

The Incredible Nineteenth Century: Science Fiction, Fantasy, and Fairy Tale

Editor: James Hamby, Middle Tennessee State University
Pedagogy Editor: Vivian Delchamps, Dominican University of California
Media Reviews Editor: Joe Conway, University of Alabama in Huntsville

Volume 2, Issue 2
Whole Number 4
2024

ISSN 2995-2514

Editorial Board:

Gisèle M. Baxter
The University of British Columbia

Sidney Blaylock
University of North Alabama

Mark Bould
University of the West of England, Bristol

Gregory Bronson
Trevecca Nazarene University

Katharine Burnett
Fisk University

Mitchell Cram
Johns Hopkins University

Emily Dotson
University of Virginia's College at Wise

Patrick Fleming
Independent Scholar

Stephanie Graves
Vanderbilt University

Holly Hamby
Fisk University

Janice Lupo
Middle Tennessee State University

James Machin
Birkbeck, University of London

Adam McInturff
Middle Tennessee State University

Ashley Quinn
Cumberland University

Samanda Robinson
Johns Hopkins University

Brittany Sanders
Texas Christian University

Laurence Roussillon-Constanty
Université de Pau et des Pays de L'Adour

David Seed
University of Liverpool

Carol Senf
Georgia Institute of Technology

Ethan Taylor Stephenson
Richland Community College

Matthew Harrington
University of Tennessee Southern

Percy Verret
Motlow State Community College

Caroline LaPlue
Middle Tennessee State University

Jeffrey Weinstock
Central Michigan University

Cenk Tan
Pamukkale University

Nathaniel Williams
University of California, Davis

About *I19*

The Incredible Nineteenth Century: Science Fiction, Fantasy, and Fairy Tale (I19) seeks to publish the finest scholarship on the century that was, in many ways, the time period in which the modern genres of science fiction and fantasy began, and in which the academic study of fairy tale and folklore has its roots. *I19* interprets “the nineteenth century” broadly, using the dates of “The Long Nineteenth Century”—roughly, from the beginning of the French Revolution to the end of World War I—but even these dates are just notable historical markers as they approximately coincide with Romanticism and Modernism, respectively. Scholarship on works from the eighteenth century that anticipated or influenced writers in the nineteenth century or ways in which nineteenth-century literature influenced later authors both fall within the interests of this journal. *I19* also publishes scholarship on Neo-Victorianism, Steam Punk, or any other contemporary genres that react to the time periods contained within The Long Nineteenth Century. Genres such as horror and mystery, though not strictly within the realms of the fantastic, are also welcome, due to their close affinity with science fiction and fantasy. Scholarship on early film is also welcome. Additionally, *I19* is dedicated to maintaining a scope that is both multicultural and global, and encourages submissions on works from marginalized communities and from around the world.

In addition to literary scholarship, *I19* also publishes works on pedagogy. These pieces may be personal reflections, strategies on course design, innovative assignment sheets with commentary, or anything else that educators teaching nineteenth-century literature may find useful.

Finally, *I19* maintains a robust Book and Media Reviews section. Reviews on recent scholarship, as well as period fiction and film, are featured in every issue.

Queries and submissions may be sent to i19@mtsu.edu. We accept submissions on a rolling basis, and there are no author fees.

Table of Contents

From the Editor

“An Ever-Expanding Field”

James Hamby.....5

Articles

“Destabilizing Happily Ever After: Dickens’s Conflation of the False Bride/Fairy Bride Motifs in
David Copperfield”

Amy Bennett-Zendzian.....9

“‘For the Dead Travel Fast’: Foreign Contagion in *Dracula*”

Sophie Bradley.....34

“The Intersections Between Epistolarity and Sentimentalism in *The Sorrows of Young Werther* and
Frankenstein”

Hope Siler.....61

Media Review

“*Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*: A Maligned Video Game Masterpiece”

Wyatt Rogers.....86

Book Reviews

S. T. Joshi’s *The Recognition of H. P. Lovecraft: His Rise from Obscurity to World Renown*

Rev. by Hannah O’Flanagan.....96

John Garst’s *John Henry and His People: The Historical Origin and Lore of America’s Great
Folk Ballad*

Rev. by Christian Gallichro.....101

Dina Schiff Massachi’s *The Characters of Oz: Essays on Their Adaptation and Transformation*

Rev. by Michael Hancock.....106

Kristina Baudemann’s *The Future Imaginary in Indigenous North American Arts and Literatures*

Rev. by Mari Yates.....112

Brooke Cameron and Lara Karpenko’s *The Vampire in Nineteenth-Century Literature: A Feast
of Blood*

Rev. by Toni Thibodeaux.....122

From the Editor

An Ever-Expanding Field

Those of us who study nineteenth-century literature are sometimes met with sneers by some who think the literature of this era has nothing to say about our contemporary world or who believe that anything worth saying about these works has already been said. Of course, neither of these erroneous ideas could be further from the truth. To counter the first misconception, I like to recommend that people read the first twenty pages or so of *Oliver Twist* (1837-39). This novel's exploration of the lives of the poor and of the government's role in relieving poverty is strikingly current nearly two hundred years later. As to the second misconception, I can only suggest that a willful ignorance would cause a person to hold such an opinion. The richness, complexity, and diversity of nineteenth-century texts provides an inexhaustible source for scholarly commentary and debate. Moreover, the age that produced these works was steeped in social, political, cultural, scientific, and intellectual upheaval, and we are still coming to terms with many of the changes that occurred during this time. Clearly, there is still much to be said about nineteenth-century literature. In order to help facilitate scholarship about this incredibly complex field, the editorial staff of this journal has expanded to include a Pedagogy Editor and a Media Reviews Editor. Any academic journal has college educators as a core constituent of its readership, and many academics can attest that being a skilled researcher in a field is quite different than being an expert teacher, and vice versa. With this in mind, *I19* seeks to publish pedagogical pieces in which scholars of nineteenth-century literature can share assignments, course designs, and classroom activities with others to help facilitate the teaching texts in our field. We are therefore pleased to introduce Vivian Delchamps of the Dominican University of California as our Pedagogy Editor who will lead our efforts in publishing scholarship on teaching the fantastic literature of this era.

Dr. Delchamps's areas of expertise include nineteenth-century literature, illness, pain, and disability, and she studies how nineteenth-century women writers such as Emily Dickinson, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, and Frances E. W. Harper "used literature to supplement diagnostic ways of knowing and capture the raw potential of disabled embodiment." She has published essays in *Poetry and Pedagogy*, *Insurrect!*, and other venues, and she has an article forthcoming on *The Wizard of Oz*.

Teaching science fiction, fantasy, and fairy tale of the nineteenth century is complex on many fronts. Firstly, as shocking as it may be for those of us who grew up loving these genres, many students are not as familiar with the fantastic as we assume they will be. The first novel I ever taught was Ursula K. Le Guin's *The Left Hand of Darkness* (1969), and near the end of the first class, after a minimally successful discussion, a dismayed-looking student raised her hand and asked, "Why doesn't she just write about things on *Earth*?" At that point I realized how badly I had failed, and that I should have begun the discussion of this book, before we had even started reading, about the conventions of science fiction and how authors often use this genre as a way to displace problems from our everyday reality so that issues are defamiliarized and we can look at them with a fresh point of view. Better preparation would have helped my students be more open to the ways Le Guin explores sex, gender, and culture in this novel. Secondly, as mentioned above, the nineteenth century was a time of unprecedented change, and students studying literature from this time need to understand its history and culture. Nineteenth-century society can be both alien and startlingly similar to our own, and helping students see how this era in many ways gave birth to the world we live in can help them to appreciate its literature. Finally, the teaching of literature from any time period and of any genre is a complex undertaking, and as educators we are always looking for better ways of reaching our students.

The stories the nineteenth century produced maintain a central spot in popular imagination still today. Consider, for instance, how many reinterpretations of *Frankenstein* (1818) or *Dracula* (1897) have been produced by film studios in just the past two years. Or, think about the ways the works of Edgar Allan Poe have remained a staple of American cinema and television for decades, ranging from Vincent Price movies to *The Simpsons* (1989-present). Even beyond these canonical works and authors, the nineteenth century remains a time period that Hollywood loves to engage with and recreate. Because of the popularity of nineteenth-century fantasy, science fiction, and fairy tale throughout various forms of media, this journal has expanded to include a Media Reviews Editor, a position that will be filled by Joe Conway. Dr. Conway studies early American literature, pop culture, and economics in literature and culture, and he is the Director of Graduate Studies at the University of Alabama in Huntsville. He writes that our culture in the twenty-first century still needs “the tropes and characters of the nineteenth century in order to make sense of itself. *Moby Dick* was Big Oil before Exxon and BP, *Dracula* foreshadows vulture capitalism, *Frankenstein’s* monster continues to embody marginalized consciousness.” In regards to contemporary recreations of the nineteenth century in contemporary media, he says “Despite changing technologies—videogames replacing books, for example—we can’t shake the sense we are still citizens of the nineteenth century.” He teaches early sf writers such as Shelley, Hawthorne, and Wells along with their twenty-first century descendants like Nnedi Okorafor and Silvia MorenoGarcia. He also teaches neo-slave narratives beside nineteenth-century autobiographies of formerly enslaved people, and Edgar Allan Poe beside Toni Morrison. He writes that “Anna Kornbluh describes our contemporary culture as one of pure ‘immediacy,’ and so one way to ensure the work of previous writers continues to hold relevance for our students is by demonstrating how much a part of the past continues to haunt the present.”

In our media reviews section, we plan to highlight not only fantastic writings from the nineteenth century, but also science fiction and fantasy set in this time. One of the most interesting aspects of studying literature from previous eras is the ability to trace how succeeding generations have interpreted those works, and how they have injected their own concerns and ideas into it. Also, especially in the context of nineteenth-century literature, contemporary media set in this time provides the opportunity for previously silenced voices to be heard. Populations that suffered atrocities during the nineteenth century—those who suffered from industrialism, class oppression, sexism, homophobia, global colonization, slavery, or Manifest Destiny, for example—now have the chance to tell their own stories.

Nineteenth-century studies is a field that is ever-expanding, and having these two new positions will enhance *II9*'s ability to engage in conversations about teaching texts written in this century and about new media inspired by this time. We hope the contributions of this journal will have a meaningful impact on the study of this complex and intriguing field.

Articles

Destabilizing Happily Ever After: Dickens's Conflation of the False Bride/Fairy Bride

Motifs in *David Copperfield*

Amy Bennett-Zendzian

Life was more like a great fairy story, which I was just about to begin to read, than anything else.
—David Copperfield

Introduction

In Charles Dickens's *David Copperfield* (1849-50), naïve David calls his wedding to Dora Spenlow a "fairy marriage" (531), apparently using the term in the same sense that "fairy-tale wedding" is popularly used today: to describe the romantic obtainment of happily-ever-after between a bride and groom, characterized by a sense of the fantastic or unreal. As a child, Dickens too had been seduced by a dream of fairy-tale ecstasy: in a nostalgic description of finding "Little Red Riding Hood" on his Christmas Tree, he reminisces, "She was my first love. I felt that if I could have married Little Red Riding-Hood, I should have known perfect bliss. But," he continues significantly, "it was not to be" (*Christmas* 291). While David is a blind young dreamer, Dickens the adult writer is made sadder and wiser not only by his deeper understanding of fairy tales but also by his own life experience. Dickens knew by then that traditional fairy tales don't always end on the wedding day—often as not, they go on to relate the continued torments visited upon the bride and groom by nightmarish in-laws, or by one another—and this knowledge runs through the heart of the novel. The truth is, as Kelly Hager explains, "Dickens's most autobiographical novel is concerned in a multiplicity of ways with the institution of marriage and the miseries it causes" (990). Dickens's use of the phrase reveals his understanding of its true implications: "fairy marriages" are as likely to result in misery as in happiness.

Dickens uses fairy tale conventions in complex ways in this novel. He employs the fairy tale plot of the “false bride,” and ultimately Dora proves a false bride, Agnes Wickfield the true bride. However, Dickens rejects a simplistic portrayal of Dora as a fairy tale villainess. To create a portrait more psychologically complex and true to life as he understood it, Dickens complicates the “fairy marriage” of Dora and David by additionally drawing on “fairy bride” tales, a characteristically British type of fairy tale that depicts human marriages with fairies. Such tales have no clear villains, but they inevitably end in tragedy. A close examination of Dickens’s use and transformation of both conventions reveals Dickens’s recognition of both the inherent bliss and the inherent tragedy in “fairy marriages.”

Literature Review: Dickens’s Love of Fairy Tales

Dickens was a voracious reader and a lifelong lover of fairy tales, and his extensive use of fairy tales in his novels is well established. In *Dickens and the Fairy Tale* (1972), Michael Kotzin notes that the importance of fairy tales to Dickens was first observed within his lifetime and continues to be recognized in a strain of Dickens criticism that, according to Edgar Johnson, characterizes his aims as more “adventurous” than mere attempts to achieve “literal realism,” understanding that in Dickens’s fiction, “the elements of the fairy tale are superimposed on the every-day world and the deep symbolic truths of myth gleam through the surface” (qtd in Kotzin 1-2). Kotzin’s important contribution to this strain of criticism is a survey-style exploration of “the relationship between Dickens and the fairy tale as it was regarded and used in his own time” (2). Given Dickens’s vast body of work, Kotzin’s wide-ranging overview of patterns in Dickens’s uses of fairy tale character types and plot structures cannot cover every instance, much less engage in deep analysis of each pattern’s significance. Though Kotzin identifies Betsey Trotwood as a fairy godmother, Uriah Heep as a subhuman supernatural villain, and David as a fairy tale hero (at least

in his own conception), he has little to say about Dora or Agnes. In fact, his suggestion that Agnes's love magically lifts David from despair in a transformational moment reminiscent of "Beauty and the Beast" seems not only simplistic, but inaccurate, as David largely recovers from his depression by going through a crisis while on his own, before he is able to move on to Agnes.

A more sophisticated exploration of the two characters in fairy tale terms can be found in the best and most comprehensive examination of Dickens's use of fairy tales, Harry Stone's seminal monograph *Dickens and the Invisible World: Fairy Tales, Fantasy, and Novel-Making* (1979). Stone argues that Dickens's use of fairy tales is "so basic and pervasive" that the "study of Dickens's commerce with the invisible world can take us to the very heart of his creative vision" (xi). His extended section on *David Copperfield*, called "The Fairy-Tale Method Perfected," analyzes characters like David, Betsey, Uriah, Dora, Agnes, and several others in depth, as well as a host of minor characters in brief, to demonstrate the unity of effect of Dickens's fairy tale vision. Stone demonstrates that "the fairy tale mechanisms, far from weakening the story, or being simply ancillary to it, underline and deepen it" (200).

Despite their popularity in the 1960s and '70s, critical readings that focused on Dickens's use of fairy tales have fallen out of favor since the '80s. Simon Edwards writes dismissively of "the wrong kind of critical attention" that *David Copperfield* has attracted, and the worst, in his view, are "the self-delighting 'fairy-tale' readings, [which] are essentially *unhistorical*" (64, emphasis in original). Edwards's scorn is unwarranted. Kotzin grounds fairy tale criticism in history, and the coherence of Stone's compelling analysis of Dickens's "fairy-tale method" in this novel can hardly be overstated. Nor are fairy tale readings a well that has run dry; even Stone leaves some issues unaddressed. While his analyses of Dora and Agnes are perceptive, Stone is more interested in them as fairy tale character types than in how they function in recreated fairy tale plot structures. Stone identifies Dora as both "the fair maiden, [who] is guarded by the

fearsome dragon, Jip” (255) and as a “puissant enchantress” who blinds David to the truth of her insufficiency (248). Without recognizing that fairy tale marriages often lead to misery, Stone can only explain the fairy-tale language that surrounds David and Dora’s wedding as “iron[ic]” (250). Stone contends that Dora is “weak, dependent, fearful, inadequate” (248) and, most of all, “profoundly destructive” for David (232). Such an interpretation of Dora’s character is insufficient, as is Stone’s categorization of Agnes as flat angelic paragon. Thus, further investigation of the “false bride” and “fairy bride” plot patterns that underlie Dickens’s shaping of these two characters, particularly of Dora, is warranted.

Which Fairy Tales Did Dickens Know?

The fairy tale plot device of the false bride dates back at least as far as the seventeenth century with multiple uses in Giambattista Basile’s *Il Pentamerone* (1634-36), and there are plentiful models in fairy tales that Dickens would have been familiar with. Several of the most well-known tales that use the false bride motif were collected by the German folklorists and brothers Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm, such as “Aschenputtel” (Cinderella), in which the heroine’s stepsisters successively take her place on the way to the altar by cutting off parts of their feet to fit into the golden slipper, and “The Goose Girl,” in which a princess is forced to switch places with her wicked waiting-maid as they journey to the city of her betrothed. In tales like “Aschenputtel,” the false brides are exposed before the marriage takes place, but in others, the hero actually weds a false bride; and in tales like “The Goose Girl,” he lives with the false bride for some time before the deception is uncovered, and the villainess must be killed so that the husband can replace her with the true bride.

A necessary caveat to any comparative analysis of Dickens's plots with specific tales is that despite his well-established affection for fairy tales as a genre, Dickens's knowledge of particular tales and variants is sometimes difficult to determine. Basile's *The Pentamerone* was translated into English in 1847 by John Edward Taylor, with plates by Dickens illustrator George Cruikshank, and Dickens is likely to have read it for the sake of his friend¹ as well as for his own pleasure. The first English translation of the Grimms' tales, Edgar Taylor's *German Popular Stories*, appeared much earlier, in 1823, and was also illustrated by Cruikshank. Dickens likely read this tremendously popular collection for himself, to his children, or both; in a letter to "an unidentified woman" about her translation of "Little Red Cap" (the Grimms' version of "Little Red Riding Hood"), he wrote that he remembered reading that particular version of the tale (which differs significantly from the Perrault-inspired version that would have been on his childhood Christmas tree) before. He adds, "I have read Snow Whitey [sic] to my two little girls with prodigious success. I have six children ... and expect a seventh child some fine morning in May. So you see I command a pretty large audience for Fairy stories" (qtd in Kotzin 35). Even if Dickens did not read the J. Taylor or E. Taylor translations, he would have read English magazines that reprinted some of the tales along with original and imitative tales in the same style, "which were commonly found in [magazines] during the 1830s" (Kotzin 36). In the 1840s, he read translations of Danish tales by Hans Christian Andersen, who was (for a time) a friend of his; when Dickens and Andersen met, Dickens particularly mentioned "The Little Mermaid," which he knew from the translation that had been printed in 1846 in *Bentley's Miscellany* (Bredsdorff 15). "The Little

¹ Dickens's infamous falling-out with Cruikshank over the proper way to tell fairy tales began in 1853, with the publication of "Frauds on the Fairies" (Stone 13).

Mermaid” includes an important variant on the false bride motif (and is also arguably a variant of the “fairy bride” story; and, like a fairy bride story, it has a tragic ending). In the 1850s and ’60s, Dickens’s own magazines *Household Words* and *All the Year Round* printed fairy tales and Dickens-authored articles about them (Kotzin 37). In addition to “The Little Mermaid,” it may be stated with reasonable confidence that Dickens had read translations or imitations of the Grimms’ version of “Cinderella,” “The Goose Girl,” and/or other tales with similar false bride plots, such as those from *The Pentamerone*.

The motif occurs in fairy tales worldwide, but it is less clear whether Dickens also knew any specific false bride tales originating in the British Isles, such as the characteristic “The Black Bull of Norrway.” While this tale was not collected in print before 1894 (by Joseph Jacobs in *More English Fairy Tales*), it is possible that a British variant of this tale or a very similar one was in oral or ephemeral print circulation in Dickens’s time (as other tales in Jacobs’s collections certainly were, including some of Dickens’s favorites such as “Whittington and his Cat” and “The Babes in the Wood”). As context for my examination of Dickens’s use of the motif, I will use three characteristic examples of false bride plots: “Cinderella” and “Goose Girl,” which Dickens certainly or almost certainly knew, as well as “Black Bull,” which he may have known. A fourth tale, “The Little Mermaid,” is also useful, especially since it is certain that Dickens read it, though the tale is atypical.

Use of the False Bride/True Bride Motif

Dickens uses the false bride motif relatively straightforwardly to structure the novel’s plot thread of David’s successive marriages to Dora and Agnes. As in nearly all false bride stories, the true bride, Agnes, both precedes and succeeds the false bride as a potential love interest in David’s

life. Her status is signaled both by her patience in waiting for her lover to realize his mistake, and by the hardships she must undergo as she waits. Cinderella and the Goose Girl are trapped in servitude and harassed by their inferiors, while the heroine of “Black Bull” must travel the world in search of her lost love in a pair of iron shoes nailed to her feet.² It is David who travels the world before they reunite rather than Agnes, which emphasizes her patient waiting—she is more like the “meek and patient” Goose Girl (157) than the world-traveling, actively striving heroine of “Black Bull”—but the true bride’s trials are nevertheless recognizably transformed into Agnes’s torments by the repulsive, “umble” Uriah Heep, who like the goose boy Curdken wants to “take hold of” the true bride with his low-class hands (155), and by Heep’s mother. In this function, Mrs. Heep mirrors Cinderella’s wicked stepmother (who keeps the prince from Cinderella and goads her daughters into attempting to take Cinderella’s place), the Sea Witch in “The Little Mermaid” who cuts out the little mermaid’s tongue, and the trickster mother of the false bride in “Black Bull.”

At a crucial moment in the novel, when David’s failure to recognize Agnes as the true bride guarantees years of misery for him, Agnes, and Dora alike, Mrs. Heep’s witchlike powers are at their height. David describes her thus:

Whensoever, slowly pondering over my letter, I lifted up my eyes, and meeting the thoughtful face of Agnes, saw it clear, and beam encouragement upon me, with its own angelic expression, I was conscious presently of the evil eye passing me, and going on to her, and coming back to me again, and dropping furtively upon the knitting ... What the knitting was, I don’t know, not being learned in that art; but it looked like a net; and as she worked away ... she showed in the firelight like some ill-looking enchantress. (482)

² In this she resembles Andersen’s little mermaid, whose deal with the Sea Witch for human feet stipulates that every step she takes on land will feel as if she is “treading on a sharp knife” (293).

Though she acts on behalf of her son, a false mate for Agnes rather than for a false mate for David, the end result is the same. Like the deceptive “old washerwife” in “Black Bull” who fools the knight into betrothing himself to the wrong girl, Mrs. Heep’s evil influence keeps the true pair separated. Like the Sea Witch in “Little Mermaid,” she silences any potential declarations of love. Whenever David meets Agnes’s gaze, he quickly feels it negated by Mrs. Heep, who casts her “evil eye” on both of them. An “evil eye” grants the ability to curse; folklorist Alan Dundes draws a special connection between the evil eye and desiccation or “withering” (298), in this case the withering of the potential flowering of love between David and Agnes. Instead of marrying her true love, Agnes is in danger of being ensnared in a “net” and carried away from him by this “illlooking enchantress” and her evil spirit of a son. In this scene David is located as a potential barrier between the net and Agnes, but his act of letter-writing to Dora’s aunts is what will lead him down a false path and away from Agnes, abandoning her to worse torments ahead. As if enchanted to forget his true bride (a common motif in this tale type), David is “blind, blind, blind,” and while his fairy godmother Betsey can identify the spell, she cannot break it (425). On the day of his marriage to Dora, David “seem[s] to see nothing” (531), eats without “believing in the viands,” and speaks in the same “dreamy fashion” without knowing what he is saying (533).

While true brides undergo trials that they must bear patiently, false brides are often exposed through their unfitness for marriage. The stepsisters in Cinderella literally do not fit into the golden slipper, but their mother convinces them to take knives to their oversized toes and heels, reassuring them, “Once you become Queen, you won’t have to walk any more” (83). But the trail of blood streaming from the shoe gives their unfitness away, and their gruesome fate is mirrored in Dora’s loss of the use of her legs after her miscarriage, obliging David to carry her up and down the stairs once she can no longer “r[u]n nor walk” (589). In “Black Bull,” the false bride cannot perform the

domestic task of washing a stain out of a shirt, paralleling the contrast of Dora's utter failure at housekeeping with Agnes's virtually magical ability to perform as a superior housekeeper from her childhood. Like Cinderella, who receives supernatural help from her mother's grave to perform impossible domestic chores set by her stepmother, Agnes has apparently inherited her domestic magic from her deceased mother, whose place in her father's household she occupies and whom she so closely resembles that she appears to David to be the "original" of her mother's portrait (194). Dora's dead mother gives her no help from beyond the grave—instead of a benevolent mother, she has a witchlike guardian in the form of Miss Murdstone—and the result is her embarrassing ineptitude.

