too engulfing, that “life is on hold, so to speak”\(^{205}\) when people delve into intense feelings. She believes in the objective, constructive, selfless approach to life, in giving herself up fully to others, and in this finding her own strength. To use Jung’s dichotomy, Gretchen represents “the Urania type of mother-image [which] predominates in masculine psychology,”\(^{206}\) which is in a strong contrast to the Earth Mother – the type most usually appearing in female psychology. Since Urania is a Muse of astronomy, the Urania type of mother is celestial; in Plato’s *Phaedrus*, she is described as one of the Muses “who are chiefly concerned with heaven and thought, divine as well as human.”\(^{207}\) To Gretchen-Urania, Lestat becomes a paired opposite, the son-lover – Puer Aeternus – or The Divine Child.\(^{208}\) The Puer Aeternus archetype, in Latin “eternal youth,” is the “eternally youthful component of each human psyche…ultimately attached to the archetypal mother.”\(^{209}\) The archetype has both positive and negative side; the positive side propels the carrier to create his or her own future, it becomes the positive, changing force in his or her life.\(^{210}\) The dangers of the Puer Aeternus archetype lies in the man’s/woman’s inability to part with his mother; in man, specifically, the negative Puer Aeternus leads towards a developmental halt, as it turns into a negative mother complex.\(^{211}\) Lestat becomes the negative Puer Aeternus once his father renounces him and his mother, Gabrielle, is reborn as the vampire-Amazon. His search for the Mother starts in *The Vampire Lestat* and continues throughout the novels; in *The Tale of the Body Thief* he clings to
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Gretchen in a false belief that he had finally found the lost Mother in her. At one point, Gretchen even tells Lestat, “You realize you are like a child, don’t you? You have a great simplicity to you. The simplicity of a saint.” Yet Gretchen does not nurture Lestat’s way of life, his narcissism and his avoidance of responsibility; on the other hand, she – as the heavenly, objective mother – pleads with Lestat to become an ascetic: a man who renounces the pleasures of the body and turns on a journey towards selflessness and redemption.

While in Faust, Gretchen is seduced and subsequently punished for going astray, in The Tale of the Body Thief Gretchen appears in the role of a rational seductress; she reasons with Lestat’s subjectivity, trying to persuade him to become one with heaven and with masculinity. Rice’s Gretchen is not a young, innocent virgin, but a forty years old nun, who does not take pride in her virginity, instead, she believes it “to be a cowardly thing.” For Gretchen, sexual intercourse does not represent a bogeyman, a fatal test for a woman; on the other hand, it becomes one of the last tests she has to pass in order to prove to herself that she truly is a selfless nun with one vocation only: to help others. In The Tale of the Body Thief, sex and other earthly pleasures are not perceived as wrong, but as inhibiting. In fact, to Gretchen, the Urania-mother, any human pleasure stands in a way of her mission, because pleasure is subjective and aimed at oneself, while the work of Urania is aimed at others, thus becoming objective. In this, the character of Gretchen is very masculine: she is one with the heaven, not with the Earth. Lestat, on the other hand, becomes the ambassador of the feminine aspect: he is the one for whom pleasure, individuality, and carnal desires represent the core of one’s life. Jung finds out the same principles fuel Faust, prompting him, ultimately, to bring about the death of Gretchen:

Faust takes the opposite road [to the cult of asceticism]; for him the ascetic ideal is sheer death. He struggles for liberation and wins life by
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binding himself over to evil, thereby bringing about the death of what he loves most: Gretchen.\textsuperscript{214}

Just like Faust, Lestat – first in becoming a vampire, and then in exchanging bodies with Raglan James – binds himself over to evil, hoping to find “the beauties of this world”;\textsuperscript{215} yet, in \textit{The Tale of the Body Thief}, Lestat does not cause Gretchen’s death, nor does he cause her fall from grace.

Gretchen – an archetype of the Mother-Urania – demands of Lestat to embrace his evil past, and redeem himself for it through the selfless work for others just like Faust did after Gretchen’s death; in other words, she wants him to become both a “saviour and destroyer.”\textsuperscript{216} Gretchen says to Lestat:

“I think there’s a reason you took your leave of absence...There is a secret reason you came down to earth, that you came into the body of a man. Same reason Christ did it.”

“And that is?”

“Redemption,” she said.\textsuperscript{217}

To Lestat such ideas become unbearable:

\textit{I didn’t care}. I could weep for any individual soul who suffered, yes, but about sacrificing my life to the nameless millions of the world, I couldn’t care! In fact, it filled me with dread, terrible dark dread. It was sad beyond sad. It seemed no life at all. It seemed the very opposite of transcendence.

I shook my head. In a low stammering voice I explained to her why this vision frightened me so much.


\textsuperscript{215} \textit{Ibid.}, 81.

\textsuperscript{216} \textit{Ibid}, 82.

\textsuperscript{217} Anne Rice, \textit{The Tale of the Body Thief} (New York: Ballantine Books, 1992), 236.
“Centuries ago, when I first stood on the little boulevard stage in Paris—when I saw the happy faces, when I heard applause—I felt as if my body and soul had found their destiny; I felt as if every promise in my birth and childhood had begun its fulfillment at last.

“Oh, there were other actors, worse and better; other singers; other clowns; there have been a million since and a million will come after this moment. But each of us shines with his own inimitable power; each of us has his chance to vanquish the others forever in the mind of the beholder, and that is the only kind of accomplishment I can really understand; the kind of accomplishment in which the self—this self, if you will—is utterly whole and triumphant....”

Similarly to Faust, Lestat was always “blindly following the urge of his I Ibido, like a man overcome by strong and violent passions.”219 He becomes the one rebelling not only against Christianity and its denial of passion, but also against social roles and morals. Gretchen, on the other hand, becomes Lestat’s foil character in that she partially represents the good female archetype emerging from the Catholic religion— the Virgin Mary. As Michael P. Carroll in his study of the Mary cult states, the Virgin Mary is “unlike most of the mother goddesses in the world … dissociated from sexuality.”220 Moreover, as Jung claims, in Catholicism the Virgin Mary represents the only good female belonging to the Godhead quaternity221 as opposed to most of the mother goddesses in the world.

221 Michael P. Carroll further explains Jung’s theory of quaternity: “...the quaternity is an unconscious predisposition to associate two pairs of opposites in a balanced composition. In discussing the Godhead (by which Jung seems to mean ‘the sacred’), Jung argues that the particular quaternity that will shape our conscious thoughts is one that predisposes us to think in terms of a balanced union of two specific contrasts, namely, male vs. female and good vs. evil. Carried to its logical extreme, of course, this particular quaternity would produce four conscious images associated with the Godhead: the good male, the bad male, the good female, and the bad female. But because archetypes ... only shape our thoughts, all four images will not usually be found in all religions.” See Michael P. Carroll, The Cult of the Virgin Mary: Psychological Origins (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992), 34.
to the Protestantism, in which a good female image is missing completely. However, Rice’s Gretchen is not a typical Virgin Mary. For one, she is also a highly rational Mother-Urania. Moreover, though her body comes to represent all that is heavenly, the world in which she lives defies the presence of God and heaven.

In *The Tale of the Body Thief* no God exists to either strike or redeem Gretchen after she goes to bed with Lestat; as a result, religion has no power over Gretchen. The only one, who can lead Gretchen astray, is herself. Yet, being extremely rational, Gretchen realizes that God ultimately plays no role in what she does: “to try to know god…this can be construed as a sin of pride, or a failure of imagination. But all of us know misery when we see it. We know sickness; hunger; deprivation. I try to lessen these things. It’s the bulwark of my faith.”

Knowingly drawing her strength for the hard work from within, from the archetypal instead of from the religious, Gretchen gives evidence to Lestat that her vocation was not assigned to her by some invisible entity, but chosen by her alone:

> “An ordinary life is impossible for someone like me. I have to be doing something hard. I have to be taking risks. I entered this religious order because their missions were in the most remote and treacherous areas of South America. I can’t tell you how I love those jungles!...They can’t be hot enough or dangerous enough for me. There are moments when we’re all overworked and tired, when the hospital’s overcrowded and the sick children are bedded down outside under lean-tos and in hammocks and I feel so alive! I can’t tell you. I stop maybe long enough to wipe the sweat off my face, to wash my hands, to perhaps drink a glass of water. And I think: I’m alive; I’m here. I’m doing what matters.”
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222 God and Devil appear for the first Time in the next novel called *Memnoch the Devil*, as a result changing the whole dynamics of *The Vampire Chronicles*.
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The second archetype any woman most compatible with the Mother should incorporate into her psyche is the Amazon; the previous quotation illustrates exactly this incorporation. Taking pride in the nursing vocation, fully devoting herself to a highly dangerous job away from all people is typical of the Amazon, whose life does not revolve around relationships, but around freedom and self-realization. In this, Gretchen defies the stereotype of the selfless, religious nun; although she believes in God, she proclaims becoming a nun her own choice, and one that fills her with joy. Gretchen takes pride in who she is and what she does. Becoming a nun is not an act of humility, it is an act of strong will. And yet, since Gretchen is not lead by her consciousness, but rather by her unconscious, archetypal patterns, her vocation is at the same time admirable and sad – in order to fulfill the needs of her unconscious, she has to fully sacrifice her consciousness and her femininity. There is no other possible vocation for Gretchen: she has to become the selfless, yet proud mother to all.

5.3.4 Dora

Dora, a minor female character, appears in Memnoch the Devil – one of the most controversial novels of The Vampire Chronicles series. The novel reads as Rice’s take on Milton’s Paradise Lost and Dante’s Divine Comedy and revolves around Lestat meeting with the Devil and God, while visiting both Heaven and Hell. As a result, the narrative takes place in two different realms (New York and an imaginary heaven/hell realm); Dora belongs to the “real” world. For most of the narrative, Dora’s personality, behavior, and appearance are being described by Lestat and her father’s ghost. She is also briefly discussed by Armand in The Vampire Armand. With her appearance, Dora belongs to the babyfaced ideal of Anne Rice; she has “very white skin, short black hair, bobbed, long thin yet shapely legs.”

Repeatedly, Dora is described as a tiny, or little girl; in addition, her bravery, strength, and a seeming invincibility are emphasized. Armand depicts Dora as an “entrancing mortal” with raven hair, a pouty mouth, cheeks of porcelain and the
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dashing limbs of a nymph,” Dora is a daughter of Roger – a passionate gangster obsessed with Wynken de Wilde, a mystic and heretic preaching oneness with God through union with women – a victim Lestat has been fascinated with and following for quite some time before killing him. After taking Roger’s life and disposing of his body, Lestat finds Roger’s ghost sitting in a bar; he tells Lestat, “I have to talk to you about Dora.”

Roger’s ghost describes his and Dora’s life to Lestat with one purpose in mind: to make Lestat look after his daughter. Dora is an unconventional, religious woman, who teaches others about the power of love; she has her own television program where she preaches to other people, especially the women. Dora is a child born out of a sex-based relationship between Roger and Terry, a cunning nurse, who was taking care of Roger’s dying mother. Terry threatens she will get an abortion if Roger does not marry her; Roger uses an alias to marry her and pays her out, but Terry does not want to part with her daughter. In the end, Dora stays living with her mother, while Roger only comes for visits. Once Dora is older, Roger and Terry start arguing over her education; at one point, Terry decides to run with her daughter and her boyfriend away from Roger. Before they can get away, Roger kills Terry and her boyfriend and takes Dora with him. Not much is said about the relationship of Dora and her mother. Roger mentions that Dora “did love [Terry] in a very protective and kind way,” and that “[s]he knew [he]’d gotten rid of Terry, or …freed her from Terry.” Further on, Roger depicts Dora to Lestat:

Dora went to the Holy Land when she was nineteen. She went back twice before she graduated. She spent the next ten years studying religions all over the world. Then she proposed the entire idea of her television program; she wanted to talk to people. ...Dora really doesn’t
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care about material things. Dora believes against impossible psychological and intellectual odds that God exists. 232

Dora embraces the religion of female mystics such as Julian of Norwich, Teresa of Avila, or Hildegard of Bingen, she teaches “her own modern compassion for the flesh”233 and Roger expects “she’s going to make a religion where nobody hurts anybody else.”234

When Lestat meets Dora, he is at once mesmerized by her; Dora encompasses the mystical and theological, the feminine and the masculine, the worldly and the heavenly – she is the highest feminine mother type, Sophia. Upon meeting with Lestat, she is not frightened, as she can feel that Lestat is not human; in fact, Lestat is the one who feels “something almost chilling in her presents,” 235 something frightening, which he readily connects with sanctity. Dora’s voice is “typically feminine,” but “her words seemed to have authority, rather like those of a man,”236 and according to Lestat she looks rather inhuman, almost scary. In her teachings, she “talks about the sterility of now and how people need the ineffable…she’s convinced that the prohibition against sex destroyed Christianity.”237 She talks mainly to women and believes in establishing a new order, “a movement of love from the core of the people that would reach eventually to all governments in power, so that injustice would end.”238 She believes that the world has to change, that it “needs a new revelation… a new prophet.”239 In connecting the earthly with the heavenly, Dora arrives at the highest possible form of femininity described by Neumann as Sophia – “[the] dual Great Goddess as mother and daughter… a spiritual whole in which all heaviness and materiality are transcended.”240 Sophia is an important spiritual figure appearing in Gnostic gospels, which were prohibited by early
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Christians;241 Gale Swiontowski defines Sophia as “the bridge of intermediary between spiritual and physical realms, and precursor to Christ and the Holy Spirit, who come into existence only because of her actions.”242 Lucy Reid, inspired by Erich Neumann, in her study of the Divine in feminism describes Sophia as follows:

Sophia-Spirit is not the Other, distinct from or alien to creation, but is the All in All, suffusing everything, linking and sanctifying everything. She is like the depths of the sea, undergirding and holding together the crashing turbulence of our lives. The power of Sophia-Spirit is not the authoritative power exerted over another, but is the indefatigable power of love to attract and transform.243

Dora, in her faith in the all-encompassing, transformative power of love represents Sophia, the one who sanctifies everything and everyone, the one that mediates between the spiritual and physical, connecting the two instead of dividing them, nurturing people through the maternal love coupled with the heavenly power of Jesus.