Transformation of the False Bride Motif

However, Dickens also swerves from the false bride motif in significant ways. False brides meet grisly ends. Cinderella's stepsisters do not die, but in addition to being rendered lame by their own hands, they each have their eyes "pecked out" by vindictive doves (84). The false bride and her mother in "Black Bull" are "burnt" to death by the knight, angry at being fooled. Even in "Little Mermaid," in which the false bride wins the prize, the rivals cannot both survive the night of the marriage, and upon relinquishing her right to plunge a knife into the other's breast, the good little mermaid "dissolve[s] into foam" (231). Most memorably, the false bride in "The Goose Girl" pronounces the punishment for treachery that will be enacted upon herself after the truth comes out: that "she should be thrown into a cask stuck round with sharp nails, and that two white horses should be put to it, and should drag it from street to street till she is dead" (158). False brides suffer some of the most gruesome deaths in fairy tales, matched only by the horrific fates of childcannibal witches of the type that appear in the Grimms' "Snow White" and "Hansel and Gretel." Like any

false bride, Dora must die to clear the way for the true bride, but she does not undergo a Dickensian version of a grisly fate: she is not viciously beaten to death by her lover, nor does she spontaneously combust, nor fly to pieces upon being hit by a train. On the contrary, her death is marked by angelic serenity and a fuller ability to comprehend her situation than her husband possesses, and her dying words are no vicious pronouncement of jealousy. Instead, it is a heartfelt bequeathing of David to her successor Agnes. Dora's behavior at her death does not neatly fit the pattern of the succession of false bride by true bride.

And unlike most true brides, Agnes does not simply patiently wait for David (much less strive on behalf of her claim); instead, she retains perfect sympathy for her rival, advocating for Dora, lending her considerable influence with David to legitimize the mismatch. David says, "And how [Agnes] spoke to me of Dora ... and round the little fairy-figure shed some glimpses of her own pure light, that made it yet more precious and more innocent to me!" (439). During the wedding ceremony, Dora is "always clasping Agnes by the hand," refusing to be separated from her, favoring Agnes "above all the others" (533-34). If anything, the marriage between David and Dora can only take place with Agnes's permission and blessing, while the marriage between David and Agnes can only take place with Dora's permission and blessing.

This concordance between rivals fails to fit the pattern of most false bride stories. It does, however, align with "The Little Mermaid," a notable exception to the pattern of bitter rivalry when the mermaid loses the prince to another bride. The prince has promised to marry only the girl who saved him on the beach after his shipwreck. The little mermaid knows that she was his savior, for she brought him out of the water onto the beach; but, even though he mentions marriage to the little mermaid once, the prince eventually marries the beautiful "temple girl" who first found him on the shore (230). Besides the fact that the mermaid is the story's heroine, there is no particular

reason to think that it is the temple girl rather than the little mermaid who is the *false* bride.³ Though she is heartbroken for herself, the little mermaid bears no ill will toward her rival: she stands “holding the bride’s train” during the ceremony, laughs and dances at the reception more “brilliantly” than she ever has before, benevolently kisses the “handsome brow” of the prince who has chosen another, and dies (230-31). In her supernatural beauty, her childlike littleness, her status as an important but temporary distraction in the prince’s romantic life, and her untimely death, the little mermaid bears more resemblance to Dora than to Agnes. Of course, the little mermaid, as a magical being, is also a fairy bride, making permanent marriage between herself and a mortal impossible, because in the end, fairy brides always return to the supernatural world they came from. Andersen’s successful combination of the two motifs in a single story may have inspired Dickens’s attempt of the same feat.

While it is useful to recognize that Dickens begins with a false bride/true bride rivalry, to characterize Dora simply as a false bride is not sufficient. Particularly once the two women have been introduced to one another, there is no trace of rivalry to be found. Moreover, Dora’s death is imbued with a tragic sense of loss, not of justice or vengeance served. Understanding Dora as a *fairy* bride, and uncovering the unusual role that Agnes plays in this fairy bride story, requires looking beyond their false bride/true bride opposition, and ultimately provides rewarding insights into Dickens’s depiction of both characters.

³ Disney’s 1989 adaptation, of course, returns to a straightforward “false bride” plot, conflating the characters of the Sea Witch and the false bride; and in their version the mermaid does win and weds the prince in the end.

The Fairy Bride Motif

Like false brides, captured supernatural brides can be found in tales worldwide. British folklorist Katharine Briggs's entry for "Fairy brides" in *An Encyclopedia of Fairies* (1978) identifies the fairy bride tradition as a descendant of ancient stories of mortal couplings with "goddesses and nymphs" (135). Half-human, half-animal brides like seal maidens (selkies) and swan maidens—brides captured through the theft of their animal skins—are part of the fairy bride tradition, as are stories of a mortal man's capture of a bride from Fairyland. Fairy bride stories involve a fraught process of wooing, involving theft or capture of the bride (or bribery with gifts), and often include a quest challenge for the would-be groom (for example, learning the bride's true name). Fairy brides are of "more than human beauty," fruitful, and supernaturally competent at the domestic arts, bringing multiple children, wealth, and prosperity to their spouse's home (136). A universal feature of the tale type is a taboo, which the husband must not break lest he lose his wife. In selkie and swan maiden tales, the husband must keep her sealskin or cloak of feathers hidden from her. Variants of these tales from the British Isles provide classic examples of how the motif functions. In W. Jenkyn Thomas's "The Fairy Wife" (1907), a typical version of the bride-from-Fairyland motif, the husband may not strike his fairy wife with iron, or she must return to Fairyland (56). Similarly, in Thomas's "The Lady of Llyn y Fan Fach" (1907), the story of a fairy bride from beneath a lake, the husband will lose his wife if he strikes her "three causeless blows" (3). Of course, the taboo is inevitably broken, the hidden skins found, the blows struck; the fairy wife always returns to the other world, the husband is always left behind; and the children may or may not accompany the fleeing wife.

Compared to his direct use of the "false bride" trope, the significance of Dickens's use of the "fairy bride" motif is more obscure, partly because the motif itself is not as ubiquitous, at least

not in the form of a wife from Fairyland. A great deal of Victorian literature is informed by fairy tales, but continental tales tend to dominate, such as “Cinderella,” “Little Red Riding Hood,” and “Beauty and the Beast.” The narrative structure of Charlotte Brontë’s *Jane Eyre* is shaped by the French tales “Cinderella” and “Bluebeard,” rather than by, say, quintessential English favorites like “Jack and the Beanstalk” or “Tom Thumb.” Kotzin observes that “most of the native fairy tales once available, and drawn upon by Shakespeare, Spenser, Peele, and Jonson” had all but disappeared from English literature by Dickens’s time (9). With the “fairy bride” theme, Dickens makes use of a fairy tale motif that originates from the British Isles, in the tradition of Shakespeare.⁴

In *The Fairies in Tradition and Literature* (2002), Briggs observes that fairy brides are found especially often in Welsh folklore: “The fairy wife is a universal concept, but the particular form she takes in Wales is characteristic” (88). Briggs identifies the fairy bride tradition as one of few that are “native to these Islands [of Britain],” driven into the margins by the “foreign invasion” of classical tales and other countries’ myths and folklore (174). In “The Fairy Bride Tradition in Wales,” Juliette Wood notes that the story of the fairy bride from Llyn y Fan Fach was printed in 1861 (56). The timing makes it unlikely that Dickens had read a printed version of a typically Welsh rendering of the tale. Nevertheless, he could have known the story through oral tradition; Wood explains, “About three dozen variants of the tale dating from the tenth to the twentieth century are known” (56). Wood additionally suggests that the tale’s popularity was “beginning to lose ground” in the 1880s (65), which implies that it was still popular in the years leading up to Dickens’s writing of *David Copperfield*.

⁴ Not coincidentally, the most in-depth study I found of the fairy bride theme in English literature was in Regina Buccola’s *Fairies, Fractious Women, and the Old Faith* (2006), in which she discusses Shakespeare’s use of the fairy bride motif in *Cymbeline* (1611) and *All’s Well that Ends Well* (ca. 1598).

Dora as Fairy Bride

When David first sees Dora, he instantly recognizes her as a fairy: “She was more than human to me. She was a Fairy, a Sylph, I don’t know what she was—anything that no one ever saw, and everything that everybody ever wanted. I was swallowed up in an abyss of love in an instant” (331). The moment parallels a mortal man’s first vision of his fairy bride. In “Fairy Wife,” when the hero spies fairies dancing in the field, his eye falls

on one of the fairy damsels, whose beauty was beyond anything he had ever seen in a human being ... her voice was like the voice of a nightingale and as gentle as the breeze of a summer evening in a flower garden: her bearing was graceful and noble, and she tripped on the greensward as lightly as the rays of the sun had danced a few hours before on the ripples of the lake hard by. He fell in love with her over head and ears. (54)

David likewise says of Dora, “She had the most delightful little voice, the gayest little laugh, the pleasantest and most fascinating little ways, that ever led a lost youth into hopeless slavery” (353). In Herman Hofberg’s “The Swan Maiden” (1895), the young hunter becomes so “smitten” that “neither night nor day could he tear his thoughts from the bright image” (72) forcing him to seek advice from his mother on how to woo her. In “Lady of Llyn y Fan Fach,” the youth becomes “love-stricken” and “bewildered by a feeling of love and admiration for the object before him” from the first moment “he beheld, sitting on the unruffled surface of the water, a lady; one of the most beautiful creatures that mortal eyes ever beheld, her hair flowed gracefully in ringlets over her shoulders” (1-2). David, too, is “moon-struck,” smitten, and bewildered by Dora’s ringleted beauty (401).

False brides are the pursuers, while fairy brides are pursued. On balance, Dora’s enchanting qualities seem more innate than calculated to ensnare. Like other mortals who would wed fairy

brides, David is the agent of action, overcoming multiple obstacles to win Dora, gaining her love through gifts and attention, and facing her father, Mr. Spenlow, and his attempt to permanently end their courtship. Similarly, the suitor of the Lady of Llyn y Fan Fach brings a series of gifts to obtain his lady's initial favor, and then must perform an impossible task set by her father (identifying his beloved from a pair of identical ladies). David approaches the task with a fairy tale hero's enthusiasm: "What I had to do, was, to take my woodman's axe in my hand, and clear my own way through the forest of difficulty, by cutting down the trees until I came to Dora" (439). Dora does not particularly encourage this pursuit; once the period of their initial innocent flirtation is past, she is distressed by David's terrible enthusiasm, burying her face, weeping and wringing her hands until David "felt like a sort of Monster who had got into a Fairy's bower" (459). In "Swan Maiden," the captured maiden "[f]alls] upon her knees and beg[s]" to be released from bondage (72). In "Fairy Wife," after the man informs the fairy that he has her true name, she, "folding her tiny hands ... exclaim[s], 'Alas, my fate, my fate!'" (55-56). Fairy brides, including Dora, eventually resign themselves to their lover's determination to possess them, but a lingering sense of reluctance and regret hangs over the stories.

Transformation of the Fairy Bride Motif

However, after the marriage, Dickens's use of the motif swerves from the typical in a significant reversal. Fairy marriages are happy, prosperous, and fertile while they last, partly because fairy brides are supernaturally domestic wives. For example, in "Fairy Wife" the narrator relates that

Everything in the house and on the farm prospered under [the fairy's] charge. There was no better or cleaner housewife in all the country around, or one that was more provident

and thrifty than she was. She milked the cows three times each day, and they gave the usual quantity of milk each time. The butter she made was so good that it fetched a penny a pound more than any other butter at Carnavon market ... So wise and active was the fairy wife that he became one of the richest men of that country. (56)

Dora, of course, is preternaturally *incapable* at housewifery. David says in the chapter “Our Housekeeping,” “nothing had a place of its own ... I made no allusion to the skirmishing plates upon the floor; or to the disreputable appearance of the castors, which were all at sixes and sevens, and looked drunk; or to the further blockade ... of wandering vegetable dishes and jugs” (542). Dora spends too much money on bad food, fails to discipline the pets or the servants, and cannot keep accounts or mind the keys. In fact, she is so much the *opposite* of a fairy wife that it seems this characterization can be no accident on Dickens’s part, especially when all the qualities of domestic magic that a fairy wife should have are so close at hand—in Agnes. I shall return to this apparent contradiction shortly.

Dora’s infertility raises several questions. When fairies, selkies, or swan maidens return to the world they came from, sometimes they are forced to leave their children behind, and sometimes they take their children with them—but there are nearly always children. But Dora miscarries her only pregnancy: David mourns, “It was not to be. The spirit fluttered for a moment on the threshold of its little prison, and, unconscious of captivity, took wing” (588). What’s more, Dora’s miscarriage is the beginning of the end. She soon loses the use of her legs, and not long afterwards the “Little Blossom” withers entirely (590). Earlier, I pointed out that Dora’s death does not fit the “gruesome justice” model of false bride stories. Is the miscarriage that causes her death a form of narrative punishment for Dora’s being a sexual creature, in a classic example of Victorian repression? Kelly Hager observes, “If things sexual cannot be mentioned, then they are to be found

everywhere” (992). Like many other critics, Hager notes that Dora is deeply sexualized, understood by David almost entirely in terms of her body (her soft little hands, her parted, pouting lips, her shaking curls) or by her physically playful charms (resting her head on David’s chest, playing prettily with his buttons, his hand, or his hair). The logical implication of the false bride model of justice combined with the Victorian literary trope that sex kills (cf. *Oliver Twist*’s (1837/39) Nancy) is that Dora dies because she is sexualized—because she is the bad wife, and Agnes the good one. Yet this conclusion is too simplistic for *David Copperfield*; after all, “bad girls” Martha Endell and little Em’ly survive, as does the fertile Agnes. Dora’s sexualized beauty is part of what makes her a fairy bride, but it is not the cause of her death.

Breaking the Taboo, Losing the Bride

Despite her lack of magical fruitfulness, Dora’s death establishes her as a fairy bride, whose tragic loss is to be deeply mourned, rather than a false bride. In tales of brides from Fairyland, the reason that brides return home—metaphorically die—is that their husbands break the taboos against harming them. In “Lady of Llyn y Fan Fach,” the husband’s “three causeless blows” (3) cause his wife to return to the lake. In “Fairy Wife,” the fairy agrees to wed on the condition that “you must never strike me with iron” (56). In selkie and swan maiden tales, the husband keeps her animal skin, a fundamental part of his wife’s nature, locked away from her in an ongoing form of harm; she is trapped against her will in the limited role of human wife, and despite her professed love for husband and children, her instantaneous flight upon reclaiming the sealskin or cloak of feathers comes as no real surprise. The fairy bride tale type can be understood to caution against domestic violence, as well as more metaphorical forms of spousal abuse. In many versions, husbands who love their wives dearly violate the taboos by accident, which suggests that simply

having good intentions is not sufficient. The husband cannot prevent himself from violating the taboo if he does not truly know his wife well enough to understand what the taboo is.

In Dora's case, David's failure to treat her like a real human woman arguably leads to her death. To begin with, for David to attempt to "form Dora's mind" to suit his own is to do her a symbolic violence as great and as gruesome as Cinderella's stepsisters taking knives to their feet—as Agnes, Betsey, and Dora herself all try to warn him (585). When David attempts to school Dora in housewifery, she invokes fairy tale language to set him straight, protesting, "don't be a naughty Blue Beard! Don't be serious!" (536). Dora intuitively feels that too much strictness from her husband will kill her, and thus reminds David of the story of Bluebeard, a serial-killing husband who marries one wife after another, murdering each one for what he considers unseemly behavior. "Bluebeard," one of Dickens's favorite fairy tales, had "a tenacious hold of Dickens's imagination" (Barzilai 506). The original Bluebeard of *David Copperfield* is Mr. Murdstone, who married David's hapless "Baby" of a mother, only to drive her to her death with his unfeeling harshness (12). Later in the novel, Murdstone marries again, another young woman only "just of age," apparently with every intention of repeating his performance (404). Having in his turn married a woman just like his mother, David must at all costs resist repeating his stepfather's cruel performance, and Dora is wise enough to sense it.

Dora is wise in other ways as well. Hager says, "she realizes long before David does ... that [her] inability to be a proper companion is due to the quality of her education" (997). As Hager suggests, Dora becomes significantly more self-aware after she meets Agnes. When she tries to talk to David about her new awareness, asking if she might have been "more clever" (515) if she had known Agnes earlier, David replies patronizingly with "What nonsense!" (516). Hager makes clear the other way in which David, for all his good intentions, harms Dora: on the few occasions

when *she* tries to be serious (on her own terms), he is as unreceptive to it as she is when *he* tries to be serious (on his). After his first failed attempt to educate her, David takes upon himself “the toils and cares of our life, and had no partner in them,” reassuring himself that this will make Dora “bright and cheerful in the old childish way” and “happy with her old trifles” (546). However, for all her despair over housekeeping and accounts, Dora is not made happy by the awareness that her husband is treating her as a “plaything” rather than as a partner (511). She watches him with “quiet attention” as he works late into the night, and resists when he tries to send her to bed (546). Her upbringing has been inadequate to the task that is before her, but she loves David and is not prepared to be permanently dismissed as hopeless. In her pathetic, yet significant offer to “hold the pens,” as well as her renewed efforts at housekeeping that follow, Dora shows the potential to develop (546), but in David’s mind it is nothing but “make-believe,” and as long as he withholds his true feelings with her, so it is (547).

The older David is aware of his own faults in his treatment of Dora, as he admits when he says heavily, “If I did any wrong, as I may have done much, I did it in mistaken love, and in my want of wisdom. I write the exact truth. It would avail me nothing to extenuate it now” (545). In David’s defense, the true fault may be in the inability of Victorian society to imagine a possible role for a real, human wife who has plentiful attractions and virtues, but none of them domestic. Like a swan maiden missing half her true self, Dora is stunted, and cannot rise to the position of an equal partner in marriage. David is merely acting the part of Victorian society by metaphorically withholding Dora’s cloak of feathers. Hager argues that in her final few conversations with David, Dora gently reminds her husband of the wrong he has done her by failing to treat her as an equal. She explains that since they can never be true partners, it is better for her to go. David is deeply troubled by the implicit accusation, crying “Oh Dora, dearest, dearest, do not speak to me so. Every

word seems a reproach!” (645). So, killed by kindness rather than cruelty, Dora the fairy bride departs.

Two Brides Conflated

After she dies, David mourns Dora deeply for years. However, the fairy bride story is not quite complete. Dora lacks several of the key qualities that identify fairy wives, but Agnes possesses them all—industry, thrift, fertility, wisdom. Compared to Dora, however, Agnes has little of the “fairylike” about her; she is devoid of sexual appeal, frequently interpreted by critics as an indefensibly flat paragon of virtue. In “Soul-Mates: David Copperfield’s Angelic Bigamy,” Maia MacAleavey argues that the “triadic” romantic situation of David, Dora, and Agnes “blurs the distinction between marrying more than one person at a time and marrying more than one person sequentially” (202). MacAleavey observes that the image of “Agnes pointing upward,” David’s repeated vision of Agnes (and the closing image of the novel), is not only an image of a virtuous Agnes gesturing towards heaven (737), but also an image of a grieving Agnes pointing upwards towards Dora’s room, as she does when she comes downstairs to tell David of Dora’s death (647). MacAleavey’s essay is concerned with religious questions about second marriages, but her observations of how images of Dora and Agnes are perpetually intertwined, rather than set in opposition to one another, help solve the riddle of the false bride/true bride rivalry, as well as the strange implication of the fairy bride motif that Dora and Agnes are two halves of a whole. Together, they make up a whole fairy bride. In this sense, Agnes may not be Dora’s successor so much as her continuation in another form, much as the fairy in “Fairy Wife” finds a way to maintain contact with her family even after she has returned to Fairyland, by speaking to them from a “floating island” in the middle of the fairy lake (57).

Moreover, Dora's death has helped David learn how to properly court and treat a fairy bride. He can do for Agnes something he never truly did for Dora—he puts her needs and interests before his own. Only when he puts selfishness aside in a wholehearted commitment to helping Agnes achieve her desires can the two of them come together. When David confesses his love to Agnes (having first received her tacit permission, in contrast to his importunate pursuit of Dora), and she reciprocates, at that moment his two wives are united in a single figure: David cries internally, “And O, Agnes, even out of thy true eyes, in that same time, the spirit of my child-wife looked upon me, saying it was well; and winning me, through thee, to tenderest recollections of the Blossom that had withered on the vine!” (725). After David and Agnes are married, Agnes admits that Dora's deathbed wish was “That only I would occupy this vacant place” (726). Together they weep for Dora, though they are “so happy” (726). Dora will never truly be gone, a truth they acknowledge by naming one of their daughters “Dora” (735).⁵

Conclusion

Dickens does not simply repeat fairy tale patterns; he completely re-envisions them. What begins as a false bride/true bride opposition between Dora and Agnes begins to collapse, particularly from the moment they meet and recognize in each other the important qualities that the other lacks. A reductive summary of the two motifs in the novel might assert that Dora's story is imbued with the tragedy and pathos of fairy bride stories, while Agnes achieves a fairy-tale ending by winning through as the true bride. Yet Dickens's transformations of both motifs

⁵ The illustrator, Phiz (Hablôt Knight Browne), also intuits the importance of Dora's continued presence, depicting her life-size portrait on the wall of David and Agnes's home (728).

destabilize the potential for a true fairy-tale happily-ever-after. Like the floating island compromise in “Fairy Wife,” there is something not entirely satisfactory, even untidy, about the novel’s final arrangement, with the portrait of poor Dora forever hanging over the head of an inhumanly perfect woman whose greatest flaw is that she has no flaws. A less reductive summary might suggest that the false bride/true bride opposition makes us acutely aware of both Dora’s and Agnes’s deficiencies—Dora’s incompetence, Agnes’s lack of sexual charms—and that while the fairy bride pattern attempts to reconcile the two sets of virtues in a single figure, it is limited by the tale type’s own inherent limitation: the most idyllic “fairy marriage” must finally end in separation and grief. In this sense, Agnes and David’s wedding is a true “fairy-tale wedding,” with all that the loaded phrase implies, encompassing both grief and bliss.

Works Cited

- Andersen, Hans Christian. "The Little Mermaid." *The Classic Fairy Tales*. Edited by Maria Tatar. Norton Critical Edition, 2nd ed., W. W. Norton, 2017, pp. 283-300.
- Barzilai, Shuli. "The Bluebeard Barometer: Charles Dickens and Captain Murderer." *Victorian Literature and Culture*, vol. 32, no. 2, 2004, pp. 505-24.
- Basile, Giambattista. *The Pentamerone, or The Story of Stories*. Translated by John Edward Taylor, illustrated by George Cruikshank, edited by Edgar Taylor, London, David Bogue, 1847. Transcribed by Heidi Anne Heiner, *SurLaLune Fairy Tales*, 2021, accessed 30 Sep 2024, surlalunefairytales.com/book.php?id=62.
- Bredsdorff, Elias. *Hans Andersen and Charles Dickens: A Friendship and its Dissolution*. Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1956.
- Briggs, Katharine Mary. *The Fairies in Tradition and Literature*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967.
- . "Fairy brides." *An Encyclopedia of Fairies: Hobgoblins, Brownies, Bogies, and Other Supernatural Creatures*, Pantheon Books, 1976, pp. 135-37.
- Buccola, Regina. *Fairies, Fractious Women, and the Old Faith: Fairy Lore in Early Modern British Drama and Culture*. Susquehanna U P, 2006.
- Dickens, Charles. "A Christmas Tree." *Household Words: A Weekly Journal*, vol. 2, no. 39, 21 December 1850, pp. 289-95.
- . *David Copperfield: Authoritative Text, Backgrounds, Criticism*. Edited by Jerome H. Buckley, Norton Critical Edition, W. W. Norton, 1990.
- . "Frauds on the Fairies." *Charles Dickens: Selected Journalism 1850–1870*, edited by David Pascoe, Penguin, 1997, pp. 566–72.

Dundes, Alan. "Wet and Dry, the Evil Eye: An Essay in Indo-European and Semitic Worldview."

The Evil Eye: A Folklore Casebook, edited by Alan Dundes, U of Wisconsin P, 1992, pp. 257–312.

Edwards, Simon. "David Copperfield: The Decomposing Self." *David Copperfield and Hard Times (New Casebooks)*, edited by John Peck, St Martin's Press, 1995, pp. 58-80.

Grimm, Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm. "Cinderella." *The Complete Fairy Tales of the Brothers Grimm*, 3rd ed (expanded), translated and edited by Jack Zipes, Bantam, 2002, pp. 79-84.

—. "The Goose Girl." *German Popular Stories*, translated and edited by Edgar Taylor, London John Camden Hotten, 1869, pp. 151-58.

Hager, Kelly. "Estranging *David Copperfield*: Reading the Novel of Divorce." *ELH*, vol. 63, no. 4, 1996, pp. 989-1019.

Hofberg, Herman. "The Swan Maiden." *The Classic Fairy Tales*. Edited by Maria Tatar. Norton Critical Edition, 2nd ed., W. W. Norton, 2017, pp. 72-73.

Jacobs, Joseph, editor. "The Black Bull of Norrøway." *More English Fairy Tales*, G. P Putnam's Sons, 1894. Transcribed and annotated by Heidi Anne Heiner, *SurLaLune Fairy Tales*, 2021, accessed 30 Sep 2024, surlalunefairytales.com/book.php?id=24&tale=638.

Kotzin, Michael C. *Dickens and the Fairy Tale*. Bowling Green U Popular P, 1972.

McAleavey, Maia. "Soul-Mates: David Copperfield's Angelic Bigamy." *Victorian Studies*, vol. 52, no. 2, 2010, pp. 191-218.

Perrault, Charles. "Bluebeard." *The Classic Fairy Tales*. Edited by Maria Tatar. Norton Critical Edition, 2nd ed., W. W. Norton, 2017, pp. 188-93.

Phiz (Hablot K. Browne). "A Stranger calls to see me." Steel etching. Originally published November 1850. Illustration for chapter 63, "A Visitor," in Charles Dickens's *David Copperfield*, volume two, Centenary Edition, 1911. *VictorianWeb*, victorianweb.org/art/illustration/phiz/dc/40.html

Stone, Harry. *Dickens and the Invisible World: Fairy Tales, Fantasy, and Novel-Making*. Indiana U P, 1979.

Thomas, W. Jenkyn. "The Fairy Wife." 1907. *The Welsh Fairy Book*. Dover, 2001, pp. 54-57.

—. "The Lady of the Lake (The Lady of Llyn y Fan Fach)." 1907. *The Welsh Fairy Book*. Dover, 2001, pp. 1-7.

Wood, Juliette. "The Fairy Bride Legend in Wales." *Folklore*, vol. 103, no. 1, 1992, pp. 56-72.

Amy Bennett-Zendzian is a Lecturer and Writing Center Coordinator in the Writing Program at Boston University, with degrees from Cornell University, Boston University, and Simmons University. Her essay on the gift economy in *The Hunger Games* appeared in the edited collection *Critical Insights: The Hunger Games Trilogy*. Her chapter on teaching fairy tales in composition classes, co-authored with Theodora Goss, appears in the edited collection *Fairy Tales in the College Classroom: Essays to Spark Lesson Plan Ideas Across the Curriculum*.

For the Dead Travel Fast: Blood, Soil, and Foreign Contagion in *Dracula*

Sophie Bradley

Existing as a “dead man made alive” (Stoker, *Notes* 17), Count Dracula reflects Victorian fears of foreignness and illness spreading into the individual bodies of English citizens and the national body of English society. Lorenzo Servitje notes that cholera, in particular, was linked to the understanding of disease as enemy (34). Throughout Bram Stoker’s *Dracula* (1897), the Count exists as a physical manifestation of this diseased, foreign enemy threatening the safety and civilization of England. Between 1831 and 1866, cholera epidemics in England resulted in the deaths of over a hundred thousand men, women, and children in three waves of contagion (Underwood 173), which served to emphasize and reinforce racial understandings of the disease.

Many scholars have examined the themes of English exceptionalism, nationalism, death, and plague in Victorian texts through the historical context of cholera, yet few have examined the understanding of soil as a metaphor and embodiment of lineage in connection to reverse colonization, foreign invasion, and foreign contagion. These fears and connected, radicalized understandings of disease create an understanding of Englishness as “pure,” “human,” and “natural,” against the foreign, colonized other in the Victorian Era, an anxiety reflected in *Dracula*. Although Marion McGarry suggests Stoker owes his influence for cholera in *Dracula* to his mother, Charlotte Stoker’s, accounts of the illness in Sligo, Ireland (27-28), I argue the multilayered text reflects a deeper link to fears of invasion, nationhood, and English identity through the importance of soil and purity in the novel. I argue the representations of soil, blood, and nationhood in *Dracula* symbolize not only the direct threat of cholera but also a symbolic threat: the plague as the threat of the “other,” specifically an animalistic, foreign entity entering under suspicious and questionable methods. Vampirism represents a contagious pathogen and an

invading nationality attacking its host, equating Dracula's foreign identity with a direct threat to England and Englishness—a living, animal embodiment of national fears of contagion and infection.

Nearly exclusively connected with foreignness, cholera was closely associated with the martial metaphor of medicine as war against disease (Servitje 34), with the colonial and military language serving to heighten fears being infected with foreignness through disease. Primarily encountered in India by British soldiers, cholera became intertwined with understandings of India as “the source of disease, in the dirty brown bodies of the colonized natives” (Prashad 243). This association resulted in cholera being considered foreign, often including the modifier “Asiatic” before it was dropped by the first quarter of the twentieth century, being understood as “almost exclusively (if temporarily) Asian” (Hamlin 8). I argue Stoker draws on three major understandings of disease—contagion, miasma theory, and contingent contagionism—and the earlier, proto-germ theory of animalism, to dehumanize the foreign count and emphasize the unknown, unpredictable threat of the foreign. Stoker's use of three different theories of disease etiology reflects the biopolitical logic and imperatives of the nineteenth century to suggest that regardless of how disease made one sick, it was the foreign that introduced and transmitted it. Contagionist theories, imbued with colonial and nationalist logics, highlight the threat of the Count's entry into England as akin to a foreign other entering the body, thereby threatening English lineage (Hamlin 3, Gilbert 19). Miasma theory posited that disease emanates from decay or filth in an impure population; the Count, then, threatens to bring “vampirism” to England or else illness, i.e. cholera, from his native country, thereby reflecting the understanding of “cholera in Britain [as] a national emergency brought about by national sin” (Gilbert 27). Contingent contagionism mixed contagionist and miasma theories to emphasize that individuals from impure environments could, in turn, infect

those they came into contact with (Servitje 123). The Count reflects all three theories, highlighting his threat not only to individual bodies but also to the body politic at large through the fear of his infection becoming a form of reverse colonization.

Stoker goes beyond these three nineteenth-century disease etiologies, drawing on animalculism to suggest the foreign count is less a person from an “impure environment” and more a being closer to an animal. Animalculism was the belief that small “disease-causing animalcules” were a method of contagion (Wilkinson 133). Writing in *A General History of Animalcules* (1843), Andrew Pritchard describes these tiny creatures as existing in “freshwater[,] ... salt water of the ocean; and some live in the astringent solutions ... They are found in fluids produced by animal secretions; moist earth, too” (62). These “living enemies” were linked to animals, first discovered in 1676, and capable of growing in various conditions (Porter 265), echoing the Count’s adaptability and ability to survive. These “tiny creatures” did not spontaneously generate life, but rather were believed to require a parent to be created (Gaynes 73). The movement of the Count echoes these depictions as he crosses over water while encased in earth, and often takes the form of an animal. As a “living enemy” the Count threatens the lineage of England by introducing disease not only through his direct contact, but through more insidious modes of infecting the very earth itself.

The mixing of modes of contagion combines understandings of disease with folklore to suggest these animal-like, foreign enemies from impure and/or inferior environments could spread illness to the “superior” and civilized English, thereby creating a reverse colonization. Stoker utilizes all three to emphasize the threat of foreign contagion, with a focus on lineage. Dracula’s threat is not only what he can do in this lifetime, but throughout time by destroying English bloodlines. As Macy Todd points out, the Count’s link to the past is in the soil, because he is

“helpless without the earth that is enriched by history” (378). The power of soil becomes twofold: existing as the literal soil by which he travels and infects, and metaphorically as the history and lineage his infection threatens. He threatens the men by saying, “My revenge has just begun! I spread it over centuries and time is on my side. Your girls that you all love are mine already; and through them you and others shall yet be mine” (282). He is capable of this contagion in two ways: firstly, through the contagion of direct contact with English girls, thereby contaminating English bloodlines, and through the contamination of death in the soil, contaminating the very land of England itself.

Contaminated, corrupted soil, then, becomes representative of nationhood and lineage—a threat to the living. The attempts by Van Helsing to “sterilise the earth” are a part of what Todd describes as larger “genocidal projects of mass sterilization. It is not enough that Dracula be killed, not enough that he be prevented from reproducing” (378). Given Stoker’s emphasis on the four modes of disease contagion, I argue the hunting party must go beyond killing Dracula directly and also destroy his lineage (namely, Lucy) and later his connection to the soil to prevent the further spread of disease. The understanding that soil could pass disease appears in a letter from Charles Pearson, Chairman of the City of London Board of Health, concerning the burial grounds of those who had died from cholera in 1832, in which he notes:

This disease has now unfortunately established itself in this city in a form of increased malignity and brutality and the Board over which I have the honor to preside [has] acknowledged [the] fact that emanations from bodies of persons who have died of infectious diseases are calculated to spread contagion even years after the decease of the subject ... If the victims of cholera be permitted to be interred within the confines of this densely populated city, I feel the greatest apprehension that the seeds for its reproduction

will be sown amongst its inhabitants and that long after it may be supposed that the calamity has passed over our heads posterity may have to censure our negligence and imprudence in thus bequeathing them this dreadful malady. (Pearson nationalarchives.gov.uk)

The concern of the Board of Health was that the “seeds of reproduction” would be sown through the soil, through association with the diseased dead. Dracula requires soil to travel, effectively transporting the soil of his native land into England, and thus contaminating the purity of English earth. An association with the soil in Dracula has been linked to what Ross G. Forman calls “ideas of death, rottenness, plague, and the perversion of tropes in growth and planting” (937). The Count’s ability to travel through soil, along with his connection to his heritage as a foreign entity, entails the “‘blood and soil’ discourse that underlies many modern conceptions of nation and citizenship” (937) that was used to naturalize and villanize different groups. That is to say, Dracula is directly connected to his country, and constitutes an invasion by the other in Britain. The understanding of the danger of soil as contagion, as reflected in the Board of Health letter, is reinforced through the link between Dracula as “undead” and requiring soil to travel. When arriving in Transylvania, one of Harker’s companions misquotes Gottfried August Burger’s 1774 folk Ballad “Leonor,” saying, “For the dead travel fast” (20). The poem tells the story of a soldier who has died, yet his wife fears that “it will yet be as late that his cold corpse creeps from the grim grave’s gate ... what if in distant Hungary he clasp another bride” (Burger 4). The allusion to the poem highlights two fears: firstly, the spread of contagion from beyond the grave through soil, and secondly, the fear of English blood mixing with foreign blood to reproduce.

The association between soil as lineage and nationhood is reflected by Dracula’s requirement to sleep and travel in coffins filled with soil. As the Board of Health had feared in

1832, the soil allows for the dead—in this case the Undead—to “plant” the “seeds of reproduction,” that is to say, to spread the foreign contagion through English soil, thus tainting the nation. This reflects the miasmatic theory of the “sickly earth” poisoning the body (Prashad 246). Stoker uses the seed and soil metaphor of the germ using the body to parasitically infect the empire to “articulate the anxieties of reverse colonization through a modern scientific understanding of a primitive life-form emerging from imperial encounters” (Servitje 141). The sickly earth represents the foreign as opposed to the “natural” English soil. As the Board of Health feared, burying cholera victims did spread cholera, furthering the contagion. Because cholera was seen as endemic during Victorian times, the view of the disease shifted from “Asiatic” cholera to merely cholera, due to the widespread acceptance of it *as* Asian (Hamlin 8), with India, after 1832, becoming known as “the natural home of cholera” and the “ultimate ... source of disease” (Prashad 243). As a foreign entity entering England, the Count is a manifestation of these fears. Deeply linked to the soil and violence of his country, he becomes a “source of disease” capable of reproducing through English soil and blood. The focus on the foreign as the “source of disease” creates an understanding of Englishness as superior but also as *susceptible*, whereby England must be protected against a reverse colonization through this illness.

The fear of contamination by blood and soil is highlighted by the Count’s travel in “earth boxes” (283), by which he directly brings foreign soil to England. In this way, the Count echoes the depiction of animalcules existing in the fresh “moist earth” (Pritchard 62), while also reinforcing his continuous connection to his heritage, thereby remaining “pure” in his foreignness. As Harker becomes aware of Dracula’s true nature, he discovers the Count “in one of the great boxes, of which there were fifty in all, on a pile of newly dug fresh earth” (55). This fresh earth indicates a constant reaffirmation of his heritage.

Ensconced in the “fresh earth,” the Count is at once alive and dead, possessing the characteristics of a man buried alive. Harker notes his host was “either dead or asleep. I could not say which—for the eyes were open and stony, but without the glassiness of death—and the cheeks had the warmth of life through all their pallor, and the lips were as red as ever” (55). The pallor of his face and stony eyes are reminiscent of early Board of Health notices warning of the “alarming approach” of “Indian Cholera” which listed symptoms such as “slow pulse ... change of color to a leaden blue, purple, black or brown; the skin is dreadfully cold” (Hamlin 69). His recognition that he may be either “dead or asleep” fuels his check for “any sign of life,” echoing concerns that cholera patients were sometimes “buried before they were really dead, in the haste to dispose of the bodies” given that “persons attacked with this fatal disorder are, in some instances, in a state of lethargy, which may be easily compounded with death” (*London Morning Herald*, July 31, 1832, 6). Harker notes “there was no sign of movement, no pulse, no breath, no beating of the heart. I bent over him, and tried to find any sign of life, but in vain” (55). The depiction of a lack of movement and breath mirrors the *Morning Herald*’s depiction of victims who die of suffocation after being buried alive:

In cases of this nature the whole chain of phenomena of the disorder, of which the termination is necessarily death, has been closely watched, and the most common cause of death in these cases found to be suffocation. It sometimes happens that without going through this progressive augmentation of the symptoms, the patient suddenly falls into a state of absolute immovability, and dares not breathe, or the breath is scarcely perceptible, without any pulse, and becomes like ice, and, in short, is apparently dead. (6)

By laying in a coffin while seemingly dead, the Count’s description is reminiscent of a cholera victim buried before death. This “undead” moment, which resulted in the death of nearly all

victims, was still a moment of contagion as cholera was contagious through the soil, as the letter from the Board of Health advised. The “fresh earth” becomes a link between the contagious nature of cholera itself and foreign soil, which represents the threat of foreign contagion. The smell of the earth furthers this contagion through the understanding of miasma as the point of transmission given Harker’s understanding that Dracula “could not have lain there long, for the earthy smell would have passed away in a few hours” (55). This understanding that the smell would pass away—thereby limiting the exposure to contagion—was, in part, one of the reasons why there was a hurry to bury cholera victims (Chadwick 2) despite the understanding from others, such as in the aforementioned Board of Health letter, that the internment of cholera victims in the soil could spread the contagion.

The spread of cholera through soil links miasma to a threat of foreignness that evokes the sense of bringing “bad airs” from foreign places, particularly eastern geographies south of the equator, such as India—places that by the writing of *Dracula* would become the jurisdiction of tropical medicine (Taylor-Brown 17-18). These airs were deemed impure, given that, as David Arnold records, the “emergent discipline of ‘tropical medicine’ gave scientific credence to the idea of a tropical world as a primitive and dangerous environment in contradistinction to an increasingly safe and sanitized temperate world” (10), but the soil gives Dracula an opportunity to arrive and flourish in England. The sense of foreignness threatens the imagined community of nationhood within and outside of the novel, as Victorian writers, Stoker especially, “mapped the contours of empire with reference to parasitic disease, triangulating a kind of imperial nationhood that valorized British geopolitical dominance through medicine” (Taylor-Pirie 14). Transylvania represents this dangerous world, in comparison with the ordered and seemingly safe world of England the Count wishes to change.

The elimination of the Count's national identity and its potential to spread into the community of England is of tantamount importance to the Crew of Light, who view their task as critical to society as a whole. After arriving in England, Harker and his associates hope to eradicate Dracula's influences by breaking into his home. Harker admits that they "were prepared for some unpleasantness, for as we were opening the door a faint, malodorous air seemed to exhale through the gaps, but none of us ever expected an odor such as we encountered" (234). That the air is "malodorous" reflects the association between the illness and bad odors. Harker admits there is a difference between the Count's well-kept crypt and his London home, suggesting London homes are unequipped for the "natural" state of illness of the foreign country. Here Stoker directly notes miasma theory as Harker notices "the place was small and close, and long disuse had made the air stagnant and foul. There was an earthly smell, as of some dry miasma, which came through the fouler air" (234). The "dry miasma" is linked to the spread of cholera: "it was not alone that it was comprised of all the ills of mortality and with the pungent, acrid smell of blood, but it seemed as though corruption itself had become corrupt" (234). The focus on corruption emphasizes understandings of cholera through continent contagionism, which was predicated on the understanding of English exceptionalism preventing the spread of cholera from the "corrupt" foreigners to the morally and physically superior English. The emphasis on the smell being from the "earth" and the "dust in extraordinary proportions" (236), which has been disturbed by the Count's boxes of earth, highlights the threat of the soil as the cause of the miasma—that is, it has stirred up this contagion. It is here the Count's threat manifests as rats, reinforcing the Count's association with disease-carrying animals.

These corrupt influences would allow the foreign influence to contaminate the purity of English soil, nationhood, and lineage. Jonathan's earliest task is to find Dracula a house in London, as Dracula entreats him: "Come, tell me of London and of the house which you have procured for me" (31). Entering the home, he realizes the Count has a remarkable number of maps and books on England and English culture. Harker praises him for knowing and speaking English "so excellently," (29) suggesting a parallel to the "learned elite" of India at the time, who were educated by Thomas Macaulay in 1885. The intention was to create a group of Indians who could help with administration in India. They were to be, as Michael Mann says, "English in taste, in opinion, in morals and intellect [and embody the] imperishable empire of our arts and our morals, our literature and laws" (20). Jonathan's praise stands at odds with the Count's understanding of his own presumed inferiority: "I thank you, my friend, for your all too flattering estimate, but yet I fear that I am but a little way on the road I would travel. True, I know the grammar and the words, but yet I know not how to speak them" (29). The Count recognizes his inability to fully be accepted despite understanding "the grammar and words" of English.

His recognition, and Jonathan's praise, suggest that foreignness was accepted only to the extent that it was useful to the English; in essence, a false "Englishness." The Count explains that he will always be viewed as foreign, despite this knowledge: "I know that, did I move and speak in your London, none there are who would not know me for a stranger" (29-30). The emphasis on his difference and inability to be accepted as English reinforces the fear of the other, as well as the supposed English exceptionalism the Count cannot meet. Understanding this, the Count admits, "I long to go through the crowded streets of your mighty London, to be in the midst of the whirl and rush of humanity, to share its life, its change, its death, and all that it is" (29). While the Count longs to a part of the "rush of humanity," he is denied this possibility due to his foreignness. Before

he becomes “un-dead” and thus loses all traces of humanity to the remaining characters of the novel, “he was in life a most wonderful man. Soldier, statesman, and alchemist—which latter was the highest development of the science-knowledge of his time” (278). Despite this praise, which echoes Harker’s approval of his command over the English language, he is called a “child ... [with a] big child brain” (278). Only after he wishes to truly be a part of England outside of this role does he become un-dead. His entrance into England represents creating a new order, returning to fears of the foreign destroying the purity of English nationhood and lineage.

The Count, by embodying these four different modes of infection, is a manifestation of the threat of the foreign. He becomes, a “living” or rather “un-dead” enemy—failing to be considered “living” given his inability to join the “rush of humanity” that is English civilization. The British anxiety of, as Marie Kolkenbrock says, “becoming infected with otherness” (157) plagues the novel, with the Crew of Light’s anxiety regarding not only the Count’s current infectious behavior, but his ability to be the parent of new “living enemies” within England. The Professor explains Dracula’s threat resides in how he may be “the father or furtherer of a new order of beings, whose road must lead through Death, not Life” (278). As the Count himself notes, he wishes to be a part of the “change” of London. The greatest fear of these men is not death but that “we become as him; that we henceforward become foul things of the night like him—without heart or conscience” (222). The understanding of “heart or conscience” returns to the imagery of English exceptionalism—of morals only mattering if they are English. The fear of Dracula’s contagion is, like cholera, difficult to uncover given his ability to “grow and become small; he can at times vanish and come unknown” (222), akin to the patterns of cholera.

Cholera was at once a fear and a true contagion. As medical historian Christopher Hamlin explains, it was experienced not only by the individual victim but by communities as a whole,

existing as a disaster that threatened to “destroy both material and communal bases of society, uproot faith in any cosmic order” (Hamlin 3). The Crew of Light fears Dracula, representative of cholera, and his ability to uproot the typical order of things, thus changing England into something else. They do not fear death, admitting, as Van Helsing does, that “to fail here, is not mere life or death” (222), but rather the erasure of English identity. While English identity is linked to life, literature, and law, the foreign Dracula is linked to death and inhumanity. Dracula’s ability to change the “natural” order of life in England is through his association with “savageness.” An 1831 *Lancet* article noted “no rank escapes its attack ... civilized nations are changed to savage hordes, and, in short, when it exceeds a certain point, all grades and bonds of social organization disappear” (241). The bonds of social organization require Dracula to always be seen as a stranger, as he first notes to Harker. His foreign identity is codified through animal comparisons and associations, reflecting earlier understandings of contagion.

The connection between the supernatural, animals, and medicine was linked to Giovanni Cosimo Bonomo’s research on scabies in 1697. His belief in “disease-causing animalcules [being] ... living enemies” was mocked as “little better than ancient superstitions about elf-shot, worms, and flying venom” (Melville 157). This understanding of living bacteria linked the supernatural, animals, and contagion in a manner paralleled by Dracula himself. The Count’s connection to the past, along with his connection to older modes of disease theory such as animalculism is juxtaposed against the more modern understanding of illness—miasma, contagionism, and anti-contagionism—demonstrated by his enemies. Only when the Crew of Light destroys this reverse colonization does the modern triumph and the Count’s supernatural and infectious contagion is ended by “the Anglo-British colonizers overtaking the threat of reverse colonization ... purging English territory and identity from vampiric infection” (Servitje 15). Foiled by modern

science and colonization, Dracula's "not full man," "child-brain," "not of man stature" (Stoker 312) intelligence is thus capable of being colonized, but not of succeeding in reverse colonization, thereby serving to reinforce the presumed superiority of the English over the foreign other.

Embodying fears of the supernatural and contagion, Dracula is repeatedly linked to animals to reinforce his lack of humanity and otherness. Relegated to the realm of the supernatural, Dracula's connection to animals begins with Harker's arrival in Transylvania. Dracula's association with death begins when a dog howls somewhere in a farmhouse down the road—"a long, agonized wailing, as if from fear" (21). This episode indicates Dracula's connection to the dead as the "dog, according to Romanian folklore, was known for its power of giving warning of approaching death by unnatural howling" (Browning and Skal 21). The approaching death is not Harker's, but the potential for the death of the English way. The death of the English way is through the contamination of the English lineage as Dracula is, as Van Helsing calls him, "brute and more than brute" (222). The lack of humanity serves to highlight the differences between the "civilized" English and the "uncivilized" foreigners.

Representing a "living enemy," Dracula is capable of spreading contagion not only through blood, but through his association with animals, who are similarly inhuman and other. His ability to command "all the meaner things: the rat, and the owl, and the bat—the moth, and the fox, and the wolf" (222), reinforces his contagion; that is, the rat was linked to the plague in 1894 (Getz 285), while the vampire bat was identified in 1832 by Charles Darwin, who in *The Voyage of the Beagle* (1839) describes it as a creature that is "often the cause of much trouble" yet "the whole circumstance has lately been doubted in England" (25). Dracula, similarly, is described by Van Helsing as something that was doubted: "For in this enlightened age, when men believe not even what they see, the doubting of wise men would be his greatest strength" (294). Dracula's strength

lies in the doubt that he is able to spread this contagion, despite his close association with it, leading to only a few men, as Van Helsing says, “willing to peril even our own souls for the safety of one we love—for the good of mankind” (294). The association with an owl further marks Dracula as a threat against mankind given the long-standing belief, still present in Victorian times, that owls are evil. As an element of contagion, represented by the rat, Dracula is a “sad omen” for the purity of England through the reverse colonization of contagion through the soil and direct interchange of blood through his parasitic vampirism, similar to the bat. Thriving in the filth of modernity and emblemizing “dirt and filth” (Servitje 137), rats reinforce the association not only with illness, but with the past. Modern progress is set against the threat of regression as “both rats and vampires are toothy throwbacks signifying the resurgence of the primitive: rats are associated with medieval plague, vampires with medieval feudalism” (Ellman 19). The Count’s danger lies in his ability to conquer England, returning it to an uncivilized, pre-modern state.