5. 3. 5 Conclusion
The five human female characters discussed above represent a wide range of archetypal forms including the Hetaira, the Mother-Urania, the Mother-Sophia, and the Medial Woman. All of these archetypes appear in their positive aspect. Interestingly enough, no Amazon appears among the characters, while the Mother archetype appears two to three (if we count in Babette) times. Yet, despite the Mother being a prevalent archetype, the image of the ideal nurturing and helping mother and her child is at both times slightly distorted. Gretchen, the Mother-Urania, sacrifices herself to others, because she believes her vocation is to lesser human suffering. Though her vocation seems to be very feminine, Gretchen’s femininity is
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actually withdrawn, as it gives way to the objective and masculine traits of Urania. Gretchen does not care for individuals, but for humanity; she is a childless mother to all. The same applies to Dora, the mother-Sophia, who represents both the daughter and the mother to all, but individually to no-one. In other words, both Gretchen and Dora are rather detached, partially masculinized Mothers.

Partial masculinization and/or an abandonment of one’s femininity seems to be a common characteristics of all discussed human female characters. Babette, a flat character that could be depicted in one line as “a strong woman who takes over a plantation against all odds,” becomes the man in the family after her brother dies. Jesse, the Medial Woman, withdraws from her consciousness, and instead decides to explore her unconscious, abandoning her femininity in the process. Bianca, though very feminine in her looks, enjoys dressing as a man and roaming the city at night, peeking into abandoned back alleys and harsh taverns. Gretchen thrives on her missions taking place deep in the jungles, a place hardly deemed appropriate for a woman. Dora emanates both deep femininity (appearances) and masculinity (behavior, voice, language), as she builds up her own cult of worshippers. It is important to say that those characters whose femininity is common (Jesse) or withdrawn (Gretchen) seem better developed than those with distinctive femininity (Bianca, Dora). To put it differently, the most intriguing characters share more masculine traits; on the other hand, the ones which Rice depicts as deeply feminine are often childlike, weepy, and shallow. Though the female characters with less distinctive femininity seem better developed, they are far from problematic; unable to access their femininity, they often bury themselves in a one-sided life, merging with their dominant archetype.

The human female characters of The Vampire Chronicles hardly ever set out on a quest to find out what a womanhood is; on the contrary, they usually suppress their femininity in favor of work, or a religious quest. Jesse, Gretchen, and Dora all either suppress, or are oblivious to their femininity. Jesse immerses herself in the Medial Woman archetype, becoming a mediator between the consciousness and unconscious, deeming femininity unimportant. Gretchen is absorbed in her Mother-Urania archetype, perceiving femininity as a mere test of her religious perseverance. Dora seems oblivious to her femininity, her whole life steadily searching for only
one thing: the evidence of God’s existence. Bianca, the courtesan, is an exception, since she uses her feminine charms as her weapon. However, even she seems detached from her femininity, as well as her female body; when Armand rapes her, she merely laughs and slaps him, and she also willingly turns into a man by dressing up.

In contrast to their male counterparts, the female characters seem to blindly, one-sidedly follow their one dominant archetype, disregarding a possibility of becoming a psychic whole. Rice seems unable to grasp a possibility of a complex female character. All powerful Jungian archetypes are present: a lover (the Hetaira), a mother (the Mother), a nun (the Mother-Urania/Amazon), a prophetess (the Mother-Sophia), and the witch (the Medial Woman). Except for Gretchen, who combines in herself the power of Mother-Urania with some of the traits of Amazon, the rest of the characters have a one-to-one relationship with their dominant archetype. And yet, even though often depicted as flat, narrative devices, or foil characters to others, on the brief space they are given, the human female characters defy stereotypes, or work their way through them steadily.

5. 4 Analysis of Vampire Female Characters

Though the literary critics and scholars pay slightly more attention to the vampire female characters, they are rarely the main topic. Jennifer Smith in Anne Rice: A Critical Companion discusses Gabrielle and Akasha, alongside Maharet and Mekare in more detail in the chapters on The Vampire Lestat and especially in The Queen of the Damned where Smith makes a few generalizations about female characters. The essay called “Undoing Feminism: From the Preoedipal to Postfeminism in Anne Rice's Vampire Chronicles” by Janice Doane and Devon Hodges discusses Rice’s post-feminist tendencies in The Vampire Chronicles and in the same vein briefly discusses Akasha, Maharet, Mekare, and Gabrielle. Martin J. Wood presents some interesting points on some of the female characters in his essay, but his main concern is the Ricean vampires’ sexuality and Anne Rice’s
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244 Claudia (Interview with the Vampire), Zenobia (Blood and Gold), and Baby Jenks (Queen of the Damned) are not discussed here, since they are all described as child vampires and their psychology differs largely from the psychology of women. Eudoxia, a female vampire from Blood and Gold, and Madeleine, a surrogate vampire mother to Claudia, are not discussed here, as their descriptions were deemed insufficient for a detailed analysis.
transformation of the vampire myth. Katherine Ramsland’s *The Vampire Companion* is sometimes useful as a reference book, since in putting the encyclopedia together she worked directly with Anne Rice; however, this source cannot be perceived as criticism, as its main purpose is to provide information about the Ricean vampire world. Bette B. Roberts in her collection of criticism named simply *Anne Rice*, published under Twayne’s United States Authors Series, provides some interesting insights into the vampire female characters; though limited in scope, Roberts’ criticism, with its use of archetypal terminology, became quite useful for my thesis.

5.4.1 Gabrielle

Gabrielle, Lestat’s mother, is a major female character appearing in *The Vampire Lestat*; she is depicted as an unconventional mother, similar to Anne Rice’s mother Katherine. According to Lestat Gabrielle “never sa[ys] anything ordinary” and “read[s] all the time.”245 Although in her appearance she is a typical babyface, she does not convey the conventional feminine personality traits. Gabrielle “look[s] profoundly cold”246 and hardly ever laughs; moreover, Gabrielle dislikes human touch. The only person Gabrielle accepts is Lestat, one of her sons. Lestat looks a lot like Gabrielle; they both have long, blond hair and clear, blue eyes. Similarly to Lestat, Gabrielle is a black sheep of the family; they are both nonconformists. Early on in his childhood, Lestat wants to become a priest; later, when he is forbidden to become a priest, Lestat starts dreaming of becoming an actor. Whenever Lestat’s father disproves of Lestat’s actions, Gabrielle is there to defend and support her son. She buys Lestat gifts, and propels him to follow his dreams. One day, Lestat goes out and finds himself surrounded by wolves; with his guns and the help of his dog, he kills all of the wolves and becomes the hero of the village. However, he is still disregarded at the family table. Feelings of anger and alienation, so similar to those Gabrielle feels, force Lestat’s mother to talk to her son. In their short conversation, Lestat confesses that sometimes he dreams of killing his father and his brothers; Gabrielle replies:

---

You know what I imagine... Not so much the murdering of them as an abandon which disregards them completely. I imagine drinking wine until I’m so drunk I strip off my clothes and bathe in the mountain streams naked. ... And then I imagine going into the village ... and up into the inn and taking into my bed any men that come there – crude men, big men, old men, boys. Just lying there and taking them one after another, and feeling some magnificent triumph in it, some absolute release without a thought of what happens to your father or your brothers, whether they are alive or dead. In that moment I am purely myself. I belong to no one.247

The social face Gabrielle has to put on in the society is that of a mother and a wife; her true role, however, is that of the Amazon. In the above mentioned monologue, Gabrielle dreams of total freedom from all the social restrictions; and hence from her conscious Persona. As a mother and a wife, Gabrielle has obligations to her children and her husband, which to her dominant Amazon archetype seem alien. Taking care of others, nurturing, belonging to someone, these are all strange concepts which Gabrielle has to come to terms with, at least on the outside. However, internally, Gabrielle suffers from the lack of freedom; since she cannot abandon her family and start acting upon her repressed archetypal patterns, she extends herself through Lestat and his actions.

Gabrielle, as a woman of the 18th century, realizes that she has a certain vocation prescribed to her by the society and that as a woman, she cannot escape her fate; however, Lestat, as a man, is not bound so strongly by the society, he can follow his dreams and through his actions, Gabrielle may feel at least partially free. Despite realizing it, Lestat becomes the psychological extension of Gabrielle, who enjoys every bit of her son’s rebellion. At the time when Lestat meets Nicki, a musician, and together they start to dream of leaving for Paris, Gabrielle’s health deteriorates. Feeling the death inevitably approaching, Gabrielle goes to Lestat to

convince him to leave for Paris and pursue an acting career. The final dialogue of Gabrielle and Lestat before his leave reminds one of a Freudian mother-son moment:

She talked for a long time. She said things I didn’t understand then, about how when she would see me riding out to hung, she felt some wondrous pleasure in it, and she felt that same pleasure when I angered everyone and thundered my questions at my father and brothers as to why we had to live the way we lived. She spoke in an almost eerie way of my being a secret part of her anatomy, of me being the organ for her which women do not really have.\footnote{\textit{Anne Rice, The Vampire Lestat} (London: Time Warner Books, 2006), 72-3.}

As Doane and Hodges fittingly point out, in Gabrielle’s monologue “Rice makes it explicit that she knows what is going on here; Gabrielle has penis envy and is living her life through her favorite son.”\footnote{Janice Doan and Devon Hodges, “Undoing Feminism: From the Preoedipal to Postfeminism in Anne Rice’s Vampire Chronicles,” in \textit{American Literary History}, Vol. 2., No. 3 (Autumn, 1990), 429.} Although the Freudian reading of the quoted scene, in fact, suggests itself, one can read deeper into the proposed meanings. Instead of penis envy, which sounds – intentionally – very negative, one could say Gabrielle reassigns her regressed, and socially undesirable, masculine traits to Lestat. Put differently, the restrictions imparted on femininity forbid Gabrielle to express her more masculine traits, and so she exhibits them at least impersonally through Lestat. She delights in everything he does as if she was the one doing all those things. Thus, when Gabrielle says “you are the man in me,” she in fact means “you are the withdrawn femininity in me (the part that I have to keep hidden from the rest of the world, since it is not deemed feminine enough for a woman).” But Lestat could also be perceived as Gabrielle’s personal shadow – he personifies all vices and virtues inappropriate for women, hence all that Gabrielle wants, yet cannot to become. She could, therefore, also be saying “you are the shadow in me (all that which is unconscious, repressed and cannot be seen by others in me).” Whether Gabrielle talks about her femininity, or her shadow, one thing is bound to happen eventually after her transformation into the vampire: both her femininity and her shadow are to
be incorporated back into Gabrielle’s psyche; thus leaving Lestat without a role in Gabrielle’s life.

As soon as Lestat turns Gabrielle into a vampire she breaks free from all social restrictions and becomes one with her withdrawn femininity and her most prominent archetypal pattern – the Amazon. Gabrielle, terminally ill and on the brink of death, comes to Paris to see Lestat once again before she dies. However, instead of bidding goodbye to each other, Lestat’s mother learns that her son has been transformed into something “[n]ot alive.” 250 When Lestat offers transforming Gabrielle into the same creature as he is, Gabrielle says yes almost immediately. Lestat portrays Gabrielle’s transformation: “There was no age to her, no single moment. My knowledge dimmed and flickered and there was no mother anymore, no petty need and petty terror; she was simply who she was. She was Gabrielle.” 251 For Gabrielle, turning into a vampire allows for a way out of her social role, her persona; the moment she becomes a vampire, the mother role stops defining her life, her actions, and her thoughts. Liberated from the social restrictions, she turns in front of Lestat from a mother into “a woman torn out of time and place… no chains on her, free to soar.” 252 To Lestat, such profound change seems peculiar; as a man, he did not experience the transformation into a vampire as a liberating process. Before he was turned into a vampire, he lived his life fully: he fought a battle with the wolves, hunted for food, and argued constantly with his father, only to finally flee away with his boyfriend to start acting on a stage in Paris. He was always the active one; the masculine one; the man who had all the power. Gabrielle, on the other hand, was a woman held down by the prevailing femininity of the time: she was given a place in the society and a passive role of a mother, and until becoming a vampire, that was what defined her whole life.