Dracula’s association with animals reinforces his lack of inhumanity and his danger through a deeper connection to death and direct action against England. The moth, similar to the owl, was understood as an omen of death. These associations reinforce both Dracula’s danger and his connection with the foreign as he is described by Van Helsing as a man-eating tiger: “Your man eater, as they of India call the tiger who has once tasted the blood of the human, care no more for other prey, but prowl unceasing till he get him” (294). This simile shows how Van Helsing fears Dracula will never stop seeking his prey. This is further emphasized by Seward’s description of Dracula in England: “There was something so panther-like in the movement—something so unhuman” about him, that the men are immediately frightened by his “lion-like disdain” (281). Directly establishing Dracula as “unhuman” he is marked as other—an inhuman and animal force that must be eliminated if it cannot be civilized and utilized for a purpose.

Dracula's inhumanity and otherness allow him to, as Van Helsing says, "flourish in the midst of diseases that kill off whole peoples" (294) and mark him as a harbinger of death and disease. During his approach to the castle, Jonathan sees a "a faint flickering blue flame" (22), that is later revealed to indicate the presence of treasure, immediately after the howling of the dogs. The blue flame reinforces the motif of death and miasma, given that "In medieval folklore, the blue flame (*ignis fatuus*) rises from the plague dead, but it acquires mystical properties in its association with St. George's Eve, the April 23 commemoration of the Christian knight and dragon slayer" (Browning and Skal 22). Given that the howling of dogs symbolize death, the presence of the flame suggests Jonathan is approaching the danger of the contagion. This belief is linked to the superstitious past, at odds with the later scientific focus of the Crew of Light, indicating the Count's connection with the medieval rather than the modern. The driver, presumably Dracula himself, stands between the flame and Harker, yet "he did not obstruct it, for I could see its ghostly flicker all the same" (22), suggesting that Dracula stands between the "savage" and the civilized at this moment. Harker cannot comprehend this phenomenon, and chooses instead to ignore it, admitting "This startled me, but as the effect was only momentary, I took it that my eyes deceived me straining through the darkness" (22).

When Dracula opens the door, Harker describes him as "a tall old man, clean shaven save for a long white moustache, and clad in black from head to foot, without a single speck of color about him anywhere" (24). According to Browning and Skal (22), Stoker based this depiction on actor Henry Irving's role as Hamlet, noting the importance of Hamlet's lines on the novel: "'Tis now the very witching time of night/When churchyards yawn and hell itself breaks out/Contagion to this world. Now I could drink hot blood'" (III.ii.359-61). The direct link to contagion reinforces

Dracula's otherness, establishing him as immediately different from the English Harker. This otherness is compounded with the emphasis of "Blood is life" (139) During his invasion, Dracula drinks English blood to assert dominance, mixing his blood with theirs, thus contaminating English bloodlines.

Stoker's repeated use of the understanding of "Blood is the life" highlights the fear of reverse colonization as well as parasitism. He repeatedly notes the superiority of his blood and lineage, explaining, "we of the Dracula blood were amongst their leaders, for our spirit would not brook that we were not free" (39). Revealing his "leadership," the Count foreshadows his desire to conquer England in a reverse colonization to allow them greater freedom, returning to his admission of always being a stranger in England, despite his ability to speak English so easily. His identity will always be linked to his heritage, revealing the Szekelys "can boast a record that mushroom growths like the Hapsburgs and the Romanoffs can never reach" (39). The focus on a "mushroom growth" emphasizes the imagery of contagion spread through the soil. Mushrooms indicate organic material in soil, highlighting the transfer of organic matter between the dead in the soil and the creation of this infectious new life, carrying both scientific and supernatural connotations of the Devil, elves, and fairies (Kane 44). The imagery of a mushroom growth associates Dracula with not only the Devil, but also with contagion, given that the Victorian idea of fairies as "kidnappers and bringers of illness and death was clearly linked to the concept that they were, themselves, the dead" (Silver 171). In this way, the lineage of the Szekelys, and the "Dracula at their heart's blood, their brains, and their swords" (39), are capable of spreading their lineage through the soil, illness, and death in ways these "mushroom growth" kingdoms are incapable of doing. Stoker suggests the Englishness of spreading across the land, yet the "mushroom growth" kingdoms are unable to grow vertically, lacking a true heritage and past the

Szekelys' record demonstrates. By spreading across the land, the Dracula lineage is capable of this growth, thereby eliminating what he views as "lesser" nations; however, despite this ability for vertical growth stretching across bloodlines and soils, Dracula's pride is viewed by the English as a part of his inferiority—his inability to accept this threatens the established order. Due to Dracula's failure to recognize English superiority, he is viewed as possessing an animalistic "childbrain." For the Crew of Light, this poses a direct threat to England's social order.

The Count's association with illness and death links together with his status as a foreign national. That is, by establishing himself as the "heart's blood" of the nation, Dracula becomes symbolic of the entire nation entering England. He emphasizes the importance of his blood, telling Harker: "We Szekeleys have a right to be proud, for in our veins flows the blood of many brave races who fought as the lion fights, for lordship" (37). This fight for "lordship" connects to the fear of reverse colonization in which the foreign identity holds power. The animalistic depiction—"as the lion fights"—highlights the violence and lack of true civilization in the eyes of the English. Dracula reveals that "we were a conquering race" (38), hinting at his plans for England, as "we throughout the Four Nations received the 'bloody sword,'" (38) which symbolizes "national emergency" (Browning and Skal 38). The emergency is the lack of freedom as he reveals, "our spirit would not brook that we were not free" (39). Yet instead of outright war, Dracula intends to subvert bloodlines because "Blood is too precious a thing in these days of dishonorable peace" (39). The phrase "dishonorable peace" alludes to the Crimean War of 1853-1856, in which the sentiment of "dishonorable peace" was expressed by Lord Crowley over the conclusion of the war (Conacher 44). During the Crimean War, the British aided the Ottoman Empire against Russia, and a majority of soldiers' deaths was caused by disease. There was, as Huang et al note, a "high death

rate from disease at 212 per thousand—one third of which was due to cholera” (336). In this symbolic representation of cholera, Dracula is a foreign force enacting a reverse colonization not through actions seen in “warlike days [that are] over” (39) but through disease transmitted by blood and soil to damage English bloodlines and health.

The soil of Transylvania has been fought over “for centuries by the Wallachian, the Saxon, and the Turk” (31), recalling the historical importance of how the movement of English soldiers across India spread disease. The link between conquest and disease is emphasized as Dracula continues: “why, there is hardly a foot of soil in all this region that has not been enriched by the blood of men, patriots or invaders” (31). Dracula notes the region can be considered a “treasure” unseen by “most men” despite it being “ground fought over” (31). The locations of the buried treasure are only visible on a night “when all evil spirits are supposed to have unchecked sway” (31). The “evil” is associated with the men who fought over it, with the invaders finding “but little, for whatever there was had been sheltered in friendly soil” (31) when he was triumphant. The imagery of the soil reinforces the disease in the soil given its “friendly” nature. The blood of invaders has “enriched” and changed the “friendly soil,” as Dracula seeks to do in England. This change is further emphasized by the understanding of soil as the treasure of the land; that is, the invaders seek the “friendly” or fertile soil, without recognizing the value of the country itself. Dracula contemptuously notes men lack the ability to see the treasure—the value of the country beyond the soil—“Because *your* peasant is at heart a coward and a fool!” (31; emphasis added). The treasure—marked by the blue flame associated with plague death—is visible only on this evil night, and sought only by invaders, as the Count reveals, on “that night no man of this land will, if he can help it, stir without his doors” (31). The native inhabitants know better than to seek a false treasure in “friendly soil” that would spread plague, reflecting the belief that Indians lived with

cholera for quite some time, but that it was English trade routes that spread it to the rest of the world.

Dracula's role in spreading contagion, coupled with his identity as a foreigner, echoes English understandings of cholera in India, where "evidently, people lived and died by different rules" (Hamlin 13). For Victorian physicians, "cholera was an Indian disease, but a European concept, a product (and vindication) of observation" (Hamlin 44). According to a nineteenth-century physician, John Macpherson, the answer for cholera for the natives was faith in a Hindu cholera deity rather than medical science (Hamlin 43). Emphasizing that no man would willingly seek treasure associated with plague death, Dracula suggests the natives know how to avoid the contagion in ways the invaders are unable to understand, echoing differences in understanding cholera between colonized and colonizer in India during this period. For Dracula's peasants, cholera has become a way of life; the treasure above the plague graves reveals itself as dangerous. In *A Treatise on the Epidemic Cholera, as it has Prevailed in India* (1832), the English surgeon Frederick Corbyn notes "Bodies of troops in motion have been attacked, have retained the disease, while it was unknown to the fixed inhabitants of the country through which they passed" (72). Dracula tells Jonathan that "even the peasant that you tell me of who marked the place of the flame would not know where to look in daylight even for his own work" (31), with Jonathan himself agreeing he could not find it, either. Framing his peasants as smart enough to avoid the contagion in the soil, Dracula suggests the superiority of the natives over the English, not only in the potential to avoid it, but in the ability to contaminate and infect the blood and soil in England without the English initially recognizing it.

The representations of the blue flame above the soil in combination with Dracula's repeated explanations of the superiority of his nation creates a direct threat to England and Englishness, an

embodiment of national fears of contagion and infection. By revealing that the ground has been saturated in blood, Stoker returns to the imagery of contagion through mass cholera burials. This suggests a fear that contagion could spread through the soil itself, namely through “invaders” whose blood could stay in the soil even after death, thus adulterating the country itself. As Dracula admits, “We Transylvanian nobles love not to think that our bones may be amongst the common dead” (33), and he suggests that time will turn the English soil into more friendly conditions. He notes that the country “cannot be made habitable in a day; and after all, how few days make up a century” (33) to emphasize the slow reverse colonization he will enact while doubting men are unaware of his presence.

Blood and soil, as well as Dracula’s inhumanity, are crucial for this slow colonization, as they are the modes of contagion. To travel, Dracula requires “earth boxes” (283), bringing the contagious, blood-soaked soil of his homeland to mix with the symbolically pure and “productive soils of Europe” (Prashad 11). Understanding this importance, the men pursuing Dracula realize, as Van Helsing says, they “must trace each of these boxes; and when we are ready, ... we must, so to speak, sterilise the earth, so that no more he can sake safety in it” (226). The need to “sterilise the earth” highlights the danger of this contaminated soil entering into the soil of England, thus making it less pure.

By same manner in which the Count’s contaminated soil seeks to ruin the purity of the English nation through an “undead” contagion, Dracula seeks to take English lives through a parasitic blood transfusion that changes pure English blood into mixed, impure blood in an act that kills the host. In introducing Dracula’s identity, Stoker repeatedly highlights the connection with blood as a nationalistic identifier to contrast foreign blood with the “purity” of English blood. Mina embodies the proper English citizen: loyal to England, vehemently opposed to the foreign, and

capable of continuing English lineage through “proper” reproduction. It is, as Van Helsing says, “for her sake” (344) the men must eradicate Dracula’s contagion. Throughout the novel, the phrase “blood is life” is repeated, with Renfield admitting his belief that “by consuming a multitude of live things, no matter how low in the scale of creation, one might indefinitely prolong life” (219). Dracula’s life is prolonged in this way by taking English lives and national identity as he takes blood, relying, of course, upon the scriptural phrase, ‘For the blood is the life’” (219). Dracula’s contagion, then, lies in his ability to take life and replace it with an “un-dead” life.

The fear of mixing blood and bloodlines demonstrates Victorian “[a]nxieties about ... changing geopolitical relations (vide reverse colonization, damaging imperial skirmishes in places like the Sudan, and renewed imperial self-doubt)” (Forman 929). When Lucy first becomes sick, Seward describes the effect of the illness in terms of contagion: “It is something like the way Dame Nature gathers round a foreign body an envelope of some insensitive tissue which can protect from evil that which it would otherwise harm by contact” (121). “Nature” here represents England protecting itself from foreign individuals—a sense that there would be harm from contact as the portrayal of “wild/ uncivilized land” that needs to be charted then overtaken. As Stephan Arata suggests, Dracula demonstrates the Victorian fear that “the ‘civilized’ world is on the verge of being colonized by ‘primitive forces’” (623). Harker notes that Dracula lives in “the extreme east of the country... one of the wildest and least known parts of Europe” with “no maps” (12) available, directly at odds with the well-mapped, and thus civilized, England. The land, which Dracula envisions as a treasure, is described by Van Helsing as “very different from yours or mine” (310), and Harker describes their journey into Transylvania as a drive “into unknown places and unknown ways; into a whole world of dark and dreadful things” (326). These men cast a colonial gaze upon Transylvania, in response to the fear of reverse colonization by Dracula’s entrance into

England. Nature, embodied by the soil, is unable to protect itself from evil as Dracula's soil mixes with that of England's, thus spreading his contamination.

Dracula's ability as a foreign body to penetrate nature's defenses and infect Lucy serves to emphasize his danger as a contagious force. By transfusing foreign blood with the blood of Englishwomen, first Lucy and then Mina, Dracula seeks to subvert English bloodlines to colonize England in a parasitic manner threatening all class levels. Lucy is a young, engaged Englishwoman whose sleepwalking casts her in a negative light, marking her as less morally strong than Mina, and thus lacking the ability to protect herself from contact with Dracula. There is, as Forman says, a distinct connection between "the withdrawal of blood and the inauguration of social sickness" (929), as the death of the purity of an Englishwoman—the death of her ability to reproduce English lineage and bloodlines—can result in a less pure nature were it to continue on a larger scale. Lucy's death is described by Seward as being caused by "nervous prostration following on great loss or waste of blood" (182). Stoker's use of the word "waste" reinforces it is a waste for its Englishness as Lucy requires the blood of three Englishmen (and an American) in a transfusion that ultimately fails. Dracula's earlier mention to Jonathan of the "dishonorable peace" suggests his desire to return to the "glories of the great races" (39) by taking England for himself through a blood colonization.

Only after Lucy's English blood has been "wasted" and she has been laid to rest does her "un-dead" state begin, returning to direct imagery of cholera patients. Van Helsing says that "For it is not the least of its terrors that this evil thing is rooted deep in all good; in soil barren of holy memories it cannot rest" (226), and Seward asserts that they must "restore Lucy to us as a holy, and not unholy memory" (203). To do this, they use a wooden stake. For Stoker, however, it represents a method of sterilizing the earth, and thus preventing her from spreading contagion.

Once staked, Seward records that “the body shook and quivered and twisted in wild contortions; the sharp white teeth champed together till the lips were cut, and the mouth was smeared with a crimson foam” (204). This description marks a shift from Lucy, to “The Thing” and “the body” (204), effectively stripping her of her humanity, while echoing descriptions of cholera patients. As Hamlin says, cholera “took hold, drawing out the body’s heat, twisting muscles into spasms and cramps, producing insatiable thirst but taking away voice” (3). Lucy’s death includes these harsh spasms, yet her killing prevents an insatiable thirst. As Van Helsing explains, those affected “cannot die, but must go on age after age adding new victims ... for all that die from the preying of the Un-Dead become themselves Un-dead” (203) in an endless cycle, reflecting the Board of Health’s fear that unsanitary burial practices would result in the disease spreading years after the victim’s death.

Stoker’s use of four disease etiologies to characterize the Count’s vampirism as metaphor for not only cholera, but a diseased, foreign enemy threatening the blood and soil of England serves to comment on the close association between literature and medicine during the Victorian Era. The blood and soil metaphor aims to unsettle the presumed safety and superiority of the English by suggesting reverse colonization is only possible through an incursion into the past *vis-à-vis* the superstitions, bodies, and infectious diseases of the colonized. The triumph of the English colonizers through science and medicine demonstrates the push towards modernity over the past, emphasizing that the only true threat to England is itself; its continued success lies in its ability to recognize and destroy threats to its individual and political bodies.

Works Cited

Arata, Stephen D. "The Occidental Tourist: *Dracula* and the Anxiety of Reverse Colonization."

Victorian Studies, vol. 33, no. 4, 1990, pp. 621-45.

Arnold, David. "Introduction." *Imperial Medicine and Indigenous Societies*, edited by David

Arnold, Manchester UP, 1988.

Burger, Gottfried August. "Lenore." Rosetti Archive Textual Transcription. Harvard College,

Harvard University. [https://www.rossettiarchive.org/docs/1-1844.harvardms.rad.html#p\[i\]](https://www.rossettiarchive.org/docs/1-1844.harvardms.rad.html#p[i])

Conacher, James Blennerhasset. *Britain and the Crimea 1855-56: Problems of War and Peace*.

Springer, 1988.

Corbyn, Frederick. *A Treatise on the Epidemic Cholera, as it has Prevailed in India*. Carey, Lea,

and Carey, 1832.

Chadwick, Edwin. *Report on the Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Population of Great*

Britain: A Supplementary Report on the Results of Special Inquiry into the Practice of

Interment in Towns. Vol. 2. HM Stationery Office, 1843.

Darwin, Charles. *Narrative of the Surveying Voyages of His Majesty's Ships Adventure and*

Beagle, Between the Years 1826-36, Describing Their Examination of the Southern

Shores of South America, and the Beagle Circumnavigation of the Globe: In Three

Volumes. Journal and remarks: 1832-1836. Vol. 3. Colburn, 1839.

Forman, Ross G. "A Parasite for Sore Eyes: Rereading Infection Metaphors in Bram Stoker's

Dracula." *Victorian Literature and Culture*, vol. 44, no. 4, 2016, pp. 925-47.

Gaynes, Robert P. *Germ Theory: Medical Pioneers in Infectious Diseases*. John Wiley and Sons,

2023.

- Getz, Faye Marie. "Black Death and the Silver Lining: Meaning, Continuity, and Revolutionary Change in Histories of Medieval Plague." *Journal of the History of Biology*, vol. 24, no. 2, 1991, pp. 265–89.
- Gilbert, Pamela K. "A Sinful and Suffering Nation: Cholera and the Evolution of Medical and Religious Authority in Britain, 1832-1866." *Nineteenth-Century Prose*, vol. 25, no. 1, 1998, pp. 26-45.
- Hamlin, Christopher. *Cholera: The Biography*. Oxford UP, 2009.
- Huang Chenghao, et al. "Skin Disease and Military Conflicts: Lessons from the Crimean War (1854–56)." *Journal of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh*, vol. 52, no. 4, 2022, pp. 336-40.
- Kane, Aurora. *Mystical Mushrooms: Discover the Magic and Folklore of Fantastic Fungi*. Rock Point, 2023.
- Kolkenbrock, Marie. "Gothic Infections: Arthur Schnitzler and the Haunted Culture of Modernism." *The Modern Language Review*, vol. 113, no. 1, 2018, pp. 147–67.
- "London Morning Herald, Tuesday July 31, 1832." No. 15, 595. *British Newspaper Archive*, <https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0002408/18320731/038/0006>.
- Mann, Michael. "'Torchbearers Upon the Path of Progress': Britain's Ideology of a 'Moral and Material Progress' in India. An Introductory Essay." *Colonialism as Civilizing Mission: Cultural Ideology in British India*, edited by Harald Fischer-Tiné and Michael Mann, Anthem Press, 2004.
- Melville, Peter. *Romantic Hospitality and the Resistance to Accommodation*. Wilfrid Laurier UP, 2007.

- Pearson, Charles. "Letter to the Privy Council: July 16, 1832." Records of the Privy Council and other Records Collected by the Privy Council Office. PC 1/114. National Archives, Kew.
https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/pc1_114graveyards.jpg
- Prashad, Vijay. "Native Dirt/Imperial Ordure: The Cholera of 1832 and the Morbid Resolutions Of Modernity." *Journal of Historical Sociology*, vol. 7, no. 3, 1994, pp. 243-60.
- Pritchard, Andrew. *A General History of Animalcules, Including Their Appearances and Localities, and the Methods of Capturing, Viewing, and Preserving Them: Illustrated by Five Hundred Engraved Drawings*. Whittaker and Company, 1843.
- Porter, J. R. "Antony van Leeuwenhoek: Tercentenary of his Discovery of Bacteria." *Bacteriological Reviews*, vol. 40, no. 2, 1976, 260-69.
- Servitje, Lorenzo. *Medicine Is War: The Martial Metaphor in Victorian Literature and Culture*. State U of New York P, 2021.
- Silver, Carole G. *Strange and Secret Peoples: Fairies and Victorian Consciousness*. Oxford UP, 1999.
- Stoker, Bram. *Bram Stoker's Notes for Dracula: A Facsimile Edition*, edited by Robert Eighteen-Bisang and Elizabeth Miller, McFarland, 2008.
- . *Dracula*. Edited by John Edgar Browning and David J. Skal. Norton Critical Edition, 2nd ed., W. W. Norton, 1997.
- Taylor-Brown, Emily. "'She has a parasite soul!' The Pathologization of the Gothic Monster as Parasitic Hybrid in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*, Richard March's *The Beetle* and Arthur Conan Doyle's *The Parasite*." *Monsters and Monstrosity from the Fin de Siècle to the Millennium: New Essays*, edited by Sharla Hutchison and Rebecca A. Brown, McFarland, 2015, pp. 12-28.

Taylor-Pirie, Emilie. *Empire Under the Microscope: Parasitology and the British Literary*

Imagination, 1885-1935. Palgrave Studies in Literature, Science and Medicine. Palgrave Macmillan, 2022.

Todd, Macy. "What Bram Stoker's *Dracula* Reveals about Violence." *English Literature in Transition, 1880-1920*, vol. 58, no. 3, 2015, 361-84.

Underwood, E. Ashworth. "The History of Cholera in Great Britain." *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine*, vol. 41, whole no. 165, 1948, pp. 165-73.

Sophie Bradley is a PhD student in the Department of English at Lehigh University. Her research interests are Victorian literature, health humanities, and gender. She has essays forthcoming in *Journal of Dracula Studies* and in the book *Death, Sickness and Plagues* by Vernon Press.

The Intersections Between Epistolarity and Sentimentalism in *The Sorrows of Young*

Werther and Frankenstein

Hope Siler

Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818) is a text that literary critics have long noted for its formal complexity. From layering multiple narrative levels to incorporating epistolary narration, the novel stands out as a fusion of diverse literary forms that is as hybridized as the Creature it depicts. This narrative structure inevitably carries interpretive weight while also shedding light on literature's ability to reflect and complicate the cultural values that shape it. Sentimentalism, in particular, is a prominent social ideal with which *Frankenstein* engages, and the novel's formal qualities affect how sentimentalism functions in the text. For instance, Kirsten Martin notes that "Shelley's frames layer on top of one another to guide the reader through all of the novel's disparate pieces. This technique ... creates the conditions for sympathetic engagement" between readers and characters (601-02). Similarly, Hyewon Shin posits that "the epistolary frame fosters affective connections between characters (letter writers) and readers (their addressees)" (546). Such scholars associate sentimental emotions with the novel's epistolary, multi-level structure, a formal quality that *Frankenstein* shares with one of the many texts that its characters reference, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's *The Sorrows of Young Werther* (1774). Of course, the explicit mention of this work in *Frankenstein* is admittedly brief; however, both texts' combining of epistolary and framed narrative structures merits a closer reading that considers the evolving relationships between literary forms and cultural values that these novels exemplify. In short, a comparison of these works will bring to light a structural and functional shift in epistolarity, beginning as a vehicle for communicating interior emotional experience and transitioning into a simultaneous call for and

performance of outwardly focused sentimental response. This transition will help to elucidate *Frankenstein's* Gothic complication and distortion of cultural values, such as, in this case, sentimentalism.

In asserting that *Frankenstein's* treatment of sentimentalism is Gothic, I draw on several theoretical discussions about the sentimental, the Gothic, and the relationship between these literary trends. Peter de Voogd, for example, defines sentimentalism as a cultural value rooted in the eighteenth-century pushback against the philosophies of Hobbes and Mandeville, who saw egoism and self-interest as the primary driving forces of humankind. De Voogd writes that “more ‘optimistic’ theories were developed which presented ... man as ‘good’ by nature” and emphasized qualities like “sympathy ... and its near-synonymous partner, benevolence” that people could develop by using “an intuitive Moral Sense” to distinguish between good and evil (77). Hence, sentimentalism foregrounds intense, emotional experiences of sympathy while also attaching an ethical significance to these emotions as the ability to look outside the self and be moved to tears (by a piece of art, another person, a circumstance, etc.), thus making it a characteristic that displays and fosters an individual’s morality. As Hannah Doherty Hudson puts it, “sympathetic and morally improving tears” are a hallmark of sentimentalism (155).

Furthermore, Mary K. Patterson Thornburg specifies that eighteenth-century society often considered sentimental emotions to be desirable as opposed to other kinds of experiences (like violence, the unconscious, fear of the supernatural, etc.) that were deemed unacceptable (2). Thornburg asserts that these rejected experiences form the Gothic, which is “the distorted mirror image of the sentimental, reflecting, threatening, and to an extent mocking the conventions of sentimentality” (2) as well as “introducing apparent irrationalities and contradictions within the sentimental tradition” (22). One contradiction that will figure in my own argument is the possibility

that sympathetic, sentimental emotions also contain an element of self-interest as the sentimentalist's intense feelings become a source of personal enjoyment or self-absorption, experiences that would align with the philosophies of self-centeredness that sentimentalism allegedly resists. This prospect creates a contradicting sense of sentimentalism as both a selfless and self-centered experience and troubles any notion that sentimental tears have straightforward ethical implications. So, while both the Gothic and the sentimental rely on extreme emotionality, the Gothic highlights emotions that sentimentalism tries to reject, destabilizing the idea that the sentimental tradition and its moral code form a complete and harmonious view of reality. Thornburg explains, "Where the sentimental seeks to reassure us ... that right and wrong are easily distinguishable, that conformity to its code of moral and social behavior will be rewarded, the Gothic refutes such assurance" (42). Each cultural trend opposes and shapes the other as sentimental texts attempt to suppress Gothic elements and Gothic texts question sentimental ideals.

However, my decision to use the term "Gothic" in my description of *Frankenstein's* structure does not merely treat the Gothic as a critique of and an opposite to the sentimental, but rather harnesses an important characteristic of the Gothic that these discussions reveal: its ability to distort and complicate. Jerrold Hogle writes that the Gothic is often "concerned with the interpenetration of ... opposed conditions—including life/death, natural/supernatural, ancient/modern, realistic/artificial, and conscious/unconscious" (9). My use of the term "Gothic," then, refers to the distortion that happens when such interpenetration between opposing concepts occurs. Instead of using the Gothic as a tool to criticize the sentimental, my goal here is to tap into the Gothic's potential to highlight contradictions and complexities within sentimentalism, particularly the conflict between conceptions of sentimentalism as a selfless or self-centered experience. One means through which this complication of sentimentalism occurs is

Frankenstein's epistolarity, which, as stated above, harkens back to Goethe's use of epistolarity in *The Sorrows of Young Werther* to demonstrate the evolving ties between literary forms and cultural values.

Shelley's indebtedness to *The Sorrows of Young Werther* is evidenced by the fact that she blatantly calls this text to readers' attention when her Creature reads the work and emotionally reacts to protagonist Werther's love, despair, and suicide. Roswitha Burwick has connected this literary reference with Shelley's mother, feminist writer Mary Wollstonecraft, whose love letters to American speculator Gilbert Imlay form part of a compilation that Shelley's father, William Godwin, published after Wollstonecraft's death. Burwick notes that "the themes of unrequited love, suffering, suicide, and repeated allusions to Goethe [in Godwin's preface] ... suggest that [Godwin] was fictionalizing [Wollstonecraft] into the figure of a 'female Werter,'" a parallel that may, in turn, suggest that *Frankenstein's* literary allusion has feminist undertones (48). Additionally, Robyn Schiffman identifies the reference with contemporary critiques of Goethe as the Creature "signals what some detractors focused on when judging Goethe an apologist for suicide" ("Concert" 215). Indulging in heightened emotions, the Creature "avoids condemning the suicidal act" (215). Such interpretations of the allusion emphasize the intense emotional experiences constitutive of sentimentalism since, after all, *The Sorrows of Young Werther* is a quintessential work in the sentimental genre.

This reference also allows *Frankenstein* to define sentimentalism when the Creature expresses admiration for Werther's "lofty sentiments and feelings, which had for their object something out of self" (142), a description that casts sentimentalism as an experience of strong emotions prompted by an external stimulus. The definition's emphasis on the sentimentalist's focus being outside the self aligns with the pushback against egoism and self-centeredness that De

Voogd claims is a contributor to sentimental ideals; nevertheless, the Creature goes on to state, “As I read ... I applied much personally to my own feelings and condition. I found myself similar, yet at the same time strangely unlike the beings concerning whom I read” (142). This claim deems the Creature’s sentimental reaction to Werther a self-centered experience since the Creature tries to relate Werther’s situation to his own. Luis Rosa even suggests that the Creature typifies a model of reading in which one “can no longer identify an interior self and an exterior world” as distinctions between self and other become blurred (477). *Frankenstein*, therefore, features multiple, conflicting portrayals of sentimentalism in this passage so that the focus of the sentimentalist’s emotional energies within the dynamic between self and stimulus takes the foreground while the ethical implications of such intense feelings are vague. Compared to the contemporary preoccupation with the ethics surrounding sentimentalism, *Frankenstein* lays more emphasis on the complexities within the sentimentalist-stimulus relationship than on clearly labelling sentimental emotions as moral or immoral. In order to understand how *Frankenstein* complicates the dynamics between the sentimentalist and stimulus in a Gothic way, one can consider how the formal qualities of both *The Sorrows of Young Werther* and *Frankenstein* direct readers’ and characters’ attention and, by consequence, their emotions.

For instance, in *The Sorrows of Young Werther*, Werther’s feelings are closely tied to the work’s epistolarity. Novels written in the epistolary form tend to be what H. Porter Abbott terms “nonretrospective,” meaning that “the narrators are as yet uneducated by the experiences they relate” because “they do not know how their story will end until they have finished recording it” (23). Since these narrators cannot access knowledge outside of their own experiences, Abbott describes them as “cloistered” and claims that a cloistered narrator like Werther “allows the author to intensify ... concentration on the central figure’s private drama of self-awareness” (23). Indeed,

Schiffman notes that the novel's epistolary communication is largely one-sided so that "there is literally no topos for a post office or little concern at all for the mechanics of exchange and writing" as Werther's interiority takes precedence over these material concerns ("*Werther*" 422). Thus, the novel's letters are noteworthy for their foregrounding of Werther and his emotions. The novel's form further augments this emphasis by using a frame that situates Werther's letters, and the passionate expressions they contain, as the focus of readers' sentimental energies. The fictional editor, who has collected and organized Werther's writings, introduces the story by telling readers, "You cannot deny your admiration and love for [Werther's] spirit and character, nor your tears at his fate" (23). Werther's letters, then, are the focus of the narrative while the frame sets up the sentimental reaction to this content.

Unlike the editor, who devotes his attention to the object of his sentimentalism, Werther concentrates on his own emotions, the letters becoming the means through which he does so. Abbott notes this trend when he writes that Werther uses the letters to become the "constant advocate of his feelings of the moment" (31). Likewise, Maureen Harkin characterizes Werther as one of many sentimental protagonists who are "concern[ed] with their own responses, the state of their own hearts," rather than with the external stimulus that triggers the sentimental reaction (123). Readers can most clearly see Werther's tendency to foreground his own emotional experiences when he describes his interactions with Lotte, the woman with whom he is in love. Writing to his friend Wilhelm, Werther states, "There is a melody, a simple but moving air, which she plays on the piano ... the moment she plays the first note I feel delivered of all my pain, confusion and brooding fancies ... The darkness and madness of my soul are dispelled, and I breathe more freely again" (53). Though Lotte and the tune she is playing initiate Werther's sentimental response, his letters are centered around his feelings, implying that he is the focus of his own attention. In this

way, the novel's epistolarity is a means of expressing interior emotions, and the narrative structure portrays sentimentalism as primarily concerned with the sentimental protagonist, who is the object of both the narrative's and his own interest.

This emphasis on the self is an aspect of sentimentalism that troubles the ideals of sympathy and benevolence that De Voogd explains. While such ideals imply that a sentimental response is an admirable mark of virtue, *The Sorrows of Young Werther* also shows that over-indulging in emotions may result in self-destruction. Eric Parisot explores such interpretations of sentimentalism by examining suicide notes that were published in the eighteenth-century British press, and he points out some significant qualities that many of these documents share. For example, the authors of suicide notes often portrayed themselves as victims who were "subject to [an] inherently fragile constitution—an affliction beyond [their] control or design—and vulnerable to misfortunes acted upon [them] rather than liable for any misconduct acted by [them]" (287). Werther's suicide letter to Lotte also exhibits this sort of victimization as he explains the cause of his misery: "Once I was absent once more, and saw [your husband] at your side, I was disheartened ... and fell prey to feverish doubts" (127). Such language gives the impression that Werther cannot control his emotions or his fate, his sentimentalism overtaking him and exacerbating his selfabsorption so that he takes his own life. As the means through which Werther can articulate and conceptualize these dominating emotions, his letters ultimately further his focus on his own helplessness and confirm a view of sentimentalism as a dangerous experience.

Besides bringing his own interiority to the forefront, Werther's letters also elicit readers' sentimental emotions, just like the published suicide notes that Parisot analyzes. Parisot observes that published suicide notes offered "opportunities for [readers] to test their own capacity to feel and ... privileg[ed] the sentimental pleasures of sensibility over its fatal possibilities" (279). In

other words, when readers read a suicide note, their focus is turned away from the actual plight of the writer and towards their own elevated emotions, which become evidence of virtue and can even be an enjoyable experience. Werther's suicide note is no exception as it urges Lotte, readers, and all of "Nature" to "mourn ... for your son and friend and lover is nearing his end" (126). The audience's reactions constitute an essential part of the letter's function. Though some contemporary readers saw this sort of mourning as an idealistic sign of virtue, others criticized the lack of social action that resulted, believing that the trend "cut the sentimentalist off from actually *doing* anything about the deplorable situations" described in the suicide notes (Harkin 123). By contrast, Maureen Harkin suggests that action is not the goal of sentimentalism, but rather that the genre presents "non-action for its own sake" (127). In fact, Werther's helplessness and readers' inability to alleviate his suffering are precisely the conditions that allow the novel to elicit such intense emotions and become a sentimental text. Regardless of whether sentimentalism is dangerous, edifying, or unproductive, though, the use of letters in this work simultaneously emphasizes the protagonist's self-absorbed interiority and the readers' own emotional reactions, showing that the epistolary form here tends to prioritize the sentimentalist's role in sentimental interactions.

Conversely, Shelley complicates *Frankenstein's* epistolarity by altering its structure and function, and this artistic move sets up and distorts opposing portrayals of sentimentalism to create an interpenetrating binary. As stated earlier, such binaries are much like the Gothic relationships that Jerrold Hogle describes: "[The Gothic] is ... concerned with the interpenetration of ... opposed conditions—including life/death, natural/supernatural, ancient/modern, realistic/artificial, and conscious/unconscious" (9). These sorts of interpenetration suggest that a concept on one side of a binary could appear within or in tandem with its counterpart so that, while the concepts are still opposites, distinctions between them become more complex. Another example of how

interpenetration may work is evident in Jonathan Crimmins's analysis of *Frankenstein*, which situates sentimentalism in relation to another literary and cultural trend of the era, romanticism.

In his article, Crimmins identifies the romantic and the sentimental as aspects of the Gothic that are concerned with questions about individual consciousness. He traces these mindsets back to scholars such as Priestley, Lacan, and Godwin to conclude that romanticism tends to treat individual consciousness as the product of material and psychological influences while sentimentalism emphasizes how sociocultural and ideological factors affect the individual. This identification of sentimentalism with sociocultural influences here agrees with the definitions of sentimentalism that I have already highlighted since forming emotional connections with others would ideally cause individuals to conceive of themselves as part of a larger community. In the context of *Frankenstein*, Crimmins's analysis deems the Creature the symbol of the romantic because his isolation during his formative days compels him to learn about life and himself through "investigation of the material world" so that his "judgments [are] the result of sensation" (Crimmins 570). The Creature's creator, Victor, on the other hand, "orients his narrative ideologically and grounds it in the domestic" because he recognizes that social forces have shaped his selfhood (573). This difference between the romantic and sentimental "vectors" prompts both the Creature's and Victor's unsuccessful attempts to "master the principles of the opposing vector" since each vector "feels the influence of what it cannot acknowledge" (569). In the end, Crimmins claims that "[m]aterialist principles cross ideological boundaries, and ideological principles cross material borders," but each vector still "undermines the status of the other" because the novel presents no effective "mediation" or middle ground between them (579-80).

This Gothic interpenetration of binary concepts applies not only to the distinction between romanticism and sentimentalism that Crimmins articulates, but also to the various functions of

sentimentalism itself. The distortion that interpenetration can create is evident in *Frankenstein's* multi-level, epistolary structure, which creates what Criscilla Benford describes as “the inassimilable” (336). Benford explains that the inassimilable is any element of a text, such as a character or a narrative technique, that “calls attention to the incompatibility of two or more social sense-making frames” (336). Since the inassimilable brings multiple “sense-making frames” or ways of thinking into conflict with one another, I assert that it can also juxtapose the two opposing functions of sentimentalism as both a selfless and self-centered practice (336). Therefore, in order to understand how the inassimilable reveals the dualities of sentimentalism in this text, readers must examine how Shelley uses the epistolary form to complicate the portrayal of sentimentalism that Goethe’s epistolarity affords.

Sentimentalism in *Frankenstein* retains many of the functions that it exhibits in *The Sorrows of Young Werther*, but it also entails a turning outward from the self that Werther’s letters do not illustrate, moving beyond the sentimentalist’s interiority to foreground the stimulus to which the sentimentalist responds. This shift in, or addition to, the earlier epistolary depiction of sentimentalism is apparent in the fact that *Frankenstein's* epistolarity is moved to the periphery of the narrative structure. The letters form the frame while the uninterrupted, first-person style characterizes inner narrative levels. Robert Walton, the author of the framing letters written to his sister, begins the story by relating his preparations for an exploratory mission into the Arctic as well as his “half pleasurable and half fearful” emotions and his lonely longing for a friend (56). Like Werther, Walton initially uses his letters to communicate his own emotional state, yet, upon meeting the haggard Victor Frankenstein alone in the Arctic, Walton’s attention turns away from himself and towards Victor. Walton observes, “I never saw a more interesting creature: his eyes have generally an expression of wildness . . . but there are moments when . . . his whole countenance

is lighted up ... with a beam of benevolence” (59). Victor is here functioning as the external stimulus that prompts Walton to react with feeling, and the narrator’s focus on Victor rather than himself forwards a view of sentimentalism that emphasizes the object of the sentimentalist’s emotions.

In showing outwardly focused sentimentalism, Walton mimics the fictional editor from *The Sorrows of Young Werther* by using the frame to set up the emotional response to Victor’s story, which becomes the focal point of the narrative: “I [feel] the greatest eagerness to hear [Victor’s] promised narrative, partly from curiosity, and partly from a strong desire to ameliorate his fate” (62). Since this outer frame is composed of letters, the novel’s epistolarity becomes the means of performing outwardly focused sentimental response, so much so that the epistolary form subsides to make room for the first-person narrative to which it is reacting. Jeanne Britton recognizes this transition’s emotional import by stating, “*Frankenstein* offers a version of sympathy that is constituted by the production and transmission of narrative as compensation for the failures of face-to-face sympathetic experience” (3). In other words, Britton sees Walton’s desire to write Victor’s story as a desire to exercise sympathy, and Shelley’s replacing of Walton’s epistolarity with Victor’s first-person narrative demonstrates the sentimentalist’s turning away from the self to forge an emotional bond with the object of his sentimentalism.

Britton’s usage of the term “sympathy” should not be confused with sentimentalism, though, because the two concepts have some key differences that alter the implications of the novel’s structure. According to Britton, sympathy in Romantic-era Europe was “a phenomenon in which one element comes to resemble another ... [through] imaginative shifts in perspective” (6). The receding of the novel’s epistolarity to present Victor’s narrative clearly models the sympathetic process as Walton takes on Victor’s perspective in order to identify with him. Yet, Britton also

asserts that this sympathy fails because Walton does not heed Victor's injunction to kill the Creature at the end of the story, an act that would allow Walton's sympathy to play out in the material world. Britton claims that as Victor's "narrative level conclude[s], and the [epistolary] level resumes ... a lack of sympathy is expressed" through Walton's inaction, deeming sympathy a practice contingent on material action performed by the sympathizer (15).

However, as readers have seen in Harkin's analysis of *The Sorrows of Young Werther*, sentimentalism is not defined by action, but rather by inaction since the inability of the reader to intervene in the unfolding tragedy heightens the intensity of that reader's sentimental emotions. Such a concern with inaction is also evident in Cassandra Falke's examination of "the dual position that the reader [of *Frankenstein*] ... occupies as judge and confidant" since the reader is simultaneously a third party who observes the events that the letters chronicle and an addressee who receives Walton's letters (61). Falke argues that readers' third-party position implies that "[t]here is no way for [them] to affect the characters or situations [they] read about," much like the readers of suicide notes described above (63). Though Falke does not connect such inaction to issues of sentimentalism, the reader's role as a confidant who can practice "empathy and nonjudgmental reception" suggests that the judge and confidant roles could be interdependent, with the third-party observer's inability to act perhaps exacerbating the empathetic impulses of the confidant (61). Rather than signaling Walton's failure to perform empathetic action, then, *Frankenstein's* resuming of epistolarity has a much more practical explanation in terms of sentimentalism: Victor's narrative, the object of Walton's sentimentalism, has ended.

Because Victor has finished telling his story, the external stimulus that triggers Walton's sentimental reaction is removed, and Walton's outwardly focused sentimentalism ends, causing him to return to his own narrative format. He does not fulfill his initial desire to "ameliorate

[Victor's] fate" (62), but this lack of action does not bar Walton from sentimentalism since, as in the case of Werther and the readers of published suicide notes, the impossibility of productive action contributes to the intense feelings that characterize sentimentalism. Granted, Walton does have the option to obey Victor's final request, but such an action would undermine Walton's sentimentalism since, when meeting the Creature at the end of the novel, Walton has a sentimental reaction to him as well. Walton describes, "My first impulses, which had suggested to me the duty of obeying the dying request of [Victor], in destroying his enemy, were now suspended by a mixture of curiosity and compassion" (217). Walton cannot answer Victor's call for action because to do so would be to bring harm to another object of sentimentalism. Since Walton has conflicting impulses in this moment, productive action is not possible, and Victor's, the Creature's, and Walton's own helplessness solidify Walton's sentimental emotions. So, while Britton's reading of sympathy in *Frankenstein* hinges on the completion of material action, inaction is the driving force behind sentimentalism as the framed, epistolary form of the novel encapsulates an outwardly focused sentimentalism in a way that Goethe's earlier epistolarity does not.

Nevertheless, to regard sentimentalism as solely centered on an external stimulus is to neglect *Frankenstein's* propensity to distort binary concepts. In order to understand how the novel distorts conceptions of inwardly and outwardly trained sentimentalism, one can turn to Benford's notion of "inassimilable" narrative features that contrast multiple "social sense-making frames" or, in this case, varying conceptions of sentimentalism (336). By bringing these two forms of sentimentalism together to highlight the conflicts between them, the inassimilable elements of *Frankenstein* also place the two types of sentimentalism in conversation with each other so that they form an interpenetrating binary. In this way, *Frankenstein's* multi-level, epistolary structure can formally encapsulate both forms of sentimentalism as they conflict with and complicate each

other. Granted, Goethe's text allows readers to observe more than one type of sentimentalism as well, given that Werther's self-absorption is balanced by the fictional editor, whose selfeffacement makes way for the protagonist's narrative. Yet, Werther's letters do not perform such a turning outward as they can only be their own narrative, not contain another character's narrative level. This aspect of the letters prevents the epistolarity of Goethe's novel from engaging in the externally centered sentimentalism that its non-epistolary frame exhibits.

Likewise, the frame of Goethe's text does not communicate the kind of interiority with which Walton's letters begin. The editor instead remains entirely focused on Werther, noting, "I wish very much that we had enough of our friend's own testimony, concerning the last remarkable days of his life, to render it unnecessary for me to interrupt this series of preserved letters with narration" (106). This language not only maintains the self-effacing function of the frame, but also obscures the identity of the editor. Burwick reads the editor figure as Werther's friend Wilhelm, who, as the addressee of Werther's letters, would presumably possess and organize them for readers to read. Burwick writes, "Werther's friend Wilhelm appeals in his preface to the admiration, love and compassion of his readers" (48), emphasizing the heightened emotions of sentimentalism. However, the identity of the self-effacing editor is never patent in this novel, and readers cannot definitively label the editor as Wilhelm since the singular editor is often pluralized, the "I" transitioning into a "we" frequently throughout the outer frame (106). Rather than grappling with the identity of the editor figure, then, the frame is concerned with an outwardly focused sentimentalism while the inner letters primarily exhibit a self-absorbed sentimentalism. Both forms of sentimentalism are present in the text, but they are restricted to their respective portions of the narrative structure.

By contrast, Shelley positions the epistolary form in the outer frame rather than in the inner narrative levels and, thereby, endows epistolarity with the ability to express Walton's interiority *and* facilitate externally focused sentimental response. This inassimilable feature brings the two forms of sentimentalism together to foreground the conflict between them as well as their capacity to interpenetrate. The dual function of Walton's letters is evident when he returns to the epistolary form at the end of the novel. Once Walton finishes his outward response to Victor's story, another stimulus, Victor's death, soon initiates another sentimental reaction. Rather than practicing an externally focused sentimentalism this time, Walton focuses on his own emotional state by writing to his sister, "What can I say that will enable you to understand the depths of my sorrow ... My tears flow; my mind is overshadowed by a cloud of disappointment" (217). The letters, which formerly subsided to make way for Victor's narrative level, are now focused on Victor's death as an event that is significant for Walton. In other words, the letters can both contain other narratives and chronicle Walton's own story and emotions. As Jessica Hanssen states, "Walton's narrative is in the first person, with all of intimacy of the first-person confessional, [but] it also achieves a sense of third-person omnipresence" as his letters assume a duality that Goethe's epistolarity does not (102). Such duality in Walton's letters obscures definitive formal distinctions between the two manifestations of sentimentalism, highlighting how the two concepts simultaneously compete and interpenetrate to form the sort of Gothic binaries discussed earlier. Of course, each form of sentimentalism conflicts with the other because they represent the opposing philosophies of selflessness and self-interest, and since the novel never blends selfless and self-centered experiences into one coherent view of sentimentalism that has clear ethical implications, the concepts remain distinct and opposed. However, their coexistence and distortion within the framing letters still suggests that neither can fully encapsulate sentimentalism on its own or exist

in entire isolation from the possibility of the other, so the two forms of sentimentalism become an interpenetrating binary in which distinctions between opposing concepts are complicated.

Moreover, beyond Walton's framing letters, some of the narratives that his letters contain are in letter form themselves, and the presence of these letters is another inassimilable narrative feature that contrasts and distorts the two forms of sentimentalism. These letters are embedded in Victor's narrative level because they contain key information that moves his story along. His first letter from his future wife, Elizabeth, for example, relates the story of the servant Justine while his father writes a letter to explain the circumstances surrounding the death of Victor's younger brother William. The facts contained in these letters just so happen to be of use when readers discover that Justine is convicted for William's death, but besides bringing relevant information to readers' attention, these letters also interrupt Victor's continuous narrative with epistolarity. As Victor focuses his attention on the letters, the external stimuli to which he is sentimentally responding, his narrative effaces itself to make way for the object of his sentimentalism, much like the editor's frame in Goethe's novel. The epistolarity within Victor's narrative level is quite brief, yet it still harkens back to the older model of epistolarity that *The Sorrows of Young Werther* uses, mimicking and manipulating Goethe's portrayal of sentimentalism as a result.

Readers will remember that Goethe's use of a non-epistolary frame casts sentimentalism as an outwardly focused response while the inner epistolarity works to underscore Werther's self-centered emotional experiences. Though Victor's narrative level does follow the trend of embedding epistolarity within a non-epistolary frame, the implications that this format creates differ significantly in Shelley's text. First of all, the self-effacement of Victor's non-epistolary narrative is counteracted by his intense emotional reactions after reading these letters, reactions that render him, like Werther, a narrator who indulges "the full and immediate expression of [his]

feelings of the moment” (Abbott 29). Upon learning of William’s death, for instance, Victor “[can] hardly sustain the multitude of feelings that crow[d] into [his] mind” (Shelley 97). Similarly, Elizabeth’s second letter, in which she relieves him from the obligation of marrying her, causes him to contemplate his anticipated death at the hands of the Creature even as “some softened feelings [steal] into [his] heart” (192). Such a focus on Victor’s interiority undermines the formal suggestion of externally centered sentimentalism and distorts the cultural value, complicating the relationship between this social ideal and the novel’s form.