For Gabrielle, vampirism equals freedom from the consciousness, from all that society ever required of her: staying true to her social role, and above all remaining and acting in line with the prevailing femininity. Right after the transformation, Gabrielle proposes she and Lestat go into random houses and find new clothes. Lestat is taken aback; he always shops for his clothes. Yet to Gabrielle,
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the idea of something immoral seems alluring: it is what she, bound by the ego, could not have done during her human life. Instead of venturing into other people’s houses, Gabrielle eventually decides to kill a young boy, strips him of his clothes and puts it on. Lestat remarks that “… as she [Gabrielle] put on his garments, she became the boy.”253 Next, Gabrielle ties her hair into a ponytail and, seeing Lestat’s confusion over her manlike clothing, tells him, “But there’s no real reason for me to dress that way anymore, is there?”254 Since Lestat never felt the need to abandon his social role, nor act against the prevailing masculinity, he does not understand Gabrielle’s actions; and what is more – he fears her actions. She seems to him colder, and immoral; and Lestat, taught all about the prevailing femininity, finds this surprising, and inappropriate. The only justification he can find for his mother’s actions is a simple belief posed as a question: “But she was not really a woman now, was she?”255 It is easier for both Gabrielle and Lestat to believe that the transformation stripped her of her gender and femininity, and not of her social role. That way, femininity stays protected, and Gabrielle – now not a masculine, nor feminine being – can roam the world freely. Not once does it occur to either of the two vampires that with vampirism, Gabrielle’s femininity did not go away – it merely blossomed into its true color.

Gabrielle finally becomes one with the unconscious archetype closest to her mind: the Amazon. She seeks “emptiness of the country, the quiet,”256 she wants to “[g]o where there are no men and women about… where there is only the wind and the dark trees, and the stars overhead.”257 At last, Gabrielle is allowed to confess to herself that people and human, or vampire relationships are of no importance to her. Slowly, she reveals this to Lestat as well:

‘I’d rather study the currents of wind or the patterns in the falling leaves… I care less about these creatures than I do about the trees in the forest… I want to know, for example, why beauty exists… And I must
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confess that this... leads me away from my human victims... It’s of snow-covered mountains I dream... of desert wastes – of impenetrable jungles, or the great north woods of America... I can do the things now that you [Lestat] used to do. I could fight those wolves on my own...

We’re free.’

‘I was free before,’ I [Lestat] said.258

Gabrielle’s monologues leave Lestat perplexed; it turns out, suddenly, that she was more part of him than he was a part of her. Once Gabrielle is allowed to act on her withdrawn femininity, she does not need Lestat as an extension of her senses. She learns to accept her own shadow, and her own femininity; she becomes one with her unconscious. Due to this, Lestat and Gabrielle gradually start to drift apart, as Gabrielle wanders to the nature and starts fulfilling her dreams, while Lestat stays closer to humans and other vampires, seeking lasting relationships. In one of their final conversations, Gabrielle suggests something that horrifies Lestat:

“Imagine,” she said, “not merely this stealthy and loathsome feeding on mortals, but something grand as the Tower of Babel was grand before it was brought down by the wrath of God. I mean a leader set up in a Satanic palace who sends out his followers to turn brother against brother, to cause mothers to kill their children, to put all the fine accomplishments of mankind to the torch, to scorch the land itself so that all would die of hunger, innocent and guilty! Make suffering and chaos wherever you turn, and strike down the forces of good so that men despair...

“But what about your aesthetic questions?” I asked. “What you explained to Armand before, that you wanted to know why beauty existed and why it continues to affect us?”

She shrugged.

“When the world of man collapses in ruin, beauty will take over....”

Lestat, a representative of the men power ruling over the world, does not have the slightest sympathy for Gabrielle’s imagination. To him, such chaos and destruction seems petty; yet to Gabrielle, a woman who was for years trapped inside a prison made of social restrictions and conscious material, the idea seems alluring. Destroying all civilizations would mean destroying the conscious, social restrictions – everything that has to do with the ego – and all left would be archetypal, and unconscious. This, alongside Gabrielle’s passing note “I will be the goddess to those I slay” and her withdrawal to nature are the reasons why Jennifer Smith in her *Anne Rice: A Critical Companion*, claims that Gabrielle “represents the Great Mother.” Yet the Mother is not an impersonal archetype; both positive and negative, the Mother thrives on relationships with others. Seeking a seclusion does not point to Gabrielle’s effort at becoming one with nature, and consequentially embracing the Earth Mother archetype, but rather to her desire for freedom and challenges, which – during her mortal life – were conceivable only of men. She wants to go to nature to fight lions and climb mountains, not to meditate on the link of her femininity to the Earth. In fact, her withdrawn femininity almost prohibits any such thoughts. The Mother archetypes Jennifer Smith searches for, appear for the first time in *The Queen of the Damned*, where Gabrielle’s apocalyptic idea becomes the main story arc with Akasha, the Terrible Mother, the mother of destruction threatening not only the human civilization (the consciousness), but the vampire realm (the unconscious) as well.

5.4.2 Akasha

Akasha represents a sudden and important shift in Rice’s female characters; instead of standing for one possible female identity, Akasha stands for the negative

---

262 Though in *The Vampire Companion* Katherine Ramsland claims “[h]er [Akasha’s] name was inspired by a place name Rice had seen on a map in the book *Lost Cities of Africa,*” (Ramsland 7) other possible inspirations for Akasha’s name exist. The most popular, and also most cited connection is that between Akasha and H. Ridder Haggard’s character called Ayesha appearing in
mythical female; she is the myth coming to life, an archetypal goddess more than anything else. In her human form, Akasha is a princess from Uruk, who marries Enkil, the Egyptian king of Kemet, thus becoming a queen of Egypt. Soon after ascending to the throne, Akasha establishes herself as a tyrannical queen; the active and masculine-like ruler. Similarly to Lestat, Akasha seeks the truth behind human life. But in her pursuit of the truth, she is merciless and cruel. She learns about the twin witches Maharet and Mekare who can communicate with the spirits, and decides speak to them. First, she sends them an invitation, which is politely declined. Second, she sends her husband Enkil and armed forces to capture the twins and deliver them to Kemet. Thus, Maharet and Mekare experience Akasha’s tyranny first hand and describe the queen’s reign: “… it was clear … that it was Akasha who ruled this kingdom and always had. Akasha had the language – the verbal skills.” Maharet continues to say that Akasha “had no true morality, no true system of ethics to govern the things which she did.” Moreover, Maharet perceives that “in her [Akasha] there was a dark place full of despair… and a great driving force to make meaning because there was none.” Instead of a meek, perceptive woman propelled by eros, Akasha is described as a woman possessed by her Animus: a blindly opinionated, critical, argumentative person, ready to use the words to find objectiveness, even if there is none to be found. She possesses the logos, and acts upon it; while at the same time smothering that which is feminine in herself. In the criticism of The Queen of the Damned, scholars usually do not pay attention to the

“She.” (Gelder 115) Bette B. Roberts finds another possible origin of Akasha’s name; paraphrasing J. C. Cirlo’s Dictionary Symbols, Robert says: “the name [Akasha] as a variation of the acacia flower might be regarded as both pagan and Christian. The pink and white blossoms of the acacia were sacred to the Egyptians because of their duality; that is, the shrub itself was connected with the paradoxical complexities of the red-and-white principle: death and immortality, passion and purity, destruction and rebirth; the torn represented the mother-goddess.” (Roberts 67) Finally, I propose that Akasha’s name could be derived from the Indian philosophy; the word “akasha” standing for “the primary matter” in the Indian theory of prana: “It is the Akasha that becomes the air, that becomes the liquids, that becomes the solids; it is the Akasha that becomes the sun, the earth, the moon, the stars, the comets; it is the Akasha that becomes the human body, the Animal body, the plants, every forms that we see, everything that can be sensed, everything that exists.” (Chande 220). See Katherine Ramsland, Prism of the Night: A Biography of Anne Rice (New York, US: Plume, 1992), 7; Ken Gelder, Reading the Vampire (London: Routledge, 1994), 115; Bette B. Roberts, Anne Rice (New York: Twayne Publications, 1994), 67; and M. B. Chande, Indian Philosophy in Modern Times (New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, 2000), 220.

264 Ibid., 385.
265 Ibid., 385-386.
human life of Akasha; however, it is important to understand her transformation from a woman possessed by her Animus into the Terrible Mother – one that devours and destroys all.

As she falls deeper into her Animus, Akasha’s withdrawn femininity strengthens itself and her female archetype – the Mother – takes on a more shadowy aspect. The twin sisters do not have answers Akasha wants to hear; instead, they tell her the truth; that gods do not exist, and that only bad and good spirits roam the world. Akasha, angered and desperate, decides to punish the witches; Maharet and Mekare are raped by Khayman, the king’s adviser, in the court. After the sentence, both witches are exiled from the kingdom. Yet one of the spirits, the bad spirit Amel, propelled by Mekare’s wrath and desire for revenge, stays behind, repeatedly punishing Khayman for the rape. When Khayman’s life becomes unbearable and the people of the kingdom anxious, the king and queen decide to take the matter into their own hands. Akasha and Enkil come into Khayman’s house in order to soothe Amel; the people of Kemet, however, fear that the queen and the king have angered the gods and when the night falls the king and queen are stabbed to death in Khayman’s house. At that point, the bad spirit Amel enters Akasha’s body and merges with her heart and her brain: Akasha becomes the primordial vampire. After she absorbs the bad spirit into herself, Akasha becomes the Great Mother and the self-declared queen of all the vampires as well as of all the Egyptian people. In herself, she seems to unite both the positive, and the negative aspects of the Mother archetype. She is the Good Mother in that she gives eternal life; she is the Terrible Mother that in so doing, she sucks the mortal life out of her victims. Yet with the transformation, the good aspect slowly withers, and the withdrawn femininity coupled with the shadow aspects of the Mother archetype gradually takes over the queen. Conserved in her shadow archetype, Akasha is destined to become the Terrible Mother.

Akasha resembles the Terrible Mother as she is perceived by men: the alluring, yet also terrifying figure with female features, who devours, destroys, and kills. The withdrawn femininity of Akasha is used as a mask concealing her masculine behavior and masculine goals, which would otherwise be deemed unsuitable for a woman figure. In other words, Akasha is conceived of as the Terrible
Mother – the negative aspect of a woman, one which – in an ideal, patriarchal world – should not exist. After becoming vampires, Akasha and Enkil establish themselves as Isis and Osiris, two Egyptian gods who rule in the darkness. However, they find it impossible to quench their thirst for blood, and so they send for the witches. Mekare and Maharet are escorted to the king and queen; once again they tell the truth – that they have to turn others into vampires, since that is what will quench their thirst – and once again they are punished for it. Akasha and Enkil then go on and rule over their kingdom, until both get too tired of the world and fall into slumber. This is how Lestat meets them in *The Vampire Lestat* after Marius takes him to their shrine: as two living statues sitting on two stools, motionless and silent. Fascinated by Akasha especially, Lestat brings a violin into the shrine and starts playing it; thus, he wakes up Akasha, the Terrible Mother, from her slumber.

Though depicted as a woman, Akasha is far from being described as a typical babyface; her eyes are deep brown, and her hair is black, yet nothing about her facial features, or her body type is said. The single most interesting thing about Akasha, and also the most distinguishing aspect of her appearance, seems to be her figure. For example, Baby Jenks – a vampire child – describes Akasha as follows: “[i]t was the white figure that amazed her. It looked like a statue, like the Blessed Virgin Mary in the Catholic Church.”