Another inassimilable element in *Frankenstein* that brings up tensions between the two forms of sentimentalism is Safie’s narrative, which is neither entirely epistolary nor entirely nonepistolary and, therefore, distorts sentimentalism even further. The ambiguity of this narrative’s form results from the story of its creation. Safie is an Arabian woman whose father is rescued from prison by the Frenchman Felix De Lacey, and, as a result, Safie and Felix become engaged. Safie does not speak French, so she enlists “the aid of an old man ... who underst[ands] French” to write letters to Felix on her behalf, so she can “express her thoughts in the language of her lover” (138). Through a series of tragic circumstances, the lovers are separated, so Felix must long for his betrothed as he lives in exile with the rest of the De Lacey family, whom the Creature is observing from afar, until Safie finally locates and joins the family. Safie’s letters to Felix are, therefore, present in the De Lacey household, and the Creature creates copies so that he can fully understand Safie’s and Felix’s history. The exact content of these letters is difficult to discern since they do not appear in their original form in the novel. Rather, the Creature summarizes them within his own narrative level and tells Victor, “Before I depart, I will give [my copies] to you, they will prove the

truth of my tale” (138). Safie’s letters here draw on the Gothic trope of the found manuscript⁶ in which the discovery of a document lends a story veracity. Tomasz Sawczuk notes that this trope is central to the novel as Walton’s letters collectively become a “textual artifact” that positions itself as real to the readers’ world to create a sense of authenticity while Walton “endors[es] other documents presented to him by Victor,” like Safie’s letters (227). Though Safie’s narrative functions as a corroborating document, her story has a variety of manifestations: the letters that she dictates, the Creature’s copies, and the Creature’s summary within his narrative level. The epistolary document that is so crucial to the story’s alleged credibility is absent from the narrative structure, and this inassimilable narrative feature once again highlights conflicts between the two forms of sentimentalism in a way that distorts the cultural value.

In terms of the letters that Safie dictates, readers cannot discern whether her emotions are trained on Felix or herself as she “thank[s] [Felix] in the most ardent terms ... [and] gently deplore[s] her own fate” of being trapped in a harem (138). The formal absence of the letters prevents a modelling of sentimentalism through Safie’s language, so the characterization of the cultural value in the original letters remains vague. On the other hand, the Creature’s transcribing of the letters signals the desire to sympathize that Britton’s analysis of *Frankenstein* emphasizes. The copied version models the Creature’s turning his attention away from himself to recreate the letters in their original form, just like Walton’s adoption of Victor’s non-epistolary style shows an

⁶ One notable example of this trope includes the framing device in Horace Walpole’s *The Castle of Otranto* (1764), in which an editor claims to have discovered a manuscript that contains the succeeding story. Although this editor does not present the story itself as nonfiction, the notion that the manuscript is a work by a historical writer creates the illusion that the story and the language are authentic samples of fiction from an earlier time. In fact, such found document tropes so are prevalent throughout Gothic literature that Jane Austen’s *Northanger Abbey* (1818), a work that satirizes the Gothic, incorporates a humorous scene in which the protagonist discovers a manuscript that she hopes will contain a dramatic story, but actually contains nothing more than washing bills.

outwardly focused sentimental response. So, the Creature here performs self-effacing or outwardly trained sentimentalism, yet his copies are not present in the narrative structure, preventing this externally centered sentimentalism from formally impacting the novel. The Creature instead narrates Safie's narrative himself, and this choice foregrounds his own voice rather than prompting the self-erasure that the epistolary form of Safie's story would allow. The simultaneously epistolary and non-epistolary nature of Safie's narrative, therefore, draws attention to the varying relationships between sentimentalists and the stimuli to which these sentimentalists react, complicating depictions of sentimentalism in the process.

The complexity of sentimentalism is even more evident when readers consider whether sentimentalism in this novel is functioning as a sign of virtue or as an invitation for destructive behavior. In the case of Safie's story, Joyce Zonana reads the female character's narrative "silence," or the absence of the actual letters, as a rhetorical move on Shelley's part since "silence enacts women's resistance to acts of appropriation," such as the reading or writing of someone else's narrative (180). Zonana, then, sees the Creature's copied letters as possessive rather than as evidence of an externally focused sentimentalism, and had the epistolary form of this narrative been included in the novel, epistolarity could have become a vehicle for readers to exploit Safie's story as an exercise for their own sentimental capacities. Thus, Zonana implies that sentimentalism could be a destructive practice in this instance.

Furthermore, the damaging possibilities of sentimental interactions are augmented by Victor's death and the Creature's anticipated death, with each character experiencing heightened emotions to the point of mental breakdown, which wears down Victor's health and drives the Creature to vow suicide. The novel's tragic ending is reminiscent of Werther's death as the protagonists fall victim to their own miseries, but Shelley presents an alternative to this fate that

Goethe's text does not. Though Victor and the Creature are driven to their own destruction, Walton has been able to hear their stories and has the capacity to learn from their experiences. Unlike the "cloistered" Werther, who "shores up his identity against alteration or growth," as well as the anonymous fictional editor, whose lack of self-expression keeps him from having a character arc, Walton can use Victor's and the Creature's narratives to assess his own virtue and become aware of the pitfalls that trapped his fellow characters (Abbott 31). The novel's peripheral epistolarity puts Walton in a position to use his sentimental responses to foster his own virtue if he so chooses, so sentimentalism has the potential to become an edifying practice for him. Zonana, by contrast, might see such sentimentalism as proof that the cultural ideal can benefit the sentimentalist, but not the object of the sentimental response, while Harkin's insistence on sentimental inaction "shelve[s] old questions about whether ... sentiment encourages or discourages the solving of ... problems by showing that the relationship of feeling to acting is such a tenuous one" (135). These and many other interpretations of sentimentalism's ethics are all applicable to *Frankenstein*, and the point here is that the Gothic novel's use of epistolarity encourages such multiform depictions of and views on sentimentalism.

Therefore, Shelley's appropriation and manipulation of epistolary structures underscores the evolving relationships between literary forms and cultural values in *Frankenstein*. The text certainly draws on the formal and thematic qualities of Goethe's previous work, but by relegating the epistolary form to the outer frame, Shelley's novel allows the letters to model both externally and inwardly focused sentimentalism in a way that complicates the epistolary function modelled by Goethe's work. *Frankenstein*'s experimentation with narrative structure not only makes the text a prime site for analyzing the interpretive possibilities that epistolarity affords, but it also provides insight into the Gothic's capacity to distort social ideals like sentimentalism. Hence, the

intersections between epistolarity and sentimentalism contribute to the novel's notorious elusiveness, providing yet another reason why literary critics keep coming back to this text centuries after its inception.

Works Cited

- Abbott, H. Porter. "Letters to the Self: The Cloistered Writer in Nonretrospective Fiction." *PMLA*, vol. 95, no. 1, Jan. 1980, pp. 23-41. *JSTOR*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/461731>.
- Benford, Criscilla. "'Listen to my tale': Multilevel Structure, Narrative Sense Making, and the Inassimilable in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*." *Narrative*, vol. 18, no. 3, October 2010, pp. 324-46. *JSTOR*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40856416>.
- Britton, Jeanne M. "Novelistic Sympathy in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*." *Studies in Romanticism*, vol. 48, no. 1, Spring 2009, pp. 3-22. *JSTOR*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25602177>.
- Burwick, Roswitha. "Goethe's *Werther* and Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*." *The Wordsworth Circle*, vol. 24, no. 1, Winter 1993, pp. 47-52. *MLA International Bibliography*, doi: [10.1086/twc24043101](https://doi.org/10.1086/twc24043101).
- Crimmins, Jonathan. "Mediation's Slight of Hand: The Two Vectors of the Gothic in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*." *Studies in Romanticism*, vol. 52, no. 4, Winter 2013, pp. 561-83. *JSTOR*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24247264>.
- Falke, Cassandra. "*Frankenstein*'s Reader as Judge and Confidant." *Litteraria Pragensia*, vol. 28, no. 56, 2018, pp. 60-70. *Humanities International Complete*, <https://proxy.library.ohio.edu/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=2019831045&site=eds-live&scope=site>.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. *The Sorrows of Young Werther*. Translated by Michael Hulse, Penguin Books, 1989.

- Hanssen, Jessica Allen. "'Unnatural' Narratology, Frame Narrative, and Intertextuality in *Frankenstein*." *Litteraria Pragensia*, vol. 28, no. 56, 2018, pp. 97-109. *Humanities International Complete*, <https://proxy.library.ohio.edu/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hlh&AN=136704225&site=eds-live&scope=site>.
- Harkin, Maureen. "Virtue Not Rewarded: *The Man of Feeling* and *The Sorrows of Young Werther*." *The Sentimental Novel in the Eighteenth Century*, edited by Albert J. Rivero, Cambridge UP, 2019, pp. 123-37. *Cambridge Core*, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108292375.008>.
- Hogle, Jerrold E. "Introduction: The Gothic in Western Culture." *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction*, edited by Jerrold E. Hogle, Cambridge UP, 2002, pp. 1-20.
- Hudson, Hannah Doherty. "Sentiment and the Gothic: Failures of Emotion in the Novels of Mrs. Radcliffe and the Minerva Press." *The Sentimental Novel in the Eighteenth Century*, edited by Albert J. Rivero, Cambridge U., 2019, pp. 123-37. *Cambridge Core*, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108292375.010>.
- Martin, Kirsten. "In Want of Keeping: Painting and the Sympathetic Imagination of *Frankenstein*." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, vol. 32, no. 4, Summer 2020, pp. 599-618. *MLA International Bibliography*, doi: [10.3138/ecf.32.4.599](https://doi.org/10.3138/ecf.32.4.599).
- Parisot, Eric. "Suicide Notes and Popular Sensibility in Eighteenth-Century British Press." *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 47, no. 3, Spring 2014, pp. 277-91. *JSTOR*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24690288>.

Rosa, Luis Othoniel. "Taking a Risk: Wound-Readers: Derrida and Frankenstein's Monster."

Canadian Review of Comparative Literature, vol. 38, no. 4, 2011, pp. 463-81. *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature*,

<https://journals.library.ualberta.ca/crcil/index.php/crcil/article/view/24589>.

Sawczuk, Tomasz. "Taking Horror as You Find It: From Found Manuscripts to Found Footage

Aesthetics." *Text Matters*, vol. 10, no. 10, 2020, pp. 223-35. *Central and Eastern*

European Academic Source, <https://doi.org/10.18778/2083-2931.10.14>.

Schiffman, Robyn L. "A Concert of Werthers." *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 43, no. 2, Winter

2010, pp. 207-22. *JSTOR*, <https://www-jstor-org.proxy.library.ohio.edu/stable/25642182>.

---. "Werther and the Epistolary Novel." *European Romantic Review*, vol. 19, no. 4, 2008, pp. 421-

38. *MLA International Bibliography*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509580802407318>.

Shelley, Mary. *Frankenstein*. Edited by Macdonald and Scherf, 3rd ed., Broadview, 2012.

Shin, Hyewon. "The Specter of Orality in *Frankenstein* and *Patchwork Girl*." *Studies in the*

Novel, vol. 49, no. 4, 2017, pp. 538-58. *Project MUSE*,

<https://doi.org/10.1353/sdn.2017.0046>.

Thornburg, Mary K. Patterson. *The MONSTER in the Mirror: Gender and the*

Sentimental/Gothic Myth in Frankenstein. UMI Research Press, 1984.

Voogd, Peter de. "Sentimental Horrors: Feeling in the Gothic Novel." *Exhibited by Candlelight:*

Sources and Developments in the Gothic Tradition, ed. by Valeria Tinkler-Villani and Peter

Davidson, Editions Rodopi B.V., 1995.

Zonana, Joyce. "'They Will Prove the Truth of My Tale': Safie's Letters as the Feminist Core of

Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*." *The Journal of Narrative Technique*, vol. 21, no. 2, Spring

1991, 170-84. *JSTOR*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/30225329>.

Hope Siler is a second-year PhD student at Ohio University. Her research interests include Victorian literature, narratology, and documentary novels. Besides her focus in Victorian studies, Hope is also interested in exploring the evolution of documentary novels over time.

Media Review

Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde: A Maligned Video Game Masterpiece

Wyatt Rogers

With innumerable adaptations, *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886) by Robert Louis Stevenson endures as a cornerstone of the Victorian Gothic literary canon. Adapting the complexities and nuances of Jekyll's troubling scientific discovery and consequent double-life is no easy feat. While film and stage productions have historically functioned as popular and accessible vehicles for creative adaptation, the viewer is sorely limited by their role as a spectator. However, there exists one medium that encourages active participation from its audience—electronic video games. 1988's *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, developed by Advanced Communication, Co. and published by Toho, is a rarity, being one of relatively few games inspired by the novella.

Although most adaptations of Stevenson's novella have been met with mixed reception, this particular title on the Nintendo Entertainment System (NES) has garnered infamy among retro gamers as an unplayable trainwreck, often cited as one of the worst video games ever conceived. The general consensus is that, while the game attempts to translate the essence of the story into an interactive format, it falls short in several key areas. Common criticism stems from how the game's central mechanics fail to capture the rich themes and moral ambiguity present in Stevenson's work. Notoriously unforgiving difficulty also leads gamers to abandon the title altogether out of frustration, bolstering its reputation. Yet, upon further analysis, I vehemently disagree with its detractors—in fact, I consider the game to be a much-maligned masterpiece. While evidently flawed, *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* cleverly experiments with duality as a gaming concept, critiquing

violent aspects of player behavior that have been traditionally “rewarded” in the context of the medium—Konami’s classic run-and-gun, *Contra* (1987), springs to mind. *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*’s structure inadvertently critiques violence and power fantasies while its jarring transitions between two characters highlight the instability of player control and identification.

Before unraveling the game from an analytic and philosophical view, it is imperative to understand the overall premise of this adaptation, its general mechanics, and initial takeaways. With over one hundred years between the publication of the novella and the development of the game, changes are immediately apparent. The original instruction manual offers the player with a rough preface of the story:

Dr. Jekyll has been researching the human mind, and has found that it contains two opposite elements: Good and Evil. After years of experimentation, Dr. Jekyll succeeds in creating a potion which separates these two elements of the personality—and decides to test the potion on himself! When he does, the normally kind and intelligent Dr. Jekyll is transformed into the brutal and savage Mr. Hyde. The good Dr. Jekyll soon has difficulty controlling his transformations into the evil Mr. Hyde, and he finds that the two sides of his personality are in conflict for control of his mind. (2)

This rough summation is serviceable, but admittedly at odds with its source material. The novella makes the case that Jekyll is not solely righteous, though Mr. Hyde is undoubtedly wicked. Stevenson establishes this early in the novella when Enfield recounts his walk home “from some place at the end of the world” at three in the morning to his cousin, Utterson. He notes “a little man who was stumping along eastward at a good walk” and “a girl of maybe eight or ten who was running as hard as she was able down a cross street.” As the two of them violently collide, Enfield recalls, “the horrible part of the thing; for the man trampled calmly over the child’s body and left

her screaming on the ground” (Stevenson 7). In the aftermath, Enfield forces Hyde to pay one hundred pounds to avoid a scandal, which is done through a check signed by the reputable Dr. Jekyll, Utterson’s client. Although Jekyll does not violently trample the little girl, his association with Hyde and refusal to completely disavow him despite his cruelty suggests a moral ambiguity. Utterson is convinced that Jekyll is a victim of blackmail, masking the reality that his reluctance to sever ties with Hyde implies a darker, impure aspect to his character. Jekyll’s continual embrace of the effects of his serum reaches a point of no return when he begins to metamorphose into Hyde without consciously drinking it:

I had gone to bed Henry Jekyll, I had awakened Edward Hyde. How was this to be explained? I asked myself; and then, with another bound of terror—how was it to be remedied? It was well on in the morning; the servants were up; all my drugs were in the cabinet. (68)

Jekyll recounts the horrific and uncontrollable process of transforming into Hyde, though he foolishly continues experimenting with it, suggesting a willingness to explore and indulge in evil. His appearance, “pale and dwarfish” and distinct in the way “he gave an impression of deformity without any nameable malformation” (18) indicates Jekyll’s fragile moral integrity, as he knowingly engages in activities that result in Hyde’s release. His grotesque appearance and bizarre mannerisms mirror his morality, reinforcing a fascination with physiognomy at the time, supported by Utterson’s remark that “if ever I read Satan’s signature upon a face, it is on that of your new friend” (18). Hyde is the embodiment of wickedness and impulsiveness who continues to grow in stature and influence as Jekyll willingly embraces him, functioning on primal emotions, bereft of the reasonability associated with his counterpart.

The manual proceeds to outline the central characters within the video game; however, all of them appear to be creative additions, primarily serving as obstacles. There's Billy Pones, a slingshot sniper who has a crush on Dr. Jekyll's fiancée; The Bomb Maniac, a mysterious man who pops up everywhere to create explosions; Elena McCowen, a tone-deaf singer whose music notes are quite literally harmful; Rosette Ranright, the only daughter of Dr. Jekyll's friend, Lord Ranright; Arnold Ebetts, a hunting maniac who always carries his rifle around and shoots haphazardly; Jan, a strange old man who can be found digging holes in the street and shoveling the dirt onto passers-by; and Rachel, a beautiful widow who pines for Dr. Jekyll because he resembles her late husband. These figures serve as central enemies within the NES adaptation, all of whom disrupt the player's progress. Although outlined as singular characters, they make numerous appearances within the same level. There are notable omissions from the novella, including Gabriel Utterson, Richard Enfield, Dr. Hastie Lanyon, and Mr. Poole. As this list of names makes clear, there is only a loose connection to Stevenson's original characters. According to the official manual for the game: "Dr. Jekyll is in a merry mood as he leaves his house on a fine London morning—the day he is going to marry his fiancée, the beautiful Miss Millicent. Dr. Jekyll's only goal is to get to church on time!" (5). Miss Millicent happens to be the daughter of Sir *George Carew*, who is known as Sir *Danvers Carew* in the original novella, and one of Hyde's victims. She was originally introduced in the 1920 film adaptation of the novella.

Unfortunately, the daylight journey through London's streets with which the game begins is perilous for our protagonist, whose only armament is a cane; navigating from left to right, several townspeople, animals, and obstacles obstruct his path. Contrary to most 2D platformers, Jekyll's attacks are ineffectual. His primary means of defense is avoiding confrontation. As Jekyll sustains damage, his life meter depletes and his anger meter fills. Once the meter is completely filled, Jekyll

is overwhelmed by stress and transforms into Hyde. Here, the gameplay shifts drastically. Hyde navigates a demon-infested inversion of London at night. In fact, the level design is a mirror image of Jekyll's level as the player now autoscrolls from right to left. The manual explicitly claims that "This contrast between the worlds of Good and Evil is one of the most important features of this game" (3). While fists function as a suitable means of offense, Hyde has a unique ability known as the "Psycho Wave," a feature proudly advertised on the game's packaging. This curved projectile, which "flies through the air in a curved path" and returns "like a boomerang" (12), is easily the most efficient means to dispose of foes. As Hyde plows through an arrangement of growingly diabolical fiends, his anger abates and Jekyll resumes consciousness with roughly seventy percent of his life replenished. A distinguishing, and admittedly fascinating conditional gameplay mechanic, is that if Hyde advances to the equivalent position Jekyll reached in London, "the Powers That Be will intervene and shoot a thunderbolt down from the sky to eliminate Jekyll and Hyde, and the game will be over!" (5). While this may seem confusing, the objective of the game can be summarized as follows: Advance as far as possible as Jekyll and transform back from Hyde swiftly in order to reach the church, marry your beloved, and have good triumph over evil.

Having described the general gameplay, I will now argue that a methodical dissection of the title leads me to conclude this game deserves reputational redemption. Its notorious level design, cryptic objectives, and arbitrary obstacles parallel the confounding and tragic transformations in Stevenson's novella. I consider the game to exist in a separate timeline from the novella—one in which Jekyll fights tooth and nail for redemption and a happy ending as he overcomes the tumultuous force within him. Two of the most echoed complaints toward the game is that Jekyll's movement is stiff and, though his cane has a dedicated button, it is useless against the enemies he encounters. These perceived drawbacks are of metaphorical significance. In the

novella, Jekyll, dedicated to maintaining his composure and status as an affluent, intelligent, and successful member of Victorian society, never exercises his violent tendencies on those around him. Meanwhile, Hyde exercises violence openly after having experienced a prolonged period of caged dormancy, using his cane to brutally murder Sir Danvers Carew, a seventy-year-old member of Parliament. Carew's maid recounts the encounter in graphic detail:

And then all of a sudden he broke out in a great flame of anger, stamping with his foot, brandishing the cane, and carrying on (as the maid described it) like a madman. The old gentleman took a step back ... and at that Mr. Hyde broke out of all bounds and clubbed him to the earth. And next moment, with ape-like fury, he was trampling his victim under foot and hailing down a storm of blows, under which the bones were audibly shattered and the body jumped upon the roadway. (25)

In the game's revisionist timeline, Carew is still alive and well for no definitive reason, though it would surely be awkward to conceal the murder of your prospective father-in-law in the face of your fiancée at the altar.

In a metatextual fashion, the player's frustrations toward Jekyll's limitations are emblematic of human experience. We, as the player, experience the rigidity of unflinchingly maintaining a social role in a classist society. Often described as tedious, repetitive, and unforgiving, Jekyll's daytime levels mirror the mindset and lifestyle of the doctor, fearing besmirching his reputation as a member of the Victorian elite. He cannot indulge in immoral desire, suppresses his violent ideations, and bears the burden of social expectation, hence his experimentation with the serum as an escape. Fittingly, the player is denied the opportunity to inflict harm on Jekyll's adversaries although a defined button is there for the cane. An immediate impulse to initiate an attack on any perceived threat mirrors contemporary video game logic,

something ingrained for decades at this point. But *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* condemns traditional gaming sensibilities, grounding the player by stripping them of the empowering trappings of immersive and fantastical worlds that video games afford. Though the ability to manipulate an avatar is evocative of undertaking the role of God—a moral one in this case—this game will not allow such a fantasy to triumph. Using the cane against civilians expedites Jekyll’s transformation into Hyde, leaving him vulnerable during the attack’s frame window—the animation of his cane thrusting forward and returning to his side. As Jekyll cannot simultaneously move and attack, the timed animation locks him in place. This mechanic cleverly punishes the player for exercising cruelty over even-temperedness, maintaining thematic accuracy. Fascinatingly, the game incorporates a currency system in which Hyde, upon defeating an enemy, can collect a coin that can be used during Jekyll’s segments, in “more civilized” fashion, to bribe enemies to leave. The player’s imperative role is to guide Jekyll to his wedding at the church by avoiding confrontation. Violence is not fruitful, nor does it afford progress.

Conversely, many critics of the game reference the Hyde sections as being more entertaining, lamenting the fact that they result in the ultimate penalty, a game over, if they persist for an elongated period. As Hyde, players are finally afforded the opportunity to move fluidly, unleash potent attacks, and experience a more traditional gameplay loop. This aligns with Jekyll’s perspective of transforming into Hyde: “There was something strange in my sensations, something indescribably new and, from its very novelty, incredibly sweet. I felt younger, lighter, happier in body; within I was conscious of a heady recklessness, ... an unknown but not an innocent freedom of the soul” (64). How fitting is this? Players seek refuge from the dull world of Jekyll in favor of Hyde’s destructive jaunts through a macabre London. It is easy for the player to become lost in the frantic sidescrolling gameplay—blasting away demons and jumping over obstacles with far more

finesse— dismissing the jeopardy that our protagonist is in. The developers captured the essence of Hyde’s liberating recklessness. Graphically, the colors appear richer and the sprites more abstract, “sensual” in their own right. Many of the demons the player encounters are borderline Lovecraftian in nature, notably Shepp and Eproschka, defined by tendrils, wings, and grotesque shapes.