Similarly, Khayman, when talking about Akasha, refers to her figure and her posture: “... how he loathed the Mother, this tall, fair being with the posture of a warrior and a priest in one.” Lestat, on the other hand, frequently describes Akasha as a goddess, or “the thing” and comments on her ability to seduce and lull him into a false sense of security. Lestat, to whom Akasha repeatedly talks, also describes her voice as a luring voice of a temptress, “a voice that draws you into itself.” Akasha’s outward femininity seems to be alluring, yet also false – what hides behind her facade is a withdrawn femininity; one that uses her own feminine weapons to reach her unfeminine goals. She goes against all that is feminine: instead of caring for her children, she kills them mercilessly, instead of searching for the world peace, she triggers war. She is abusive, aggressive, powerful,
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goal-oriented, and, moreover, she is an active person. Instead of becoming the passive queen to her active king, Akasha kills her husband, Enkil, and sets on a path to war. Her femininity is cast away as something inappropriate and mask-like; something only Lestat, the one seduced by Akasha, can see. To others, Akasha is the impersonal goddess, the icon with manlike posture. In other words, her femininity is perceived as being distinguished from her masculine behavior and goals: she may possess a female body, yet she is also “alien, utterly foreign,”270 as well as “uncivilized,”271 “barbaric”272 and “almost savage.”273

Akasha’s story is a story of transformation from an aspiring Good Mother to the Terrible Mother. Throughout the years of her silent sleep, Akasha listens to the lamentation of the people all around the world and finally decides that masculinity and men are at fault. Once awake, Akasha becomes the Terrible Mother in all her glory, the one who believes she is “the fulfillment and … shall from this moment on be the cause.”274 Ironically enough, Akasha decides to fight the masculine evil with masculine weapons, dressed as the ideal of femininity: she is called “the Blessed Mother”, “the Madonna, the Virgin” and women of all countries listen to her as she prods them to start killing men. Deceitful, merciless warrior, Akasha spares Lestat only because he is the perfect prototype of masculinity, the ideal Jesus to her Madonna. Deep inside, Akasha apparently realizes that masculinity and femininity have to coexist; yet she believes that masculinity should be first tamed and feminized, in order to become good and equal to femininity. The feminism gone awry, according to which femininity is inherently good and masculinity as inherently bad, ultimately turns against its masculinized proponent Akasha. The desperate act of forced feminization of men is deemed inappropriate, just as the masculinization of women is deemed inappropriate. What Rice seems to propose is that there should be a balance between women and men, not a forced supremacy of either of the two; moreover, though Akasha, the bad woman, is destroyed, another character fills in for her, thus suggesting that despite the efforts of the patriarchy, masculinity in a woman
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can never be fully extinguished, just as the full feminization of men can never be put into action.

If Akasha had been killed and no other Terrible Mother was to take her place, Anne Rice would have confirmed that women can only be the Good Mothers: the caring, soothing, nurturing kinds; however, she gives a plain message to her readers – when one Terrible Mother dies, another has to take her place, because a woman is a sum of both her positive and her negative aspects; both her masculine and feminine sides. As Akasha sets out on a journey to Maharet’s house, where all remaining vampires are gathered, Maharet finishes narrating the story of her and her sister’s lives. She concludes that Mekare is already on her way to kill Akasha, and that she is their only hope. When Mekare arrives, she is depicted as a terrifying creature with no real features: she is a being encrusted in mud and dirt. Just like Jason beheaded Medusa, so does Mekare tear off Akasha’s head from the rest of her body; then she eats Akasha’s heart and brain. In so doing, Mekare takes Akasha’s place, becoming the Terrible Mother. Maharet, who from the beginning is depicted as the Good Mother, is Mekare’s other half. The two aspects are therefore united, yet at the same time divided: together, the twins represent the Mother, good and evil. Although the replacement of Akasha is a positive step – in so doing, Anne Rice seems to suggest that the negative aspect of the Mother is an inevitable part of life and of womanhood – it is slightly disturbing that the two aspects are divided between the two women. A contrasting thought seems to sprout from the division of Good and Terrible Mother, one that most likely stems from Anne Rice’s torn approach towards women and womanhood. As if Rice was suggesting that in one female body, the two aspects cannot possibly coexist: a woman has to be either feminine or masculine; either a Good Mother, or a Terrible Mother, but never both. The possession of both gender aspects may result in an internal psychological war of the woman who, at least in Rice’s literary world, is very likely to choose the masculine aspects of her psyche over the feminine aspects; just like Akasha and Gabrielle did.

5. 4. 3 Maharet and Mekare![](image)

The story of Maharet and Mekare, the witch twins of Mount Carmel, is tied tightly to the fate of Akasha. Maharet describes herself and her sister as two powerful witches capable of communicating with spirits, who, at the time of their life, were “greatly
revered… and sought for advice and miracles.”275 As mortals, Maharet and Mekare are able to communicate with both bad and good spirits, they are also capable of making rain. Their powers entice Akasha, who, under a false pretence, slaughters Maharet and Mekare’s people and transports the twins to Kemet. In Egypt, Akasha and Enkil start questioning the twins in order to find more about their gods. Yet the witches claim that no gods exist – only playful spirits who pretend to be gods in order to draw people’s attention. Akasha, desperately searching for the meaning of life, refuses to believe this and decides to punish the witches. Thus, Mekare’s tongue is torn out, and Maharet’s eyes are plucked out; moreover, they are both to be sealed in coffins alive. Yet, as the final sentence for the witches is being set in motion, Khayman, who was turned against his will into a vampire by the King and Queen, decides to help the twins by turning them into vampires as well. Before Maharet and Mekare are sent out to the sea in the stone coffins, Mekare swears she will kill Akasha when the time comes. The twin witches, now twin vampires, are transformed into two mythical creatures.

Whereas as mortals, Maharet and Mekare are most compatible with the archetype of Medial Woman, as vampires the twins turn into the two aspects of the Mother archetype. The moment Maharet and Mekare are transformed into vampires, they lose their ability to talk with the spirits. The same happens to Jesse, a descendant of Maharet, who – once a strong psychic – after the transformation cannot speak to spirits, nor see ghosts. The Medial Woman, it seems, is not an archetype female vampires can embrace. Hence, once the Medial Woman is transformed into a vampire, she has to proceed to the next archetypal form – the Mother. As is usual with the female vampires, the archetype they fall into becomes exaggerated. I cannot agree with Bette B. Roberts’ claim according to which Maharet and Mekare are “the apocalyptic good mothers,”276 and in Mekare both the Good and Terrible mother is present.277 With Maharet and Mekare, the archetype clearly becomes divided into two parts: one twin becomes the Good Mother, while the other becomes the Terrible Mother. Mekare, who speaks to the evil spirit, Amel, and later wishes evil to Akasha and Enkil, finally bringing vampirism unto them, has inside

her what Maharet lacks: the shadow element of the Mother. And it is Mekare, again, not Maharet, who decapitates Akasha and devours her brain and heart into herself, thus completing her transformation into the Terrible Mother. Together, Maharet and Mekare represent the Mother as it is described in mythology: “in mythology and rite... we find the imagery of the mother associated almost equally with beatitude and danger, birth and death, the inexhaustible nourishing breast and the tearing claws of the ogress.”  

Similarly to Erich Neumann, Marie-Louise Von Franz, an analyst and a Jungian disciple, divides the Mother archetype into a light and dark side, calling the negative aspect of the Mother the Witch, and the positive aspect the Mother Goddess. Whether Maharet is called the Good Mother or the Mother Goddess, she is, without doubt, all that is deemed positive of femininity.

In contrast to Akasha, who went to sleep when the world around her changed and she could no longer bear it, Maharet is perceived as truly immortal; she “had never slept, never gone silent, never become mad.” All this was possible for Maharet because, in her own words, she “turned to the family as if it were the very spring of life itself. The family was all things.” Before Maharet was turned into a vampire, she had given birth to a child, a girl called Miriam. Once turned into a vampire, Maharet decides to take care of Miriam and of all her matrilineal descendants. Not only does she keep track of all matrilineal descendants, she also communicates with the family members of many different branches and creates a myth of the Maharet: “a single female descendant in each generation [who] would take the name [Maharet] and the record-keeping obligations.” Naturally, throughout the centuries there is only one Maharet and due to her doings, she becomes known to other vampires as “the keeper of the records of the Great Family,” or “the guardian of her mortal family.” Upon meeting with Maharet for the first time, Marius depicts her as a woman with a symmetrical, masklike face,
possessing “an air of infinite flexibility and overwhelming menace.”285 He also describes Maharet as highly feminine: “[a] deep, soft femininity emanated from her, no less mysterious than anything else about her, a tender vulnerability that he [Marius] associated with women.”286 Despite being portrayed as a mysterious, menacing, and feminine vampire, Maharet does not pose a threat to the vampires, or the mankind. When Marius asks her why she did not come to him when he was the guard of Akasha and Enkil, Maharet answers:

I might have destroyed your shrine if I had come... I might have buried the King and the Queen beneath the sea. I might even have destroyed them, and so doing, destroyed all of us. And this I didn’t want to do. And so I did nothing. What would you have me had do? I couldn’t take your burden from you. I couldn’t help you. So I did not come.287

In her speech, Maharet acknowledges that if she had taken the matter into her own hands, she might have been able to destroy Akasha. However, since Akasha is the Mother of all the vampires carrying in herself the core of vampirism – the spirit Amel, destroying Akasha would inevitably lead to annihilation of all the vampires. The only possible way of destroying the Queen, while at the same time saving the vampires, is to kill Akasha, devour her insides and become the new Terrible Mother. Yet for Maharet, the Good Mother, such possibility is inconceivable. By nature, she does not want to interfere with the fate of all the vampires and the mankind: as a Good Mother, she does not want to bring destruction and death upon the vampires and humans.

In order to balance the Good Mother archetype, Mekare, Maharet’s twin sister, has to become the Terrible Mother; she has to fill in the place of Akasha, who became an uncontrollable embodiment of the Terrible Mother, and as a result had to be destroyed. Nowhere in The Vampire Chronicles is Mekare’s deed – the killing of Akasha and devouring of her innards – described as a deed of goodness. Though
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Mekare’s action certainly can be perceived as a good deed externally, as it stops “a feminist monster” from destroying the world, internally, Mekare becomes a carrier of a symbolical vengeance, a female propelled by nothing but vindictiveness. Her taking of Akasha’s brain and heart inside her more than anything else symbolizes her will to finally devour what is rightfully hers, and what was once taken away from her by Akasha: her mother’s (now the Terrible Mother’s) innards, which had been destroyed by Akasha’s soldiers before the twin sisters could eat them during a sacred ceremony. Thus, I do not agree with Bette B. Roberts who claims that Mekare in herself combines both the terrible and the good mother. First, Mekare’s shadow aspect shows even during her mortal life; and second, after her transformation, Mekare’s life revolves only around revenge, the concepts of nurturing and caring are foreign to her. Moreover, in her description, Mekare resembles the true Earth Mother – the one repressed out of Christianity as an evil, mysterious, pagan female figure connected to all that is earthly:

A thin layer of soil encased her all over, even the rippling shape of her long hair. Broken, peeling, stained by the rain even, the mud still clung to her, clung to her naked arms and bare feet as if she were made of it, made of earth itself. It made a mask of her face. And her eyes peered out of the mask, naked, rimmed in red. A rag covered her, a blanket filthy and torn, and tied with a hemp rope around her waist. ... [T]he woman stared at Akasha, the eyes gleaming with fearless Animal cunning... (italics mine)

Mekare, a long lost sister, becomes the element that complements Maharet. She is the evil side to the good side, yet she is also the silent and concealed side of the Mother archetype. While Maharet can steal the eyes from her victims in order to see, Mekare cannot replace her missing tongue for a new one; as a result, Mekare is mute. Her muteness seems to suggest that the negative aspect of the Mother will from now
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on become again quiet, as if it was truly nonexistent. Mekare served her purpose: she killed Akasha and replaced her. However, she will not rule as Akasha did – she will be the mysterious negative aspect of femininity, hidden from the eyes of all the vampires and humans who – for better and for worse – believe that femininity and females are above all good.

In dividing the Mother archetype into two aspects, Anne Rice followed in the footsteps of the patriarchal pattern of dualism. The dualism of Maharet and Mekare follows both the religious and the mythological pattern in which twins often personified good and evil, or “just exhibited characteristics that symbolized good or bad actions or situations.” Yet this mythological pattern of dualism, when applied to women, can be seen as highly patriarchal. Erich Neumann explains:

...patriarchal ideology is based on... a conflict in which the Feminine and the woman are experienced not as a unity but only as polar opposites. Thus woman and the Feminine appear either as negative, downward-pulling force, as swamp woman or water sprite, or as a positive, uplifting force, as angel or goddess.

Since a woman seem to be mysterious – with her ability to procreate and her monthly cycle of menstruation – men, who often stood behind the mythological and religious texts, had to divide her into two halves: the good, appropriate woman, and the evil, inappropriate witch. Splitting the woman allowed men to contain the evil woman in one body, and the good woman in another. Anne Rice in The Queen of the Damned seems to follow in the footsteps of these patriarchal mythological and religious patterns; however, as Wendy Doniger remarks, in the myths of dualism, it is always important to ask “who splits whom,” rather than why the characters are split. Here, the split of Maharet and Mekare might be a patriarchal split allowing Anne Rice for

an easier handling of the evil in women; however, one might also read the split as a way of rebelling against the horrors of Akasha. Maharet and Mekare together constitute a balanced woman: one that possesses both the good and the evil side, as well as “the real, deeper female identity that manages to be matriarchal without becoming hostile to men.”\textsuperscript{293} If they were put together into one being, such being would have to always balance between the good and the evil; yet, at the final battle with Akasha, in order to kill Akasha, evil would have to win over good. For Anne Rice, who most of her life battled with being considered not enough feminine, splitting of the female character might have seem an easy way out. The split allowed her to let Maharet stay utterly feminine and good, while her evil alter ego – her shadow – killed Akasha. In this, however, the split became reactionary. Mekare, the evil side, has no character arc, and except for the one single act of killing, she seems to be a detached, inappropriate element of femininity; one that is bound to get lost in the woods again, once there is no need for it. Instead of creating a complex female character capable of containing both good and evil aspects in herself, Anne Rice recreated two stereotypically, patriarchal females – the good one and the evil one.

5.4.4 Pandora
Pandora (born Lydia) is the only female character who, after being mentioned by Marius in \textit{The Vampire Lestat} and appearing briefly in \textit{The Queen of the Damned}, is given her own novel. Pandora’s story is continued, though only in short, in \textit{Blood and Gold}, the eight novel of \textit{The Vampire Chronicles} focusing on the life of the ancient vampire Marius. Pandora is yet
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another of Anne Rice’s first person narratives framed by a person interviewing the main character. In Pandora it is David Talbot, a newly born vampire and a past head of the Talamasca order, who gives the female vampire blank notebooks and propels her to reminiscence. Pandora, reluctantly, writes down the story of her life: born in 15 B.C. into a senatorial family, Lydia becomes the sixth child and an only daughter in the family. Of her mother, who dies when Lydia reaches her second year, Lydia says, “…all I recall of her are gentleness and sweetness.” Though motherless, Lydia does not suffer hardship; surrounded by her father and brothers, she becomes well educated, “cherished by teams of Greek tutors and nurses” and “[partakes] of life as [do] men.” Of her life she says: “I was not closeted away as a Greek woman might have been in some old Hellenistic household. I did not suffer under the earlier customs of the Roman Republic.” By the time Lydia turns ten, she already has a good knowledge of Ovid, Cicero, Horace, Lucretius, Virgil, “and all the Greek manuscripts” her family possesses. Soon enough, she becomes “the true jewel of [her] Father’s eye.”

The fondness between Lydia and her father is mutual; Lydia has a great love of her father in both her mortal and vampire life, and this she mentions several times throughout the novel: “My feeling for my Father is so great to this very night, as I sit in the café, writing for you, David…” Lydias’s brightness, boldness and wit is what her father appreciates as he “show[s] [Lydia] off at banquets at which he entertain[s] his conservative and somewhat old-fashioned Senatorial friends” reciting verses from Virgil. Often, Lydia attends her father’s meetings and events, though children are not usually welcome at such occasions: “My father thought this was amusing, of course, and he did not care what anyone else thought of his dusty little daughter, hanging onto his arms and speaking to his honored company.” At one such occasion, the fifteen years old Lydia meets Marius, at the time still mortal.
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of twenty-five years old, who is considered “the ‘bad boy’ in an intellectual way, the ‘poet’ and the ‘loafer’.” 303 Lydia, who until meeting with Marius, opposed getting married and “had wriggled out of it year after year, feigning illness, madness, total uncomfortable fits”. 304 admits she had fallen in love with him immediately, and approaches her father with a suggestion: “If you’re going to marry me to someone – if there’s no way short of suicide that I can avoid this disgusting development – why don’t you marry me to Marius?” 305 Her wish is, nevertheless, not granted to her, since Marius is considered an unsuitable husband.

Lydia and her father share a hetairic relationship with a more shadowy aspect; one in which the woman becomes, as Harold Bloom notes, “the puella aeterna, the eternal daughter, seeking love wherever she can get it.” 306 As Ulanov says, the Hetaira in its positive aspects values above all “the individual, subjective, psychic life in herself and others.” 307 If turned negative, the Hetaira often becomes either the seductress of a man, or “the eternal daughter idolizing her father, sacrificing her own development in her dedication to the ‘other.’” 308 Lydia, since the age of two motherless, growing up in a family comprising of six men, quite understandably becomes this puella aeterna, the eternal child, who seeks to become a companion to her father, thus balancing the household in which a feminine aspect is missing. In his description of the stages of woman’s development, Neumann notes that “the stability of patriarchal culture is reflected in the relationship of heaven [= Masculine] and earth [= Feminine] in their mutual interdependence.” 309 Since Lydia’s mother dies, the patriarchal stability has to be restored through the relationship of the father [= Masculine] and daughter [= Feminine]. Because, in order to preserve the patriarchy, Lydia has to correspond to the Feminine/the Unconscious/the Earth, she
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“must surrender ... her natural psychological bisexuality,” thus becoming psychologically one-sided, leaving her masculine side unconscious.\(^{310}\) As a result, Lydia, naturally possessing both the Animus and the Anima, has to suppress her Animus completely. Despite her equal upbringing, Lydia has to embrace her femininity and become a woman of the patriarchate. Yet, Lydia’s Animus spurts out of her, as she projects it outside herself at several occasions. For example, when Lydia takes part in the ancient ceremony called Lupercalia in which “the young men were hitting lightly on the arm of every young woman with a strip of goatskin, which was supposed to purify [them]”, standing in the circle and receiving the blows, she finds herself wishing “[she] was a man and could run around the hill with the other men.”\(^{311}\) Moreover, Lydia “ha[s] some sarcastic inner thoughts about ‘being purified,’”\(^{312}\) but out of respect for her father, she keeps them to herself. With her Animus repressed, Lydia’s psychic development halts; from a positive Hetaira, ready to ascend to another archetypal pattern, Lydia transforms into a negative Hetaira – into a woman, who revels in exhibitionism, lack of commitment, and “rebels against cultural mores and limitations.”\(^{313}\)

With her Animus repressed and her daughter-psychology active, Lydia is “unable to make any permanent commitment to her own attitudes or to an actual relationship” and instead “lead[s] a life full of emotional wanderings and merely tentative attachments.”\(^{314}\) At the age of thirty-five, Lydia “[is] married twice, due to pressure from the Imperial House... legally divorced and freed twice over”,\(^{315}\) bears no children as she “yield[s] to the act of love only on [her] own terms,”\(^{316}\) and becomes “a member of the Cult of Isis just to spite [her] husbands and get away from them.”\(^{317}\) She also becomes attracted to prostitutes, perceiving them as “the brilliant,
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loose women [who] conquered a barrier which [Lydia], the loving daughter of [her] Father, would never conquer.”

Eventually, instead of searching for a fulfilling relationship, Lydia decides to retire from social life and take care of her father, though he has no difficulties attending to himself. The moment she becomes free of her wifely duties and returns to her father, Lydia stops adoring the prostitutes; with her father, Lydia can slumber into the role of an eternal daughter. She does not feel the pressure to awaken the individual, and subjective in herself or others, as she can repress all individual and become her father’s Anima instead. The situation swiftly changes, when Lydia’s family is condemned and slaughtered for their political stance, and Lydia is sent abroad. Her father, “the only man [Lydia] had ever loved,” decides to fight until death takes him, and, parting with Pandora tells her, “Lydia, don’t live out your life alone on account of me. Marry for love! You must not give up!”

With the help of her father’s Jewish friends and merchants, Lydia is brought to Antioch with all family possessions. The plan is to take her to an old Greek family, whose patriarch was a friend of her father’s. However, soon after Lydia’s arrival, the family from Antioch meets the same fate as hers. Thus, Lydia moves into a house after a recently deceased widow and, in order to escape recognition and future death warrant, passes herself off as a widow from Rome named Pandora.

After taking on a new identity, Pandora first acquires three slaves, and then enters a temple of the goddess Isis; she is being troubled by a dream in which she turns into a blood-sucking monster, and searches for relief from her visions. When Pandora confides her dreams to the priestess, she inquires of her to come speak with a friend of the temple. This friend turns out to be Marius, already a vampire. Marius and the priests of the temple inform Pandora about a badly burnt creature who drains people of Antioch of blood and cannot be found. Of this, however, Pandora knows nothing, and when Marius – capable of mind reading – affirms that, she is free to go home. When she gets home, Marius already waits for her; he pleads with Pandora to stay alert, as the burnt creature is dangerous. Pandora, however, has her own head, and during day finds a way to Marius’ house, breaks in, and falls asleep on his couch.

---

318 Anne Rice, Pandora (London: Arrow Books, 1999), 68.
319 Ibid., 131.
320 Ibid., 78.
waiting for him. When she wakes up, the burnt vampire named Akhbar, who had been searching for Marius, attacks her. Draining Pandora of blood, Akhbar demands to see Akasha, whose blood could heal him. Marius takes Akhbar and Pandora to the shrine; Akasha kills him and gives her blood to Pandora instead. Thus, Pandora becomes a vampire. Drinking Akasha’s blood, Pandora has a vision:

> With the nectar flowing into me, there came another realm. Her ringing laughter filled the corridor; she ran ahead of me, girlish, feline, unencumbered by grandeur. She beckoned for me to follow. Under the stars, Marius sat alone in his soft shapeless garden. She pointed to him. I saw Marius rise and take me in his arms. His long hair was such a fine adornment. I saw what she wanted. It was Marius I kissed in the vision as I drank from her; it was Marius with whom I danced. A shower of flower petals descended upon us as upon a bridal couple in Rome, and Marius held my arm as though we had just been wed, and all around us people sang. There was a flawless happiness, a happiness so keen that perhaps there are those born who never even have the capacity for it.321

Even in her transformation, Pandora is still a child-woman; an eternal, infantile and naive daughter searching for a new lover. Though it seems she is ascending to another archetype, since she has, repeatedly visions during her journey to Antioch and in Antioch as well, during Pandora’s transformation, one learns that the visions were misleading: they were planted in her head by Akasha, who took advantage of Pandora’s negative Hetaira aspects. Through the visions, Akasha lead Pandora towards Marius; she promised her a new fatherly lover, one that would protect her and one that would carry on the masculine consciousness, while she could stay the daughterly feminine unconscious.

In her transformation, Pandora is given glimpses of Akasha’s past life, which may or may not be true; however, Pandora, infantile and naive, believes in what she

sees immediately. She tells Marius Akasha is Isis, the goddess she had worshiped all her life, and that Akasha would have it that her worship is restored. A heated exchange of views between Marius and Pandora follows:

‘...You innocent desperate idiot of a woman! Restore her altars! Oh! Restore her worship! Oh! You are out of your mind!’
‘Idiot! You dare sling your insults at me! You think you’ve brought a slave into your household? You haven’t even brought a wife.’ ...
‘I did not mean to use petty insults!’ he said. He was stung.
‘Well, then sharpen your great male reason and your lofty elegant patrician mode of expression!’ I said.
‘Yes!’ he said. ‘Reason,’ he said. He held up his finger. ‘You are the most clever woman I’ve ever known. And you listen to reason. I will explain and you will see. This is what must be done.’

Though vampires, both Marius and Pandora keep using polarized insults: men are accused of using only reason and of acting superior (= patrician) to women, who are accused of naive innocence. In the argument, Pandora’s negative aspects of the Hetaira archetype come into view; as the negative Hetaira, Pandora is unable to embrace her power. She cannot propel individuality in herself and in Marius as well, accepting him for who he is and love him unconditionally as a proper Hetaira would. She knows only how to accept the dictates of the society; how to be the unruly, feminine child to her protector. Thus, she at once wants to rebel against the patriarchy by proclaiming she is no slave and no wife, while later reversing her own words in telling Marius “…you have won. You have me now as your wife!”

Pandora, as a weak, child-woman,

...remains constantly on the horns of dilemma: if she loves her man and seeks her own fulfillment in giving him fulfillment, she rankles like
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a wound in conventional societies. If, on the other hand, she accepts the latter’s dictates she has to neglect her own genuine nature.\textsuperscript{324}

In other words, in becoming a proper Hetaira, she would have to go against the role she was given – that of a daughter (or a daughterly wife) and a feminine aspect of the patriarchy. Unable to do that, she finds herself oscillating between being an orderly wife, and an unruly, negative Hetaira.