In Chapter 10 of the novella, Jekyll states, “I was slowly losing hold of my original and better self, and becoming slowly incorporated with my second and worse” (70). Engaging in darker impulses is tempting, but comes at a cost. In Bandai’s game, Hyde advances to the left regardless of the user’s directional input, evoking an additional lack of control Jekyll has over his alter ego. Jekyll has some semblance of free-will; Hyde advances forward with reckless abandon in the name of carnage. In order to succeed, the player must carefully balance the forces of good and evil, exercising their own temperance and subduing their own gaming impulses—literally embodying the predicament of Jekyll.

Such duality extends to the final section of the game, in which there are two endings— ambitious and innovative for a game from 1988. To get the “normal” ending, you walk Jekyll to church without Hyde ever catching up, and you win. To get the “good” ending (which to me is more a “true” ending), you have to advance Jekyll to the street stage (Stage 6, the final stage), then, unintuitively, take enough damage to trigger his transformation into Hyde—remember, these stages are to be avoided to prevent a potential game over. Bizarrely, the framework of the game is shaken up—Jekyll and Hyde now present themselves as separate characters, not two beings vying for control. Hyde will climb on the rooftops, allowing him to “pass over” Jekyll, so that they never intersect and no lightning strikes to kill the player. This is the only level in which the player is rewarded for making progress with Hyde, the final destination being a church silhouetted,

Castlevania-like, by the light of the moon. This conjures a boss fight where Hyde confronts Letule, a disembodied head symbolic of the ultimate evil harbored within. After carefully weaving through fireballs, contending with unpredictable teleportation, and dealing enough damage with the “Psycho Wave,” Letule explodes with the crisp staccato of the NES sound chip. In the Japanese release of the game, a small silhouette appears, hanging from the crumbling cross on top of the church in the background. The North American version changed the graphic to something that cannot be identified—perhaps a surrogate for Jekyll in this alternate timeline who no longer has to commit suicide as a final means of escape? He evidently finds absolution. Now, there are no more stressors leading up to the church, and the player can walk to the end of the game. Without any further opposition, Jekyll no longer has to contest with Hyde for control, marries the woman of his dreams, and lives happily ever after.

The Bandai title’s wide-ranging difference from the novella allows the game to be viewed as a commentary on adapting literature into other media. Taking liberties with the source material, its most evident changes in additional characters, enemies, and modified plot can be viewed as the metaphorical introduction of frustrations and absurdities in Jekyll’s life. Self-aware in its failures and alterations, the title’s introduction of new hazards serves to comment on how literature, when filtered through the lens of new media, can either dilute or enhance underlying thematic elements. Fortunately, the arbitrary and nonsensical obstacles’ disruption of progress mirrors how Hyde disrupts Jekyll. Being victim to attacks by incongruous characters or bizarre hazards reflects the surreal and nightmarish experience of Jekyll losing himself to Hyde. The game’s unstructured, often nonsensical challenges represent a chaotic intrusion into an ordered world. Yet, such absurdity is not out of place in a narrative that explores the thin, fragile line between civility and

madness in the Victorian landscape. Rather, it reflects the disintegration of Jekyll's controlled rational self and his eventual surrender to the irrationality embodied by Hyde.

Works Cited

Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde Instruction, Nintendo / Bandai, 1988. Nintendo Entertainment System game.

Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde Instruction Booklet, Nintendo / Bandai, 1988.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde and Other Stories*. Barnes and Noble Classics, 2004.

Wyatt Rogers is an English teacher at Milford High School in Massachusetts with a passion for fostering an appreciation of literary analysis, poetry, and storytelling within his students. Beyond the classroom, he explores the intersection of literature and retro video games, reinterpreting and redeeming overlooked or maligned titles through a literary lens.

Book Reviews

Joshi, S. T. *The Recognition of H. P. Lovecraft: His Rise from Obscurity to World Renown*,
Hippocampus Press, 2021.

<https://www.hippocampuspress.com/h.-p.-lovecraft/about-hp-lovecraft/the-recognition-of-h.-p.-lovecraft-by-s.-t.-joshi>

S. T. Joshi's latest contribution to the field of Lovecraft Studies, a field to which he has tirelessly and notably dedicated his publishing career, offers a concept that is an invaluable addition to the Lovecraftian critical oeuvre—an overview of the way in which Lovecraft has been received and recognised over the past century, including both critical and academic voices alongside the response of lay readership. Indeed, Joshi presents a chronologically organised narrative of Lovecraft in print and (eventually) media, detailing Lovecraft's own publication history as well as reviews and letters connected to Lovecraft. Joshi covers roughly a decade in each chapter and pulls from a large variety of sources in order to construct this history of Lovecraft's writing. As a matter of fact, this chronology of Lovecraft in print is the real strength of Joshi's book, and the most cogent aspect of his work in general. It is certainly meticulously researched, with an impressive attention to detail in terms of dates, names, locations and general information pertaining to each publication Joshi includes. However, the sheer volume of information included within the work leads it to feel, at times, little more than an annotated bibliography.

In the preface, Joshi lays out the aims of this book as both an attempt to “chart both the dissemination of H. P. Lovecraft's work during and after his lifetime” as well as to “assess the discussions of his life, work, and thought” (7). The book is undeniably successful in achieving the first point; however, it struggles with the second aim. Joshi suggests in the preface that the book may seem uneven in its attention to detail, with the early portions being “excessively detailed” and

the later portions “cited with almost insulting brevity” (7). This is understandable and even to be expected; it is fairly well-known within Lovecraft Studies that the bulk of critical and even commercial attention paid to his life and works happened during the latter half of the twentieth century, proliferating into the ubiquitousness of Lovecraft in the twenty-first century, particularly within popular culture. However, whilst Joshi manages to reflect the gradual increase in the momentum of Lovecraft’s popularity over the years throughout the book, his study lacks the assessment he promises in the preface. Large portions of each chapter merely list every appearance or publication of Lovecraft without comment or analysis. When Joshi does make assessments, his personal bias indubitably shines through.

The first chapter, “Beginnings (1905-1922),” details much of Lovecraft’s early interest in amateur meteorology and the letters and poems he published during his high school career, including initial controversies in small publications such as the *Argosy* in 1913 (12) and Lovecraft’s first publication, a letter on astronomy. Whereas there could be an interesting narrative emerging here between Lovecraft’s burgeoning scientific interests and the eventual formation of his distinctive brand of “cosmic horror,” Joshi makes no attempt to forge any links between Lovecraft’s life and his work. He instead dedicates time to disparaging “the yawning gulf in education and critical judgement between Lovecraft and his opponents” even at this very early stage (17). This pattern continues into the second and third chapters, “The Pulp Era (1923-1937)” and “Arkham House: The Early Years (1937-1945),” whereby Joshi dismisses any negative responses to Lovecraft and instead seems to center only critical or fan commentary that matches with his own level of devotion. Even so, a particularly insightful aspect of the book is the—admittedly, overlooked and perhaps even unintended—narrative of “fandom” that seems to be at the heart of Lovecraft’s level of recognition over the last century. During each chapter, Joshi takes

care to mention fan responses to Lovecraft in journals and serial publications alongside academic or critical works. I was also excited to see by Joshi's inclusion that one of the earliest responses to the publication of "The Call of Cthulhu" in *Weird Tales* in February 1928 was a letter in "The Eyrie" (*Weird Tales*'s correspondence section) by one "R. E. Howard," already a published author in *Weird Tales* and a name that would eventually be one of the most important contributors to the wider Cthulhu Mythos (45-46). Again, the gradual formation of the "Lovecraft Circle" and how it is visible through correspondence—both personal and in publication—is a concept that could make for an insightful and useful work. Joshi, however, glosses over both this and the importance of "fandom" to the promotion of Lovecraft, offering only superficial analysis of both topics.

This superficiality continues into the next chapters, "The Beginnings of Worldwide Dissemination (1946-1959)" and "Paperbacks and Movies (1960-1971)." Joshi's treatment of negative reviewers throughout shows his own feelings towards them; such critics merely "ramble" or are generally uneducated in some way, Joshi claims (131). He also dismisses the Lovecraft criticism in the 1960s as "astonishingly hostile" (151), with British critic Colin Wilson's opinion dismissed as "a childish whine against a writer with whose philosophical outlook (which, in any case, he fundamentally misunderstands) he does not agree with" (155). This is a common criticism of Joshi's, it appears: if a critic or fan does not view Lovecraft positively, it must be because they simply do not understand his work. Joshi's personal biases also become apparent through his repudiation of the importance of the horror genre, claiming that the 1970s saw horror becoming "for the first time since the Gothic novels of the later eighteenth century, a popular commodity" (164) in "The Revival of Scholarship (1971-1979)." This is simply an incorrect assertion that ignores the importance and popularity of the Penny Dreadful, publication of enduring works such as *Dracula* (1897) and *Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* (1886) during the latter half of the

nineteenth century, and even the horror cinema boom characterised by the Universal Monsters movies of the 1930s, and unfortunately undermines Joshi's point.

In the final three chapters—"Looking Toward the Centennial (1980-1990)," "The Road to Canonisation (1991-2005)," and "Dissemination and Controversy (2006-2020)"—Joshi's own contribution to the field becomes central to the chronology of works pertaining to Lovecraft's life and writings. At first, Joshi seems to show a degree of awareness towards his personal bias towards Lovecraft. Again, in the preface, Joshi acknowledges that people might question the decision for him to write this particular work, "given [his] own intimate involvement in the propagation of Lovecraft's texts and in the critical analysis of his life and work over the past four decades" (8). He continues to admit that "it could well be asked ... whether [he has] anything new to say on this subject" and also that his ability to be objective about his own contributions may be brought into question (8). This apparent self-awareness was refreshing and Joshi's initial honesty about his own connections to Lovecraft and the growth of Lovecraft Studies as a whole put any initial reservations I had about him as the author of this book to rest. However, it soon became disappointingly clear that this was, indeed, something Joshi was unable to do. The importance he places upon his own work at the expense of others, dismissing critics such as Clive Bloom, Roger Luckhurst, and Michel Houellebecq, amongst others, as lacking in research or evidence, restricts the real functionality of this book and emphasises his own personal bias. Joshi's response to Timo Airaksinen's *The Philosophy of H. P. Lovecraft* (1999) as having minimal "utility to the Lovecraft devotee" (254) raises the question: is Joshi's book for the Lovecraft fan, or the academic?

I must finish this review as Joshi finished his book by discussing the uncomfortable topic of Lovecraft's racism. I was disappointed, but not surprised, to find that Joshi left any real discussion of the subject of Lovecraft's personal views until the very last chapter and the Epilogue.

Joshi's dismissal of "fads" in academia such as "race, class and gender" and his questioning of "whether such work really constitutes literary criticism or is merely amateur sociology" (273) shows clearly and with finality that Joshi is not the most appropriate author for such a text as this. Lovecraft's racism, and his treatment (or complete ignorance) of women in his writing, is undeniable and an important aspect for any Lovecraft critic to take into consideration, especially one that claims to be charting his rise "from Obscurity to world renown" as in the subtitle of this book. For Joshi to characterise discussions of these topics as being "recent kerfuffles" or "virtue signalling" (305) is, regrettably, par for the course for Joshi. Any insightful or worthwhile points Joshi makes about Lovecraft, or any important contributions he makes to the field, will always be lessened through his staunch refusal to accept the significance of Lovecraft's views and the way they impact his work. It also makes me wonder, as Joshi himself did in his preface, why we continue to amplify the voices of those who cannot themselves offer an objective opinion on Lovecraft and his "transcendentally brilliant fiction" (313).

Han O'Flanagan is a final-year PhD candidate and Graduate Teaching Assistant at Lancaster University. Their thesis, currently titled *Phantasmic Asexuality in the Fin-de-Siecle: Echoes of Queer Entities in Supernatural Fiction* focuses on asexual identities and experiences at the *fin-desiecle*, examined through the lens of supernatural short fiction.

Garst, John. *John Henry and His People: The Historical Origins and Lore of America's*

***Great Folk Ballad*. McFarland, 2022.**

https://mcfarlandbooks.com/product/john-henry-and-his-people/?srsltid=AfmBOorQLah7br_u2cdwd2q7lggg2VEvlAYp_wAlUgnA57e1p35VLGYL

The origins of the John Henry myth have vexed scholars since the nineteenth century. Who was this man who fought a steam-powered drill only to die in his victory? Did he even exist? What was the genesis of the folk ballad that cropped up in his name, ever-changing in its details related to location and specifics? John Garst explores these questions and more in his work: *John Henry and His People: The Historical Origin and Lore of America's Great Folk Ballad*. While Garst is a chemist by trade, he is also a “folk song enthusiast, hobbyist, and amateur scholar [with a] sixtyfive-year interest in American folksong” (7). His interest in folklore stems from the fluidity of form: “For folklore, time also brings recognition of value, but folklore has a great advantage over fixed art. Folklore is winnowed in another sense. It is changed” (51). As Garst writes, the popular ballad has continued to resonate because it adapts to its cultural context as it is just specific enough to be plausible, but also vague enough to imbue significance across generations. These shifts—in verbiage, but more importantly, in meaning—are the heart of *John Henry and His People's* longform excavation of the Henry myth.

The book foregrounds a long-standing academic dispute related to the origins of John Henry. As Garst notes, “Six scholars have concluded that John Henry was a real man, but they reached five different conclusions” (15). *John Henry and His People* is a direct response to John Nelson's 2006 book *Steel Drivin' Man: John Henry, the Untold Story of American Legend*, which claims John Henry died in Virginia. Additionally, it contends that Guy B. Johnson's 1929 *John Henry: Tracking Down a Negro Legend* and Louis W. Chappell's 1933 *John Henry: A Folk-Lore*

Study, both of which identify West Virginia as the state, are incorrect. Rather, Garst systematically strips away possible figures and events before arriving at Alabama as the only possible site of Henry's competition.

Garst presents a shift in our understanding of the true-life inspiration behind the Henry myth, not only tracing the historical record back to Alabama, but also identifying the unnamed Captain of the story as Frederick Yeamans Dabney, a Confederate soldier. The narrative presented in the folk ballads—that the steel driver John Henry is pushed into a competition against a steam drill by his boss, beats the machine, but then collapses and dies—was vague but still gestured towards fact. In a succinct, yet almost insular, biographical argument, *John Henry and his People* contends that the location of this incident is Alabama and not Virginia. Garst reports that In 1887 John Henry Dabney, working for Fredrick Yeamans Dabney [the Captain], for whom he had been a slave as a boy in Mississippi, raced a steam drill. John Henry won but died from the effort. The location was Dunnivant, on a spur of the Columbus and

Western/Central Railroad, near Leeds, Alabama. (1)

What at first seems to be a dry set of facts—at home, perhaps, in an encyclopedic article instead of a long-form academic text—turns out to be anything but.

Split into three distinct yet interrelated sections, Garst weaves the evolving narrative of the folk ballad into his own research trips to Alabama before turning to the archives and, finally, laying out his case for why “Alabama is the John Henry site” (231). Utilizing a formal and rhetorical approach that mimics a scientific essay, he tests out a number of theories, people, locations, and primary sources against “the scientific method” (197), accusing other scholars, notably Nelson with his Virginia theory, of ignoring “opposing evidence because he thinks its implications are wrong” (198).

Yet the most interesting of these sections is, oddly, the first, which breaks down the “remarkable inner passion and expressive energy” that move through the “story, the meanings, [and] the musical drive” of the song (3). Having been “sung for at least a hundred twenty-five years,” the Henry ballad accounts not only for shifts in musical composition, but also mirrors historical movements (51). Here, Garst juxtaposes the black blues musician Rich Amerson’s rendition against the Grand Ole Opry stalwart Uncle Dave Macon. While the latter “is pentatonic [and] can be accompanied by just one chord,” the former is noticeably non-linear, recursive, and improvisatory (47). In this section, we see the direct contradictions of musical interpretation along racial and class-based lines. John Lennon’s rendition is remarkably different from, say, the Arkansas prisoner Arthur Bell, who was recorded by folklorist John Lomax because he brought different experiences to the recordings. In fact, Garst observes, “‘John Henry’ is widely known and admired” by both African American and White audiences, something Garst suggests “is unusual for an American ballad” (15).

However, when the book shifts to documenting feuds between academics, including Louis W. Chappel and John Harrington Cox, in addition to Guy Johnson in the 1930s, the book turns increasingly inward, litigating a series of obscure historical facts that the critics had written about, including John Henry’s original name, the location of the railroad, and even the possibility of a man beating a steam drill. Here, the trees threaten to overtake the forest, as arcane scholarly disputes are pushed into the forefront, and the reader is given an onslaught of primary source documents with little connective tissue between them.

As such, the “historical origin” of the book’s subtitle is much more important to the author than the “lore.” Instead, Garst leads with the somewhat contentious claim that the “American ballad is based on fact ... On this basis, it can be presumed that John Henry was a historical person”

(52). While some, but not all, scholars seem to agree with this contention, Garst never addresses why it matters if Henry existed or not, or why it is important that he was located in Alabama instead of Virginia, as Nelson argues. Garst leaves the significance of the limited historical approach unsaid. Instead, Garst simply notes that “the legendary John Henry died at various times in various places, all over the American South and in Jamaica. The real John Henry died in Alabama” (232). It does not change the importance or meaning of the folk ballad.

Is Garst correct in his assertion? Perhaps. But, by taking folklore as evidence, Garst undermines some of his own argumentative stances. He notably argues at one point “An orally circulating story with no foundation in fact would be very unlikely to include rare names such as ‘Cruzee Mountain’ and ‘Dabney’” (231). The existence of concrete details in a literary text or song does not constitute fact. The real John Henry may have died in Alabama, but the legendary John Henry lives on, reconstituted and recontextualized in each new iteration of the song and “disassociated from external authority” (53). Garst himself even notes that “Legend may begin with historical truth, but it is free to reinterpret, expand, and elaborate. It elevates heroes by adding wondrous, often miraculous, events to their lives” (235).

The central tension of the book, then, is that the contours and shifts of the legendary John Henry seem to overshadow the reality of a real-life former slave. When we finally do arrive at the meaning of the ballad, in the final chapter, Garst highlights many different interpretations and themes: race, overexertion, dedication, saving jobs, retraining, family tragedy, useless resistance. These are all salient points, and speak to the malleability of the song, but more importantly they speak to the afterlives of John Henry, and the ways that the story continues to be reinterpreted today.

Christian Gallichio is a postdoctoral teaching fellow in the Writing Program and English Department at Emory University. His research is particularly interested in the intersection between gift theory and nineteenth-century transatlantic holiday writing.

Massachi, Dina Schiff, editor. *The Characters of Oz: Essays on Their Adaptation and Transformation*. McFarland, 2023.

<https://mcfarlandbooks.com/product/the-characters-of-oz/?srsltid=AfmBOorRhD-SwAi5VhlXuEty24wxv7Tvl1R1k8fqFpV6tQ2BAEj1aL80>

When people think of “Oz,” they tend to think of the 1900 novel *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* or the 1939 MGM film *The Wizard of Oz*. But the Oz franchise is larger than those two works. It is so large, in fact, that a specialized term is required to fully appreciate its mass and the concepts pulled into its orbit. In the introduction to their essay collection *Third Person*, Patrick Harrigan and Noah Wardrip-Fruin establish a list of five qualities and claim that a text should satisfy at least one to qualify as what they call a “vast narrative” (2). Two of these are closely connected to new digital media forms (vastness through procedural potential or multiplayer interaction) and another involves a sharp deviation from expected form (vastness narrative extent). The remaining two traits are vastness through world and character continuity, and vastness through cross-media universes. Beginning with the 1900 novel *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* and extending to this very day, then, L. Frank Baum’s Land of Oz is doubly vast, first through its ever-expanding cast and adventures in Baum’s fourteen-book original series and through its multitudes of retellings and adaptations, ranging from the early plays to the 1939 MGM classic film to the upcoming 2024 film release of *Wicked*, still two months away as I write this review.

The vastness of Oz, the enduring appeal of its characters, and its continuous variation over its many adaptations, makes it a series and franchise worth studying. In *The Characters of Oz: Essays on Their Adaptation and Transformation*, editor Dina Schiff Massachi presents a collection that focuses on the characters of the series and their changes through multiple iterations, aiming to “follow Baum’s archetypal characters as they’ve changed over time in order to examine what those changes mean in relation to Oz, American culture, and basic human truths” (1). This study is

accomplished through thirteen essays, each looking at a different character in Oz over multiple adaptations, with an afterword by Baum's great-great grandson Robert that fictionalizes Baum and turns him into a sort of Oz character himself—a rather appropriate gesture, as Baum often framed himself as Oz's chronicler rather than its author when addressing his child audience. The collection begins with chapters on Dorothy and her close companions—the Scarecrow, the Tin Man, and the Cowardly Lion—then shifts through other well-known characters, including the Winged Monkeys and the Wicked Witch(es). The last third of the book addresses lesser-known characters that vary across adaptations, such as the Nome King and the Patchwork Girl. An image of the character accompanies each chapter, either a Denslow illustration from the original *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* or, if the character does not appear in the first book, an illustration by long-time series artist John R. Neill. The images help set the stage for each character, providing a look into their original depictions that helps ground the discussion of their future adaptations. While the essays vary somewhat in approach and quality, in sum, they make up a collection that will be rewarding for scholars investigating American-originating modern fantasy yet accessible enough for general fans of Oz as well.

A focus on character allows for an informed examination of change over time, but it also means that there is some repetition across the essays, in terms of Baum's own background (such as the repeated investigation of his mother-in-law, suffragist Matilda Gage, as a source of influence), the plots of frequently mentioned adaptations (particularly the 1995 *Wicked* novel and the 2007 science fiction miniseries *Tin Man*), and scholars referenced and established, such as Tison Pugh and his work on queer readings of the series. Granted, this repetition has its benefits: for example, it clearly emphasizes Pugh's importance as an Oz scholar, and the importance of queerness to studies of the series, and it also means that each essay can be read independently from the others. It is a book that encourages the reader to play favorites, flipping through to find the

chapter corresponding to their character of preference. It does mean, however, that when read as a whole, the collection feels as if it moves slowly. In a similar vein, some of the essays get bogged down in a catalogue of adaptations, but for the most part, each keeps a clear focus on its character, and grants a lively discussion of its evolution over time.

Three essays in particular stand out. Dina Schiff Massachi's "Witch's Familiars or Winged Warriors?: Liberating the Winged Monkeys" argues that the winged monkeys that serve as the Wicked Witch of the West's unwilling lackeys should not be subjected to a single interpretation:

When one looks at not only Baum's Winged Monkeys but also MGM's Flying Monkeys, *The Wiz's* Winged Warriors, *Tin Man's* Moats, *Wicked's* Chistrey, *Oz the Great and Powerful's* Finley, and *Dorothy Must Die's* Lulu, Ollie, and Maude, the Winged Monkeys move beyond a reading that may symbolize a specific moment in history and, instead, become a discussion about America's complex relationship with disenfranchised groups, the power structures that accompany the disenfranchisement, and who has the agency to liberate. (79)

Like many fantastic stories and creatures, the Winged Monkeys are not a perfect allegory for any one historical moment, but through their frequent subordinate roles to other characters, they demonstrate a continual engagement with equality and exclusion.

In "A Living Thing: The Very American Invention of Jack Pumpkinhead," Paige Gray writes a weird, wonderful essay about a "weird wonderful *thing*" (122), juxtaposing thing-ness, American idealism towards the pastoral, and the trickster figure to discuss Jack Pumpkinhead. Jack Pumpkinhead is an assembly of sticks for limbs and a pumpkin head on his shoulders, assembled by the character Tip and brought to life by Magic Powder in the novel *The Marvelous Land of Oz* (1904). Unlike the functionally immortal Scarecrow, another object turned into a person, Jack is more cyclical in his existence, as his pumpkin head rots and must be replaced. This pumpkin-ness,

Gray argues, ties him to American agriculture, in both its “nostalgia for small farms and rural countrysides and its dependence on urban mass production” (131). It also, she emphasizes, draws out his absurdism—Jack serves his own guests pumpkin pie, but refuses himself, claiming to partake would be cannibalism (132). The claim is simultaneously ridiculous and intriguing—can a pumpkin man be human enough for a concept such as cannibalism to apply? Through this passage and others, Gray is particularly successful in drawing out both the playfulness and the intellectual engagement that Baum’s creations and their adaptations often inspire, and in injecting it into her own writing as well; it is a *fun* essay—something I wish I could say more often about academic work.

Finally, in Gita Dorothy Morena’s “Piecing Together the Patchwork Girl of Oz,” she constructs a sort of auto-genealogy, exploring the Patchwork Girl both in the character itself and in her role in Morena’s family, as Morena is the great-granddaughter of Baum himself. In an essay that is both uniquely personal and academic, Morena uses the metaphor of the patchwork and scrap composition of the Patchwork Girl to examine her memories of her family and the adaptations of the Patchwork Girl over time, from the original Baum to Shelley Jackson’s 1995 *The Patchwork Girl* hypertext. It serves as a strong final essay to the book, touching on themes echoed in many of the characters: liberty, performing with and against gender, fledgling and failing feminisms, and the influences that L. Frank Baum drew upon.