As the years, even centuries, go by, Pandora and Marius find themselves in a difficult position; Pandora represents the extreme feminine, while Marius represents the extreme masculine, and neither of them is capable of incorporating the other half of the feminine-masculine spectrum into their psyche. Instead of learning about their Animus/Anima, Pandora and Marius seek the Animus/Anima in each other; unfortunately, these are mere projections and not realities. Marius, for example, still reminisces about the fifteen year old Lydia, who had “the talent for reason and words,”\textsuperscript{325} and whom he perceived as his equal, and fell in love with. Yet the vampire Pandora is not made of reason and words, instead, she is made of feelings, magic, empathy, mystery, just like her distinctive femininity. She represents the unconscious; all that men fear and object to. At one point Pandora says,

\begin{quote}
I was very happy for Marius that he had such comfort in reason. But reason was only a created thing, imposed with faith upon the world, and the stars promise nothing to no one. ... I had seen that at the very heart of creation there very well might lie something as uncontrollable and incomprehensible as a raging volcano.\textsuperscript{326}
\end{quote}

She perceives the world through the eyes of subjectivity and emotionality, while Marius uses the objective reason and logic. As Pandora becomes a vampire, the shadow aspects of the Hetaira archetype take over completely and she starts
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opposing the patriarchal symbiosis of heavenly and earthly/masculine and feminine, which pushes the woman towards “suppress[ing] or surrender[ing] her own nature.” She no longer keeps quiet, “surrender[ing] the matriarchal consciousness unique to her as woman because it does not correspond to the patriarchal values or is opposed to them.”

She also does not blindly identify with the patriarchal values, fully realizing that it is impossible for her to acquire them now, after spending her life “in a form of daughter-psychology under the protectorate of the patriarchy.”

Instead, she objects to Marius, the fatherly figure, openly, since that is the only way of resistance she knows and can use.

The conflict between the earth and the heaven, between feelings and reason, between femininity and masculinity, slowly escalates. Despite Pandora’s reassuring and sweet words of love, a drift appears between the two vampire lovers; one that cannot be bridged:

Over the years, Marius guarded his delicate rationality as a Vestal Virgin guards a Sacred flame. If ever any ecstatic emotion took hold of me, he was there to grab me by the shoulders and tell me in no uncertain terms that it was irrational. Irrational, irrational, irrational!

Marius tries to arrive at the patriarchal marriage constellation, in which “women remain undeveloped…and are continually dependent on the aid of men.” As the negative patriarchal force described by Neumann, Marius also “makes it impossible for [Pandora] to participate authentically in patriarchal culture and force[s] her into a role where she is regarded as second-best and inferior.” When he feels threatened by Pandora’s femininity, he simply goes “to collect [her] and bring [her] back to

328 Ibid.
329 Ibid.
330 Ibid.
333 Ibid.
[her] senses” as a father might go collect his unruly child. Pandora, who does not understand how threatening her distinctive femininity is to patriarchy, demands of Marius to see her not as a woman, but an equal to his mind, she says, “…you cannot rule over me! Can you not consider in your reasonable fashion that the greatest part of our gift eludes you – it’s the freedom from the confines of male, female!” Being free of the division between the feminine and masculine is however, inconceivable for Marius who replies, “[y]ou can’t convince me…for one moment that you don’t feel, reason and act in the manner of a woman.” Though Pandora wishes to be freed from the femininity-masculinity paradigm, Marius does not; he is a representative of the patriarchy and as such does not see any flaws in the patriarchal order, in which the rational masculinity rules over the enigmatic femininity; in which men rule over women.

Eventually, Pandora tires of Marius’ patriarchal behavior and leaves him to lead her life as she desires; however, as a woman frozen in the negative Hetaira archetype, she cannot become entirely free of her need for a fatherly companion, nor can she establish a functioning hetairic relationship. In Blood and Gold Marius searches for Pandora, desperately, only to find her in a companionship of Arjun, an Asian vampire, whom Pandora herself created in her great need of a companion, who would take care of her. She says about Arjun, “…I made him…He is my son, my spouse, and my guardian….I made him so that he would take care of me…I placed him in charge of me so that in my weakness and despair, he could control me…” Several times, Pandora calls herself “a slave,” to Arjun: “…I’m a slave to my companion, Arjun, … I let him move me through the world, …on my own I possess no will, no momentum. Marius, I am nothing now.” However, it is only later on that Pandora confesses that Arjun has all the power over her because she required it of him in the first place. As the weak, negative Hetaira, Pandora can always be only a slave of the patriarchy hollering for freedom of a tainted patriarchal companionship, which, however, she cannot bear. Ultimately, then, Pandora enslaves herself and makes her companion – be it Marius or Arjun – fulfill the role of her
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father, protector, and slave master, as she cannot stand on her own. Pandora describes her sad fate best at the end of her own novel, *Pandora*:

> During this age [times of Louis XIV, the Sun King] I let myself be led through the world by a fierce Asian vampire, about whom I cared nothing. I had fallen into an ever existing trap for a woman: I had become the noncommittal and ostentatious ornament of a male personality who for all his tiresome verbal cruelty possessed sufficient force to carry us both through time.\(^{338}\)

Whether Anne Rice renamed Lydia to Pandora intentionally or by circumstance,\(^{339}\) it may be helpful to look now, before conclusion, at the differences and similarities between the myth of Pandora and the story of Pandora, the vampire. In Greek mythology, the myth of Pandora is first written down by Hesiod. After Prometheus steals fire and gives it to men, Zeus plots his revenge; “[h]e t[ells] Hephaestus to mix earth with water and put in it the voice and strength of the human kind and ‘fashion a sweet and lovely maiden shape, like to the immortal goddesses in face.’”\(^{340}\) Pandora is brought to earth by Hermes as a gift to Epimetheus, Prometheus’ brother, who – upon seeing the beauty of Pandora – readily forgets he pledged to his brother not to accept any gifts from Zeus and takes Pandora for his wife. The second part of the myth exists in two different versions: in the first one, Pandora receives a sealed jar by the gods, in the second one, the jar is kept in Epimetheus’ house. The ending of the myth is the same: Pandora, overpowered by curiosity, lifts up the lid, and all the evils of the world flow out of it. Scared of her deed, Pandora quickly closes the jar, thus trapping inside hope, which was kept at the

---


\(^{339}\) In a comment on her official Facebook page, Anne Rice said that she “invent[s] names based on sound and inspired by real names out there.” This may suggest the author is at least partially inspired with the real people or other fictional characters when creating her own fictional characters. See Anne Rice, [I invent names based...] in Facebook [online] (Anne Rice’s comment) September 8, 2012 at 3:09am, retrieved November 27, 2016 https://www.facebook.com/annericefanpage/posts/10151227347895452?comment_id=26314229&comment_tracking=%7B%22tn%22%3A%22%22%22%22%7D

very bottom of the jar. Pandora represents “the first woman, a beautiful but problematic creature designed by the gods as a punishment for mortal men.”

Sometimes, she is “compared to Eve from the Book of Genesis in the Bible, another first woman whose curiosity leads to trouble for humans.”

Although one can hardly trace any similarities between the story of Pandora, the first woman, and Pandora, the vampire, there are similarities to be found between the relationships of Pandora and Marius, and that of Pandora and Epimetheus as Spitteler describes it in his drama.

In The Vampire Chronicles, the relationship between the vampire Pandora and vampire Marius resembles that between Pandora and Epimetheus as Spitteler tells it in his drama, and Jung interprets it. Though in mythology Pandora represents the collective punishment, in The Vampire Chronicles, she is an individual punishment: she is the punishment of Marius, the Roman vampire. Akasha calls to Pandora, planting images and thoughts in her head, thus creating an instrument out of Pandora similar to that created by Zeus and his deities. Pandora, a beauty with “oval face shimmering beneath a mantle of rippling brown hair,” “tender-voiced, with innocent, imploring eyes and “flawless face” even resembles Pandora as she is captured in the paintings of the pre-Raphaelites Dante Gabriel Rossetti and John Williams Waterhouse; or in the painting of French classical painter Alexandre Cabanel.

---
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The description of Rice’s Pandora corresponds to the paintings of Alexandre Cabanel, Dante Gabriel Rossetti, and John William Waterhouse depicting the mythical figure Pandora.

When she comes to Marius, as a gift from Akasha, he accepts her and turns her into a vampire. Just as Epimetheus – in some versions of the myth – receives Pandora as his wife, so Marius takes the vampire beauty as his wife. Though Pandora, the vampire, does not have a box to open, she nevertheless brings unhappiness to Marius. Pandora, “associated with a form of intelligence peculiar to the feminine mind (Athena), and also with the ability to learn from experience, to foresee, or rather to see in the profundity of things their future possibilities and to take care of them (Prometheus),” 347 drives Marius mad with her feminine intelligence which, “does not separate knowledge from life or creation.” 348 Marius, who is guided by his masculine consciousness, perceives this femininity as threatening, because to

---
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understand it, he must learn to “see inside” it, instead of reducing it to the rational.\textsuperscript{349} Despite saying goodbye to Pandora, he is still driven mad by the memory of her, and so, just like Carl Spitteler’s Epimetheus, Marius “cannot rid himself of her memory-image, although she herself has long since deserted him.”\textsuperscript{350}

\textbf{5. 4. 5 Conclusion}

In contrast to the human female characters, the vampire women seem to possess either of the two extreme femininities: the withdrawn femininity (Gabrielle, Akasha, Mekare), or the distinctive femininity (Maharet, Pandora). The problem, common to both the human and vampire female characters seems to lie in their inability to cope with the meanings of femininity and womanhood. Femininity, and consequently womanhood, are not regarded as complex and empowering but rather as a unified obstacle limiting the life of a woman, which needs to be either overcome or suppressed. The three femininities of \textit{The Vampire Chronicles} – the distinctive, common, and withdrawn – are always compared to the prevailing femininity ideal, which ultimately shapes the female characters’ conception of themselves. With the prevailing femininity perceived as an ideal, women with the common and withdrawn femininity, and corresponding archetypes – the Medial Woman, the Terrible Mother, the Amazon – often suffer greatly in the society where neither the archetypes, nor the femininities in question can be freely expressed. In order to lock away their unsuitable femininity and their archetype, these women often lose themselves in some kind of vocation or work (for example, Gretchen and Jesse both get immersed in their work); or, they become a vampire.

The transformation into a vampire represents the only possible escape from the prison of social expectations; once changed, the woman finally becomes free of the social dictate and can give way to her femininity and her dominant archetype. However, since a vampire is basically frozen in time – speaking of their bodies as well as their psychology – the vampire woman can never approach the next archetype; as a result, she is only partially free – she can experience only a drop of


what being a woman means. The vampire women seem to be more inspired by mythological and archetypal patterns; though they are not inherently mythical, they possess the qualities of goddesses, as they often roam the world alone in search of unity with their shadow-like archetype. Vampire women are almost never religious, they can also never become one with the Medial Woman archetype; the human female characters, on the other hand, account for a wide range of Medial Woman (Jesse, Maharet, Mekare, Baby Jenks) and religious Mother types (Gretchen, Dora). Beauty goes hand in hand with the proverbial goodness of the archetype: Pandora, Maharet, and Jesse are all given a distinctive femininity corresponding to their positive archetype. Mekare and Gabrielle, on the other hand, devalue their femininity by either not caring for themselves, or by dressing as a man respectively, to point to their withdrawn femininity. In case of the overtly masculinized Akasha, descriptions of femininity are rather scarce. The vampire women, it seems, not only strive to become one with their femininity and their archetype, but, consequently, also with their shadow quality, as their consciousness and unconscious swap places: what was once in their unconscious gets upwards to their consciousness and vice versa. Accordingly, the vampire characters become archetypal images; women devoured by their archetypal patterns, mere shadows of their previous human-selves.
Conclusion

I do believe there are profound differences between men and women that people just aren’t ready to acknowledge on any level. What it means to be a woman is something we’ve barely begun to scratch the surface of. It’s a very difficult thing to be.  
— Anne Rice³⁵¹

In my thesis, I have analyzed the connections between femininity and archetypes of the female characters, both human and vampire, appearing in eight of the novels from the series *The Vampire Chronicles*, with the purpose of proving that the archetypal and feminine interweaves, and subsequently creates recurrent patterns. Thus, instead of following in the exploration of the possible meanings of gender(lessness) and sexuality in *The Vampire Chronicles*, as it is common among scholars and critics writing on Rice’s vampire fiction, I have chosen to focus on the often ignored female characters and their relation to the unconscious, archetypal material. The reason behind my choice is simple: in unveiling the hidden links between archetypal and feminine, more can be deduced about both the philosophy of Ricean vampire world, and Rice’s inability to write about women. Since the topic I have chosen is largely unresearched, I have decided to create a unique blend of approaches in order to cover the most of the possible connections between the archetypal and the feminine; the Jungian and post-Jungian approaches combine with biographical approach, gender studies, cultural history, and mythology. Though I do not rely heavily on biographical information in my analyses, I believe that knowing what shaped author’s life both on the personal and impersonal level is highly important whenever one conducts an archetypal study. Thus, a sub-chapter dealing with the 1950’s and 1960’s image of women in the USA was provided with the intention of giving the reader an idea of how Anne Rice’s writing may have been influenced by the general assumptions about women and femininity, which most likely shaped her mind during both childhood and adolescence. Further in the text, I propose a model of three complementary femininities found in *The Vampire Chronicles*, considered to play a crucial role in the construction of the female characters. Moreover, one ideal type of appearance – a babyface ideal – is identified

to be shared among all of the female characters of *The Vampire Chronicles* with one, or two exceptions only (Gretchen, Akasha).

I have tried to approach all of the discussed female characters in the same way: a close reading of the text was followed by an interpretation of the character’s physical appearance, relations to other characters, narrative function (if relevant), and an archetypal form. The goal was to analyze the characters one by one and only then look for similarities or differences between the characters of one group and later, between the two groups as well. Since I had difficulties finding relevant criticism on the female characters of *The Vampire Chronicles*, the analytical part is, unfortunately, very light on counterarguments. However, as Anne Rice often draws inspiration from literature, mythology, and even paintings, several chapters discuss allusions or blatant references to period paintings and writings, thus providing for a more complex analysis. Though Ricean female characters seem to share a face belonging to the beauty ideal of the 1950s and 1960s, their psychology turned out to be quite varied. All of the female archetypes proposed by Wolff appeared in Ricean vampire texts, though some were more frequent than others; for example, the Mother archetype in its many different types appeared quite often, as well as the Medial Woman. The Hetaira, usually very popular in our culture, as she is basically the lover, occurred only twice and once in its unusual negative aspect. The Amazon, an individual, relationship-free woman-friend, appeared only once and in its negative aspect.

With beauty emanating out of them, the women of *The Vampire Chronicles* are nevertheless seldom beautiful on the inside; rather, they are barren and devastated by the impossibility of showing to themselves, and to the world as well, who they truly are. Instead of exploring the female character, Rice seems to either nibble at the women, and then leave them behind, or make them into flat, narrative devices with beautiful faces and the abilities to serve as guides, muses, or mentors to their male counterparts. The idea of the prevailing femininity as it was taught to and learnt by Rice during the 1950s-60s and Rice’s own perception of femininity seem to be in great contradiction. While the 1950s-60s perceived the prevailing femininity as the key to becoming a good wife and a good mother, Anne Rice perceives the prevailing femininity as an obstacle to all, which a woman may want to, but ultimately is not
allowed to, embrace. Power, adventurousness, bravery, ambitiousness, aggressiveness, individuality, are all but a few of the traits deemed masculine by the prevailing masculinity-femininity theory. Rice, shaped since childhood by the teachings on proper femininity, apparently realizes that in assigning these traits to her female characters, she somehow violates the prevailing femininity. However, she also realizes – as she was taught by her mother Katherine – that one’s gender should never stand in a way of one’s dreams. From this then, an internal struggle results: on the one hand, Rice equips her female characters with masculine traits; on the other hand, Rice disallows the female characters to act on these traits, as they are inappropriate for a woman, who should always strive at embracing the prevailing femininity. Not a single female character of the eight novels analyzed was complex and untroubled by her womanhood; even Pandora, the only female vampire given her own novel, turned out to be a troubled being fully at the mercy of her own archetype. Shying away from her internal conflict, Rice makes it impossible for herself to truly embrace who a woman is psychologically, thus creating a lot of conflicting, and albeit disturbing images.

Though an analyses of nine female characters out of eight novels cannot speak for the whole saga of (so far) fourteen novels, it can speak plenty of the writer’s approach to women during the years 1970-2000. It also helps one understand how the characters, often neglected in the literary criticism for being considered badly developed, came to their negative perception. Undoubtedly, an analysis of all Rice’s vampire novels, and a further comparison with her other novels (especially those focusing on the witches) might help to unveil many other aspects of Rice’s point of view on women and femininity. Moreover, a detailed description of the relationship between femininity and masculinity in The Vampire Chronicles would certainly be revealing and of great value. However, though the fan base seems as eager as ever to read now the fourteenth installment to The Vampire Chronicles, the critics seem less willing to delve into the complex world of Lestat and his vampire friends. Partly, I believe, it is caused by the rather unsteady quality of Rice’s late vampire novels; to some extent, it is also caused by a general decline in the interest in vampire fiction. Yet, despite the fact that vampire fiction is now clearly moving past its heyday, Ricean vampire stories, with their ornate language and unexpected
themes, will no doubt continue attract attention of many, be it today, or twenty years from now.
Resumé

Tato diplomová práce zkoumá vztahy mezi archetypy a feminitou ženských postav v osmi románech ze série Upíří kroniky americké populární spisovatelky Anne Riceové. Práce si klade za cíl odhalit, zda lze v daných upířích románech vysledovat opakující se vzorce utvořené specifickou kombinací ženských archetypů postav, jejich feminitou a ženskou identitou, které by dále bylo možné interpretovat skrze archetypální, biografickou a genderovou kritiku. Práce je členěna do pěti kapitol, přičemž první část práce je věnována seznámení s teorií a druhá část praktické analýze ženských postav. První kapitola seznámuje čtenáře s Jungovou analytickou psychologií. Ve zkrate jsou uvedeny rozdíly mezi Carlem Gustavem Jungem a Sigmundem Freudem, především pak jejich rozdílné názory na feminitu a maskulinitu a přístup k ženám všeobecně. Kapitola se dále věnuje vysvětlení některých teoretických konceptů a termínů – co je to archetyp, archetypální obraz, vědomí, nevědomí, archetyp stínu, animy a Anima – vztahujících se k ženské psychologii, případně k teorii archetypální kritiky jako takové. Druhá kapitola předkládá teorie ženských archetypů dvou významných jungiánských analýtických řečenů Toni Wolffové a Ericha Neumann. Druhá kapitola předkládá teorie ženských archetypů dvou významných jungiánských analýtických řečenů Toni Wolffové a Ericha Neumann, které dále fungují jako stěžejní teoretické texty, o něž se opírá analytická část studie. Wolffová ve své práci rozlišuje čtyři ženské archetypy (strukturální formy), které žena během svého života, v ideálním případě, postupně zapracovává do svého duševna, jde o archetyp matky, amazonky, hetéry a média. První archetyp, který je ženě nejблиžší, se označuje za dominantní, od nějžená dále po směru hodinových ručiček přechází k druhému archetypu, potom ke třetímu který je protilehlý druhému a jeho povaha je stínová. Čtvrtý archetyp pro ženu představuje největší obtíže, protože je zcela odlišný, a tedy protilehlý, jejímu dominantnímu archetypu. Podle Wolffové v sobě má každá žena všechny čtyři archetypy, pořadí, ve kterém je rozvíjí, je odvislé od dominantního archetypu a doby, ve které žije – například rozvíjí archetyp média v době čarodějnických procesů se zdá takřka nemožné. Erich Neumann, na základě Jungovy typologie, dále rozvíjí archetyp matky a bližší se své práci reflektuje především „hrozivou“ matku.

Třetí kapitola se ve zkrate zabývá genderem a feminitou. První podkapitola se věnuje vymezení pojmu gender, přičemž z velkého množství úhlů vydejšuje jako styčnou teorii Judith Butlerové o performativitě, druhá podkapitola rozebírá
a načrtává možnosti definic feminity a maskulinity, a to esenciální, normativní, positivistickou a sémiotickou. Další podkapitola definují termín převládající feminita, se kterými se nadále v práci pracuje. Převládající feminita zastupuje dva obecně používané termíny – ideální a stereotypická feminita – tak, aby v sobě obsáhla negativní i pozitivní smysl obou termínů. Převládající feminita je chápána jako feminita, kterou většinová společnost považuje za vyhovující, a proto ji prosazuje na úkor jiných feminit. Převládající feminita je definována na především základě dat ze studií provedených v 60. letech v USA, neboť zkoumaná díla Riceové jsou ovlivněna především kulturom a myšlením USA z 50. - 60. let. Kapitola krátce reflektuje i postoje feministek třetího věku k převládající feminitě a ženství (womanhood). Podkapitola věnující se převládající maskulinitě a obecně typologizací maskulinit círpad především z významné práce R. W. Connellové a věnuje se předefinování slavného konceptu hegemonní maskulinitě a jejího vztahu k uvedené převládající maskulinitě. Poslední podkapitola předkládá debatu na téma gender a Upíří kroniky. Podkapitola se vymezuje proti všeobecně přijímanému mytí, podle kterého postavy Upířích kronik po přeměně v upíra přicházejí o svůj gender, případně se stávají androgynními, a na základě ukázez z Upířích kronik dokazuje, že upíři Anne Riceové o gender nepřicházejí, a jde tedy spíše o libivou a veskrze dysfunkční teorii vytvořenou samotnou autorkou a nadále udržovanou při životě kritiky, které s termínem pracují, aniž by ho bliže zkoumali a definovali. Čtvrtá kapitola předkládá krátkou biografii Anne Riceové tak, jak ji prezentuje především Katherine Ramslandová v biografii Prism of the Night a Michael Riley v knize rozhovorů Conversations with Anne Rice. Podkapitoly se zabývají rozporuplným vztahem Anne Riceové k feminité, ženství a ženám všeobecně a poukazují na skutečnost, podle které je stereotypní, a částečně negativní vztah Riceové k feminité a ženám podmíněn a formován výrůstáním v předsudcích kultury a vnímání USA z 50. a 60. let. V souvislosti s tímto argumentem poslední podkapitola shrnuje stereotypní roli žen a feminity v USA 50. a 60. let.

Pátá kapitola se věnuje samotné analýze feminity v Upířích kronikách a následným analýzám jednotlivých ženských postav – lidských i upířích. První podkapitola nejprve vztahuje silně stereotypní vzhled jednotlivých ženských postav z Upířích kronik k populárnímu ideálu vzhledu žen z USA 60. a 70. let, tzv. babyface
ideálu (ideálu dětské tvářičky). Jednotlivý vzhled postav je dále konfrontován s třemi rozdílnými typy feminity tak, jak se objevují v Upířích kronikách, jmenovitě distinctivní feminitu (distinctive femininity), běžnou feminitu (common femininity), a odvrácenou feminitu (withdrawn femininity). Feminity jsou dále vztaženy k jednotlivým ženským archetypům; distinctivní feminité odpovídá archetyp dobré matky a hetéry, běžné feminitě médium a hrozivé matce a amazone náleží odvrácená feminita. Podkapitola nastoluje teorii, podle které ženské postavy v upířích románech Anne Riceové sdílejí ideál krásy, ovšem disponují rozdílnou psychologií. Následující podkapitoly se věnují jednotlivým analýzám postav. První část se zabývá čtyřmi lidskými ženskými postavami, jmenovitě Jesse, Biance, Gretchen a Doře. Ženské postavy dokazují, že ženské archetypy a feminita v rámci Upířích kronik vytvářejí struktury, které lze dále interpretovat. Oproti dále analyzovaným upířím postavám se lidské ženské postavy objevují především v pozitivních aspektech, typický je jednostranný vztah postavy k dominantnímu archetypu. Převládající archetyp matky naznačuje, že Riceové směřuje ke stereotypněmu zobrazování role žen, avšak u všech ženských postav dochází k tzv. částečné maskulinizaci či zřeknutí se feminity tak, aby feminita jejich život co nejméně definovala. Ženy nejsou schopny obsáhnout všechny čtyři archetypy a dosáhnout tak psychologické komplexnosti, což se odráží na zdánlivé plochosti ženských postav. Upíří ženské postavy, jmenovitě Gabrielle, Akasha, Maharet, Mekare a Pandora, jsou oproti lidským ženským postavám extrémnější ve vyobrazení feminity i archetypu, avšak trpí stejným problémem jako jejich lidské protějšky: nemožnosti uchopit a vnímat feminitu jako součást sebe sama. Analýzy jednotlivých ženských postav poukazují na vnitřní konflikt spisovatelky, která nemá ujasněný vztah k (vlastní) feminitě a ženství (womanhood). Sama Riceová v sobě spojuje dva rozporuplné přístupy k feminitě a ženám: jeden, ovlivněný převládající feminitou 60. let, podle kterého je feminita pro ženy limitující, ale potřebná, a druhý, spoluutvářený její matkou a manželem Stanem Ricem, podle kterého feminita nepředstavuje problém ženu žádný problém, a tudíž potřebná veskrze není. Vykreslené postavy jsou proto samy o sobě plné rozporů: ženské postavy, na první pohled všechny dostávající ideálu ženské krásy, v sobě snoubí hned tři různé stupně feminity. Ta nejextrémnější je přítom opakem převládající feminity a postavám
propůjčuje téměř maskulinní vlastnosti a myšlení, čímž převládající feminitu ohrožuje. V závěru tak dochází ke vzniku vnitřně deformovaných ženských postav, které autorka zvnějšku modeluje po vzoru převládající feminismy 50. a 60. let (žena = ženské vlastnosti), avšak vybavuje je vlastnostmi jdoucími proti tomuto stereotypními vyobrazení žen (žena = ženské i mužské vlastnosti). Protože tak ženské postavy jdou proti vnitřnímu přesvědčení Riceové, nedostává se jim možnosti jednat na základě jejich archetypálních forem (vnitřního já) a vnitřně se rozvíjet, a naopak jsou nuceny jednat v souladu s převládající feminitou a společenskými normami (vnějším já), případně – pokud je jim umožněno jednat na základě vnitřního archetypu – autorka upouští od dalšího psychologického vývoje postavy a ženská postava zůstává v zajetí svého dominantního archetypu.
Bibliography


Eurich-Rascoe, Barbara L. and Hendrika Vande Kemp, eds., Femininity and Shame: Women, Men, and Giving Voice to the Feminine (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1997).


Greer, Mary K. & Tom Little. Understanding the Tarot Court (St. Paul, Minnesota: Llewellyn Publications, 2004).


Herik van, Judith. Freud on Femininity and Faith (Berkeley: University of California, 1982).


Chande, M. B. *Indian Philosophy in Modern Times* (New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, 2000).


Neumann, Erich. “The Meaning of the Earth Archetype for Modern Times” in The
terror of the feminine and other essays on feminine psychology (Princeton, NJ:
Neumann, Erich. “The Psychological Stages of Woman’s Development,” in The
Fear of the Feminine and Other Essays on Feminine Psychology (New Jersey:
Neumann, Erich. “The Psychological Stages of Woman’s Development” in The Fear
of the Feminine and Other Essays on Feminine Psychology (New Jersey:
Paechter, Carrie. Being Boys; Being Girls: Learning Masculinities And Femininities:
Palmer, Richard E. “Postmodern Hermeneutics and the Act of Reading,” Notre
Dame English Journal, 15, no. 3 (Summer, 1983).
Papadopoulos, Renos K. ed. The Handbook of Jungian Psychology: Theory, Practice
and Applications (Routledge; 2012).
Powlishta, Kimberly K. “The Effect of Target Age on the Activation of Gender
Stereotypes” in Sex Roles 42, no. 3 (February 2000, 271-282) quoted in Linda
Brannon, Gender: Psychological perspectives, 4th ed. (Boston, Mass.: Pearson,
2005).
Ramsland, Katherine. Prism of the Night: A Biography of Anne Rice (New York, US:
Plume, 1992).
Reid, Lucy. She Changes Everything: Seeking the Divine on a Feminist Path (New
York: T&T Clark, 2005).
Rice, Anne. [I invent names based…] in Facebook [online] (Anne Rice’s comment)
September 8, 2012 at 3:09am, retrieved November 27, 2016
https://www.facebook.com/annericefanpage/posts/10151227347895452?comme
ment_id=26314229&comment_tracking=%7B%22tn%22%3A%22R1%22%7D
Rice, Anne. “The Vampire Chronicles,” Anne Rice the official site, July 2009


Wolff, Toni. “Structural Forms of the Feminine Psyche” (Zurich: Students Association, C. G. Jung Institute, 1956).


**Bibliography of Images**


*Alexandre Cabanel, Pandora* [Online Image]. (1873). Retrieved November 27, 2016 from https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/thumb/5/5d/Alexandre_Cabanel_-_Pandora_-_Walters_3799.jpg/427px-Alexandre_Cabanel_-_Pandora_-_Walters_3799.jpg


List of Figures

Figure 1 Human Psyche – Jungian Diagram ................................................................. 20
Figure 2 The Female Psyche – Toni Wolff’s Female Archetypes .................................. 31
Figure 3 Gradual Integration of the Mother Archetype ................................................. 35
Figure 4 Babyfaces ........................................................................................................ 65
Figure 5 Slender figures of the 1960s. ....................................................................... 66
Figure 6 Three Types of Femininities in the Vampire Chronicles ................................. 67
Figure 7 Sandro Botticelli, The Birth of Venus ............................................................. 73
Figure 8 Pablo Picasso – Grecian Women ................................................................... 76
Figure 9 Pandora .......................................................................................................... 119
List of Appendices

Appendix 1 Appearances of the Female Characters of *The Vampire Chronicles* .... 142
Appendix 2 Family Tree of Vampire Characters of *The Vampire Chronicles* ........ 143
Appendix 3 Female Characters of *The Vampire Chronicles*: Dominant Archetype, Woman’s Identity and Femininity, and Relation to Man ......................................................... 146
NÁZEV:
Upíří kroniky Anne Riceové: nečekaná síla feminity a ženských archetypů

AUTOR:
Bc. Nikol Šustrová

KATEDRA:
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

VEDOUCÍ PRÁCE:
Prof. PhDr. Michal Peprník, Dr.

ABSTRAKT:
Tato diplomová práce se zabývá vztahy mezi ženskými archetypy, feminitou a identitou u ženských postav objevujících se v osmi upířích románech Anne Riceové. Cílem práce je dokázat, že se v ženských postavách Upířích kronik spojuje feminita s archetypálními strukturami a společně dávají vzniknout opakujícím se vzorcům, které odkazují k autorce a dále rozkrývají její pojetí feminity a ženství. První část práce předkládá přehled použitých metodologií; důraz je kladen na Jungiánskou a post-Jungiánskou psychologii, stěžejní teorie ohledně ženských archetypů, a na koncepty feminita a maskulinita. Druhá část práce se zabývá biografií Anne Riceové a jejím přístupem k feminitě. Zbytek práce je věnován analýze jednotlivých upířích a lidských ženských postav. V závěru práce autorka usuzuje, že vznik psychologicky rozpolcených ženských postav je podminěn Riceovou vlastní nevyrovnaností ve vztahu k feminitě a ženskosti.

KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA:
Anne Rice, upír, feminita, Carl Gustav Jung, Toni Wolff, ženské archetypy
TITLE:
Beyond Control: The Unforeseen Power of Femininity and Female Archetypes in Anne Rice’s Vampire Chronicles

AUTHOR:
Bc. Nikol Šustrová

DEPARTMENT:
Department of English and American Studies

SUPERVISOR:
Prof. PhDr. Michal Peprník, Dr.

ABSTRACT:
This thesis focuses on the connections between female archetypes, femininity, and identity of the female characters in eight of the vampire novels written by Anne Rice. The aim of the work is to prove that in the female characters of The Vampire Chronicles, the archetypal and feminine interweaves, thus creating patterns referring back to the author and her own conception of femininity and womanhood. The first part of the thesis offers an overview of the methodological background; emphasis is put on exploration of the concepts of Jungian and post-Jungian psychology, the leading theories on female archetypes, and the concepts of femininity and masculinity. The second part explores the biography of Anne Rice and her own approach towards femininity. The rest of the thesis is dedicated to the analyses of significant vampire and human female characters. The thesis concludes that author’s inconsistent perception of femininity and womanhood, influenced by her upbringing and by the societal expectations of 1950s and 1960s, contributed to her creation of female characters struggling with their own female psyche and womanhood.

KEYWORDS:
Anne Rice, vampire, femininity, Carl Gustav Jung, Toni Wolff, female archetypes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Dominant Archetype (Positive-Negative)</th>
<th>Woman’s Identity (Positive-Negative)</th>
<th>Relation to Man</th>
<th>Femininity</th>
<th>H/V</th>
<th>Book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gabrielle</td>
<td>Amazon (negative)</td>
<td>Cold and unrelated to feminine instinct (individual development)</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>H-V</td>
<td>TVL, TQOTD, TVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akasha</td>
<td>Terrible Mother (negative)</td>
<td>Devours others</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>TQOTD, TVL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharet</td>
<td>Medial Woman (positive)/ Good Mother (positive)</td>
<td>Wise Woman; helps</td>
<td>Mediatrix/Mother</td>
<td>Distinctive</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>TQOTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mekare</td>
<td>Medial Woman (positive)/ Terrible Mother (negative)</td>
<td>Wise Woman; devours</td>
<td>Mediatrix/Mother</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>TQOTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse</td>
<td>Medial Woman (positive)</td>
<td>Wise Woman; mediates between conscious and unconscious</td>
<td>Mediatrix</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>TQOTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gretchen</td>
<td>Mother-Urania (positive)</td>
<td>Nourishes others; abandons Self entirely</td>
<td>Mother to Puer aeternus</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>TTOTBT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bainca</td>
<td>Hetaira (positive)</td>
<td>Awakens individual psychic life of herself/others</td>
<td>Daughter (Anima)</td>
<td>Distinctive</td>
<td>H-V</td>
<td>TVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dora</td>
<td>Mother-Sophia (positive)</td>
<td>Transformative Sophia; the highest femininity</td>
<td>Mother and Daughter</td>
<td>Distinctive</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>MDD, TVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandora</td>
<td>Hetaira (negative)</td>
<td>Submerges own ego in identification with father’s Anima</td>
<td>Daughter (Anima)</td>
<td>Distinctive</td>
<td>H-V</td>
<td>TQOTD, Pandora</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appendix 1 Appearances of the Female Characters of The Vampire Chronicles*
Appendix 2 Family Tree of Vampire Characters of The Vampire Chronicles
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>H/V</th>
<th>Face</th>
<th>Eyes</th>
<th>Mouth</th>
<th>Hair</th>
<th>Voice</th>
<th>Body &amp; Other Physical Characteristics</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Babette</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>large, brown</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>raven</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>strong and honest; like all strong people she suffered ... a measure of loneliness; she was a marginal outsider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeleine</td>
<td>H-V</td>
<td>fragile</td>
<td>calm, violet</td>
<td>childish, pouting</td>
<td>dark-red</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>mad, devoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrielle</td>
<td>H-V</td>
<td>angular face, perfect cheekbones, strong jaw line yet exquisitely feminine</td>
<td>very clear, cobalt blue</td>
<td>delicate lips, sweet, but often hard</td>
<td>full and blond</td>
<td>low-voiced</td>
<td>her features were too small, too kittenish and made her look like a girl</td>
<td>did not laugh often, could look profoundly cold, never said anything ordinary, read all the time, educated, disliked to be touched, hated to be called mother, silently unhappy, always had a little girl sweetness; glacial, forbidding, a wanderer, something more akin to a prehistoric reptile than a human</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akasha</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>deep brown</td>
<td>softest shade of ashen rose</td>
<td>black; braided with strands of gold</td>
<td>voice that draws you into itself</td>
<td>white figure, statue-like; the posture of a warrior and a priest in one</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharet</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>masklike, symmetrical</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>voice with reticent softness</td>
<td>small breasts</td>
<td>a deep, soft femininity emanated from her, a tender vulnerability; the embodiment of illimitable strength and will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mekare</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Hair Color</td>
<td>Eye Color</td>
<td>Skin Color</td>
<td>Physical Features</td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Jenks</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>big, blue</td>
<td>little pouting</td>
<td>two little blond braids</td>
<td>eighty-five pounds, looked mean, and deceptively cute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>curly red</td>
<td>a delicate woman, fragile-looking, bird-like frame; pale skin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wore no cosmetics, perfume, or jewelry, worn hacking jacket, boy’s shirt open at the neck, jeans; later cashmere blaze, wool pants, or jeans; a strong sense of family; confident, lucky, sometimes impatient, rather stubborn, could read people’s thoughts; saw ghosts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bainca</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>girlish, oval</td>
<td>fierce blue, oval</td>
<td>peach-soft lips</td>
<td>slender; looked as a human swan; fine shape of body with exquisitely molded arms and breasts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>thick wavy blond</td>
<td>clever, indomitable, a fearless creature, a porcelain princess; graceful, devoid of pride and bitterness, incomparable charmer, generous, kindly wit; looks like women drawn by Botticelli; mysterious mistress of her own house; the daughter of Pandora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dora</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>long neck, very white skin; tiny, little; tiny waist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>little sparrow of a girl, lovely little woman; walks about as if she were invincible; too brave and strong; attracts everyone; magnetic; a genius; a dream lily woman; the mystical and theological were mixed in her; spoke with terrific self-confidence; owl-like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3 Female Characters of *The Vampire Chronicles*: Dominant Archetype, Woman’s Identity and Femininity, and Relation to Man

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Dominant Archetype</th>
<th>Woman’s Identity</th>
<th>Femininity</th>
<th>Relation to Man</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pandora</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>oval, flawless face</td>
<td>innocent, imploring</td>
<td>rippling brown</td>
<td>tender-voiced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gretchen</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>broad, very strong bones, clear skin</td>
<td>hazel, pale green</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>dark blond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eudoxia</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>small, oval</td>
<td>round, extremely large</td>
<td>a heavy mass of black curls</td>
<td>rounded chin, small cheeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

352 This table is loosely based on and inspired by the Diagram B as it appeared on page 197 in Ulanov’s study *The Feminine: In Jungian Psychology and in Christian Theology*; the table shows how a female character’s identity (a personality type) is shaped by the woman’s dominant (positive or negative) archetype and interwoven into her femininity type, as well as how the archetype influences her relationship to men. The table also specifies whether the character in question is a already a vampire with none, to little description of her mortal life (V), a human (H), or transitions into a vampire at some point during the story, so that the reader gets to know the character both as a human and as a vampire being (H-V); moreover, a note is made as to in which novel the character appears.
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