A minor complaint of the book would be that the net of adaptations could have been cast a little wider. There are comics that would speak well to how the franchise’s characters turn up outside of Oz settings, such as Alan Moore and Melinda Gebbie’s sexually explicit interpretation of Dorothy in *Lost Girls* (2006), or the *Oz/Wonderland War* (1985), which has the characters teaming up with animal superheroes and Wonderland to fight the Nome King. It would also be interesting to see discussion of Oz-based manga and anime, such as *Captive Hearts of Oz*

(2017/2018) and *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* (1986), or the use of games where players take the roles of Oz characters, from the 1985 *Wizard of Oz* for the Apple II to the 2009 *Emerald City Confidential*, which reinterprets Oz through the lens of film noir.

These complaints, however, speak more to personal taste than to a serious flaw with the collection. In fact, they demonstrate the power of these essays to prompt further reflection on the vast narratives of Oz. The authors are to be commended for the range of works that are considered here, from familiar works such as the MGM film and *Wicked* to more obscure choices, including the made-for-television *Muppets' Wizard of Oz* (2005) and the visual album *Straight Outta Oz* (2016) by Torrick Hall. Through its variety of characters, Oz explores issues of gender performativity, queerness, feminism, and liberty, both in Baum's original contexts and in the reverberations that have echoed through the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. As a whole, the collection is an impressive and endearing piece of scholarship, easily recommended to Oz and fantasy scholars, as well as the dedicated Oz fan who wants to delve a little bit deeper into their favorite characters.

Work Cited

Harrigan, Pat, and Noah Wardrip-Fruin. "Introduction." *Third Person: Authoring and Exploring Vast Narratives*, The MIT Press, 2009, pp. 1-10.

Michael Hancock is a sessional lecturer at the Department of Language and Literature at the University of Waterloo. His research areas include speculative fiction, fantasy, and the crosses between literature and games.

Baudemann, Kristina. *The Future Imaginary in Indigenous North American Arts and Literatures*. Routledge, 2022.

<https://www.routledge.com/The-Future-Imaginary-in-Indigenous-North-American-Arts-and-Literatures/Baudemann/p/book/9780367754822?srsId=AfmBOooMPLIs8dlsWuwz4CImM5k7JL-rcjAGALnVkqGzRAPcANH4X9oa>

Kristina Baudemann's *The Future Imaginary In Indigenous North American Arts and Literatures* draws together texts by Indigenous authors that share a common trope: dreaming of "a common future while nevertheless being mindful of their cultural differences" (2). Her case studies address six novels and eight stories that imagine the future against the backdrop of the past. Positing that the "gradual disappearance of Indigenous people is a narrative—rather than historic fact or natural necessity," Baudemann explains how that narrative is "grounded in the circular logic according to which their supposed absence in times to come justifies the colonizers' past and present genocidal dealings with them" (5-6). Yet, as Baudemann's meticulously researched book documents, the future is not a cemented truth but rather malleable and dependent on actions in both the past and present. As she sets forth in her opening chapter, Baudemann's method of "future analysis" requires that she develop and apply new theoretical parameters that highlight how each text she examines "creates *its own future imaginary*" (7, emphasis in original). Collectively, these new imaginaries overturn the past by offering futures with endless possibilities for indigenous peoples.

In her second chapter, Baudemann explores the elusiveness inherent in defining the future, an intangibility that "can nevertheless be owned, controlled, reached for, or destroyed" (13). Envisioning the contact between Indigenous peoples and colonizers as an always-apocalyptic event, Baudemann upholds storytelling as a site where colonialist futures can be disrupted and

colonial structures dismantled. Imagined Indigenous futures will still be “dependent on the rules and relationships underlying the specific system of representation, be that an ideology, a statement spoken within a specific context or discourse, an oral story, [or] a work of fiction” (24), but now new rules are set through Indigenous creativity. As an example, she analyzes Ryan Singer’s *Supply Run* (2017), an acrylic painting depicting an extraterrestrial trading post with Indigenous customers on Tatooine, home to Luke Skywalker. By placing the Navajo homeland adjacent to the *Star Wars* galaxy, Baudemann posits, “Singer creates room in the common future imaginary for real Indigenous people beyond the stereotypes of the primitive and aggressive Sand People” (16). This scene gives rise to a future distanced from the trauma of North American colonization of Indigenous tribes, producing a future imaginary that opens new and exciting vistas on a cultural level, thus offering a universe of unfrozen possibilities.

Baudemann begins and ends her third chapter with an examination of Oglala Lakota Kite’s 2017 performance piece *Everything I Say Is True*, connecting the artist’s slideshow to Foucault’s examination of how colonial archives are structured in order to suggest that “manipulation” of any archive “is possible” (36). Kite’s piece “draws on an assortment of different future imaginaries developed in novels, films, TV shows, commercials, and political speeches” (38). Drawing on Derrida’s notion of the archive as always opening toward the future, Baudemann speculates that Indigenous artists like Kite negotiate archival structures different from colonial archives, providing a space for various apocryphal Indigenous futures.

Next, Baudemann links Indigenous futurism to “*Afrofuturism/afrofuturism*, the generic denominator for African American sf and the fantastic” (42). Both of these terms, she says, “evoke histories of colonial disenfranchisement and oppression” (42). The connections she envisions in this section prepare the reader for her discussion of “Indigenous sf,” Miriam Brown Spier’s term

for “science fiction by Indigenous authors as opposed to texts that simply include Native characters” (qtd. in Baudemann 44). Baudemann argues for distinguishing between the initially interchangeable terms “Indigenous Futurisms” and “Indigenous SF,” as the two genres reach different audiences and call on distinct generic histories and traditions. In other words, Baudemann acknowledges that Indigenous futures draw on and build upon generic conventions seen in creative works by other oppressed peoples. Furthermore, as she infers, “Future imaginaries are not only shaped by different genre systems but also by the medium through which a story is told, its distinctive features and limitations.” (47) To that end, this chapter addresses rapidly emerging digital technologies—cyberspace, smartphone games, virtual realities, and so forth—considering not just how technological mediums impact narration but also how the phrase “native to the device” works as “a pun on a technical term that detached Indigeneity from people and land” (55). This stands out as one of the rare instances in this otherwise-comprehensive book where Baudemann forgoes making a specific application.

For instance, *Prey*, a 2006 immersive first-person shooter video game, features a main Indigenous character—from the Cherokee Nation—who, along with other family and tribe members, is abducted by extraterrestrials. According to Michael Sheyahshe, a member of the Caddo Nation, “The choice to have a main character from this tribe was made because of the large amount of myths and stories (along with a lot of research material)” (32). While initial response to the announcement of a Native American main character was cautious (some worried they would make the character too much of a cartoon caricature), the studio also enlisted the acting skills of Michael Greyeyes (Plains Cree) to serve as the voice of the male version of the protagonist. Commenting on the gamemakers’ construction of Indigenous characters, Greyeyes said,

I was impressed with the way they conceived of and wrote Tommy. I have read a lot of scripts for feature films and television and have grown to recognize the tropes common to the stories with aboriginal characters or themes ... In fact, the overwhelming majority of roles written for native actors are in the Western genre. There are few opportunities for us to appear outside that paradigm, and when we do, it is often equally narrow in focus (Sheyahshe 32). The actor also related that the game's writers took his comments seriously and "in nearly all instances, [changed] dialogue or thematic content" (Sheyahshe 32). By the studio's recognition and valuation of Greyeyes's input, the kind of archival negotiation Baudemann imagines is already occurring in other digital spaces, though she omits analysis of this game (and games in general) in her book.

In Chapter 4, Baudemann offers a case study of three of Gerald Vizenor's novels: *Bearheart: The Heirship Chronicles* (1990), *The Heirs of Columbus* (1991), and *Treaty Shirts: October 2034—A Familiar Treatise on The White Earth Nation* (2016). Overarchingly, she sees *Bearheart* introducing, "on a metanarrative level, the subversive idea of an Other archive of trickster stories, Anishinaabe songs, and traditional teachings, tellingly hidden away in a file cabinet of the Washington, D.C. BIA building, a monument to the colonial order" (69). Key to this subversiveness is the malleability of the archive. While the BIA building stands metaphorically even if physically destroyed, the titular character—Saint Louis Bearheart—"tells his story of future times while literally squatting in the archive of settler culture" (80). In this way, Baudemann concludes, Vizenor's story "demonstrates how Indigenous storytelling forces the colonial archive to shift out of its form and make room for alternate futures" (80).

As with *Bearheart*, Baudemann reads *The Heirs of Columbus* as measuring "the Indigenous future in terms of a deconstruction and transformation of the colonial archive" (81). Establishing Christopher Columbus's journal entry for the claiming of land in the New World for Spain as "the

presumed starting point of American history,” she explores Vizenor’s rewriting of Columbus’s words in ways that imagine “visions of sovereign Indigenous futures” (84). Baudemann’s close reading of *Heirs* serves as one of the many highlights of this chapter, as she simultaneously demonstrates, just as predicted in her opening chapter, how to “pervade the semantic layers within a single work” and how “imaginaries are developed throughout subsequent works by the same author or artist” (7). Ultimately, she concludes, *Heirs* un-writes the colonial archive in order to create a transformed New World where Indigenous cultures are once again central in much the same way as *Bearheart* and *Treaty Shirts*.

Baudemann characterizes *Treaty Shirts* as a “form of future history,” saying “it maps out a coming world that is presented as a direct result of recent political events” (94). Its connection to the past—and the colonial archive—is embodied through the Constitution of the White Earth Nation (1888), a historical treaty that takes on its own fictional life within the novel, both as a document and as a person, through one of the novel’s seven narrators, Archive, who identifies himself as the great-nephew of the Constitution’s principal author. The novel ends with the Constitution poised to endure anywhere, as the narrators carry it into a dystopian Indigenous future. In Baudemann’s words, “*Treaty Shirts* envisions a sovereign Indigenous archive, with the Constitution of the White Earth Nation at its core” (100).

Chapter 5 offers a case study of three futuristic narratives by Stephen Graham Jones: *The Fast Red Road* (2000), an “Indigenous-centered speculative novel that features elements of science fiction, horror, and fantasy” (113); *The Bird is Gone* (2003), “a speculative novel set in an alternate present or near future, where Indigenous characters backtrack colonial history, slip through time, and work on a guerilla plan for the end of the world and the dawn of a brighter, all-Indigenous future” (133); and *Ledfeather* (2008), an apocalyptic novel in which the “future at the frontier [is]

constituted through an assemblage of epistolary fragments” (167). Baudemann’s initial paragraph in this chapter acts as the introduction for and an overview of Jones’s work. She draws the three works together somewhat, writing, “In all three words, fragments from texts and oral stories constitute the hinges on which the colonial landscapes are imagined swinging open and uncovering the Indigenous world of the future—” (112). This chapter contains an excellent close reading of each novel. It also includes, in her discussion of *The Fast Red Road*, a sidestep into a discussion of *The Scræling*, “an obscure porn movie” (127) (never marketed and available only in bootleg copies) that features a “trickster ending” (129). Her analysis of this movie, featuring an ending that leaves the Scræling laughing as the final credits roll, suggests that “anything is yet possible” for Indigenous people even as it demonstrates the depth of Baudemann’s research (129). The abrupt ending of the chapter after the discussion of the third novel—*Ledfeather*—leaves the reader wishing she had spent just a little more time on drawing an overall conclusion about Jones’s work and impact, building on the ideas she raises about them collectively in the opening paragraph to the chapter. Her ending sentence to her first paragraph, “Through [the novels’] discussion of processes of writing and un-writing, Jones’s works become themselves subversive texts that threaten to overthrow the colonial archive” (112), reads as her defacto concluding thought to this case study, even though it precedes her actual reading of the novels.

In the sixth chapter, Baudemann turns toward analyzing virtual archiving through “machinima,” or the art of creating animated films using video game graphics. She uses as her case study the 1993 documentary *Kanehsatake: 270 Years of Resistance*, by Abenaki filmmaker Alanis Obomsawin, and its reinvention within Skawennati’s machinima series *Time Traveller*™. In this film series (recorded within Linden Lab’s virtual world *Second Life*), the main character Hunter travels through time to reimagine different outcomes to Canadian oppression of Indigenous people.

As Baudemann writes, “An essential part of Skawennati’s future imaginary in *TimeTraveller*™ is her depiction of an imagined future world” (176), a world recreated visually and auditorily in the game in ways impossible to produce on the page. Interestingly, Indigenous futures in this series grow less dystopian and “gloomy” as the episodes progress:

Skawennati’s acts of “retelling and reimagining” are not only a necessary premise for creating a narrative about the future on her own terms. By mirroring this practice in the time travel plot where Hunter “reimagines” history, Skawennati also connects the Indigenous past with an imagined positive future. (181)

This future imaginary supposes both a return of sovereignty to Canada’s Indigenous tribes and the use of digital archives as interactive museums that supplement the past in productive ways. Or, as Baudemann puts it, “Skawennati’s machinima ... encourages viewers to consider digital media themselves as ‘museums of the future’” (189). These museums do not romanticize the pre-Colonial past, but they do offer opportunities for digitally preserving and renewing traditional knowledge.

In Chapter 7, Baudemann describes her first-hand experience as a non-indigenous user of the virtual reality project *2167* (2017), which was developed for Canada’s sesquicentennial celebration. Prepared to be disappointed, she found herself immersed in a future imaginary depicting “the reality of Indigenous people in Canada in 150 years, or seven generations” (194). In *2167*, colonialism’s end is presented through four cyberpunk worlds, each created by a different digital artist. In these worlds, only movement into the future is possible, though the future is connected to the past:

“going back” does not necessarily involve a linear backtracking of history and a reversal of colonization. The reconnection with the traditional knowledges is premised on a

complete transformation of the user's physical and mental existence, which amounts to the start of a new cycle of events. (199)

Interestingly, in at least one of these worlds, language is the only measure of the future, as new words are coined in Indigenous languages as the tribes grow through contact with other cultures. Using the example of "blueberry pie," which is not translatable into the Anishnaabe language, Baudeman concludes that "encountering the unnamable does not signify the end of language but instead necessitates change—language itself passes through a metaphorical wormhole into another reality that cannot be imagined yet" (202). Baudemann sees both advantages and disadvantages to using the medium of virtual reality, especially as VR requires a type of active engagement not required by prose or machinima. Ultimately, she regards *2167* as powerful, largely because of its presentation of four varied futures, writing,

The artists refuse to create a limiting representational code that would be perceived as *the* Indigenous way to unsettle the future. Instead, these cyberspaces map out future imaginaries – in the plural – as complex and diverse virtual landscapes of representation and simulation that negate settler time in multiple different ways while celebrating sovereignty and affirming the continuity of Indigenous cultures. (208)

Baudemann turns her attention to Indigenous women in Chapter 8, focusing on female world building and world builders. Drawing together a dizzying array of topics—the Canada Indian Act of 1876, the number of missing and murdered Indigenous women, forced sterilization, colonization, patriarchal structures, and colonial racism and misogyny, to name a few—to demonstrate the complex forces female world builders must simultaneously address. As the focus of this case study, she examines Skawennati's machinima, *She Falls for Ages* (2017), which is set in the same virtual world within *Second Space as TimeTraveller™*, which she examines in her sixth

chapter. Baudemann's use of two other sources by Skawennati in this chapter adds complexity to her analysis of the cyberpunk world. The first source, an open letter Skawennati wrote decrying the 1876 Indian Act, which "stripped Indian women of their status if they married non-Native men" (qtd. in Baudemann 215), documents the devaluing of Indigenous females that is inherent in Canadian law. The second source, a personal interview that Baudemann conducted with Skawennati, explains the choices she made regarding her female characters in *She Falls for Ages*, especially the choices designed to make her readers ask questions.

Next, she examines Skawennati's *Peacemaker* (2017), a second female-focused machinima, set in the 31st century, that gender-bends the male character in a traditional Indigenous story, replacing him with the avatar of a young girl. As Baudemann explains,

The unexpected rebirth of the cultural hero as a woman in times of political unrest and environmental catastrophe gives the traditional story an imagined future that response to current political issues, from female grassroots activism, the ongoing Inquiry into the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls to the new awareness of gender issues and enduring misogyny in all areas of private life. (221)

In the end, even though there are admittedly criticisms that trouble a feminist label, as she details in the final paragraphs of this chapter, Baudemann categorizes Skawennati's cyberspace works as promoting a feminist agenda.

Baudemann's book concludes in Chapter 9, with a short but impactful two-page ending to her study. Admittedly, she writes, not all Indigenous authors or artists try to capture the present world or even to imagine future worlds; instead, they seem, surprisingly, to be more "interested in what literature and new media art can set in motion" (231). As Baudemann posits, in her conclusion's penultimate sentence, "With their Indigenous Futurisms, [Indigenous authors and

artists] are building their own canons, continuously exploring new ways to articulate their own subversive visions of the future” (231). Certainly, Baudemann’s ambitious project fulfills its purpose by giving scholars new ways of understanding how fictional Indigenous futures rework our understanding of the past and present even as they ambitiously open the way for reimagined possibilities for Indigenous peoples.

Work Cited

Sheyahshe, Michael. “Native Resolution: A Look at Native Americans in *Age of Empires III* and *Prey*.” *Games for Windows Magazine*, vol. 14, 2008, pp. 30-32.
<https://archive.org/details/games-for-windows-2-jan.-2007/games%20for%20windows%20january%202008/mode/1up>. Accessed 23 Oct. 2024.

Mari Yates is a PhD candidate at York St. John University (York, England), exploring the intersection of Western and Fantasy genres through Tzvetan Todorov’s Theory of Equilibrium. She holds an MA in Writing (Fiction) from Johns Hopkins University and currently teaches firstyear writing at several institutions of higher learning in Northern Ohio.

Cameron, Brooke, and Lara Karpenko, editors. *The Vampire in Nineteenth-Century*

Literature: A Feast of Blood. Routledge, 2022.

<https://www.routledge.com/The-Vampire-in-Nineteenth-Century-Literature-A-Feast-of-Blood/CameronKarpenko/p/book/9781032001784?srsId=AfmBOoqVk7c24pPRDYr9dFVZqohq5zPvIECuZPmY1U5vFfIKHVUsKIVw>

Vampire is other, a symbol that inhabits the edges of boundaries and exists in liminal spaces. The vampire is a figure that at once inspires fear and longing within itself and in those with whom the creature comes into contact. *The Vampire in Nineteenth-Century Literature: A Feast of Blood* outlines the cultural characteristics of the Victorian vampire figure, arguing that John William Polidori's 1819 *The Vampyre: A Tale* solidified vague and fragmented folk tales and legends about the walking, life-feasting dead into a new version that set the standard for the Victorian literary vampire and beyond (1). The book also looks at other Victorian iterations of the vampire that contributed to its currently recognized version. Through collected essays focusing on four major themes—race and postcolonization, desire and sexuality, time and history, and adaptation (6)—this volume examines how the vampire represents shifting cultural norms and fears of the Victorians in an era of unprecedented social and economic upheaval. The collection also traces the wanderings of the vampire, “not[ing] the distinctly global exchange of ideas” (3) that contribute to its modern conception, as the volume explores the colonial influences of the monster (4).

Vampires inhabit spaces of liminality, muddling the lines of time, identity, history, doubleness, life, and death. Thus, while the four thematic divisions are not clearly delineated either in the table of contents or between sections, the editors note that the thematic focuses feed into and

build upon one another. Thematic section divisions are not expressly noted in heading or subheadings in the organizational structure of the book but only mentioned in the introduction.

Notating these sections would have contributed to more effective organization and easier access to the contents, major themes, and arguments of the individual essays and provided more coherence to the collection.

The first section of the collection focuses on postcolonial and racial identities represented by the vampire through the examination of non-British, non-traditional influences on the Victorian vampire legend. The three essays in this section focus alternately on Black, invalid, and Hindu representations of the life-feasting creature. A representative essay contained in this section is Giselle Liza Anatol's "Black Female Vampires in Nineteenth-Century Writing and Folklore." It considers African influences on vampire lore, preceding Bram Stoker's popular novel *Dracula* (1897), which "range from newspaper articles about slave revolts, to ethnographic texts describing the bloodsucking, skin-shedding *soucouyant* of Caribbean lore, to literary works such as Florence Marryat's *The Blood of the Vampire*" (11). All of these texts include Black vampire imagery, especially that of "vampiric Black women in particular" (11), and highlight the fears of colonial administrations. Colonial interests in the Caribbean use news reports to characterize slave revolts with vampiric symbolism and imagery, including the "consumption of blood" (12) and cannibalism. The Black woman vampire of *The Blood of the Vampire* (1897) is not bound by convention or social and cultural norms of family and home but is considered to be out of control.

Much of this fear of the Black female vampire's threat to British colonial interests is bound up in the "anxiety over African women's uncontrollable bodies" (13) and the effect this has on the empire. Indeed, the vampire of Marryat's work does not even feast on the blood of her victims but on their "energy, health, and life essence" (17), feeding into the fears about the overly lustful

African female. The lust and desire associated with the Black woman vampire figure translates to fear of unpure British bloodlines. Anatol even argues that *Dracula* raises questions of ethnic impurity and the tainting of English blood with foreign vampire blood (23). Indeed, this concern of foreign blood staining the purity of the British line, in the mind of colonial interests, could come from either the impurity of eastern European Slavic threats or African Caribbean ones, thus making the foreign vampire an existential threat to the empire.

Related to the theme of endangered bloodlines, the second section of the collection examines vampires as embodiments of lust and desire. Representative essays discuss the queer themes in *Carmilla* (1872) and characterize the vampire as a symbol of addiction. In Kimberly Cox's "The Vampire's Touch in 'Olalla' and *The Blood of the Vampire*," the author continues the theme of the sensual nature of the foreign female vampire in relation to perceived threats to the British empire. Both the title character of Robert Louis Stevenson's "Olalla" (1885) and Harriet, the central figure of Marryat's *The Blood of the Vampire*," possess unusual strength in their touch and at the same time entrance and repel the "young, White Englishmen" with whom they come into contact (115). The exotic foreign provenance of both Olalla (Spanish) and Harriet (African) presents a threat to polite British society. Neither woman can or will have children, which threatens the "reproductive family" (115) and values of Victorian familial culture. Even Olalla's mother and brother possess touches that, at the same time, repel and entice the British soldier with unnatural attractions.

However, although Cox argues that Olalla's touch represents how "Victorian xenophobia and gender normativity served to demonize erotic contact" (112), she misses something in Stevenson's story. While Olalla is exotic and foreign to the soldier and represents to him an enticement away from polite British society and any hope for family, Olalla's touch actually saves

the soldier, literally and physically, from her mother and brother, and later from herself. Olalla's humble mission to put a stop to her feral and cursed bloodline will not allow her to marry or reproduce. Olalla sacrifices herself, her future happiness and hope of family or companionship, to save the soldier from her fate. Although Olalla is a foreign, exotic sexual enticement for the soldier, her self-control and denial of her own desires ultimately allow the soldier to escape the monsters of her house. Olalla is the hero and savior of the story as she denies herself to save the soldier. This turns the notion of the devouring foreign vampire on its head.

The third thematic division of the collection focuses on "Vampiric Time and History" (6). The two essays in this section explore the liminal spaces of time and how the figure of the vampire relates to spatial and chronological concerns. Both essays examine the activity of different groups in British society that were perceived and characterized as vampires. Rebecca Nesvet in "'Keep[ing] Time at Arm's-Length': Vampire and Veterans in *Varney*" interrogates the perception of British war veterans of the Victorian period as portrayed in *Varney the Vampire* (1845-47), which depicts the "social stigmatization of the veteran" (130) as vampire, living off the funds of the community and no longer holding military positions of consequence. Nesvet argues compellingly that the veteran, much like the vampire, is a creature of the past who haunts the present (128). She suggests that perhaps *Varney* represents a "brief literary tradition ... of veteran trauma" (134).

The fourth and final section of the collection includes essays dealing with the adaptation of the Victorian vampire story in stage productions, in nineteenth-century America, and in modern Neo-Victorian retellings. In "America's First Vampire Novel and the Supernatural as Artifice," Gary D. Rhodes and John Edgar Browning discuss the American perception of horror and the first vampire tale published in the United States, *The Vampire; or, Detective Brand's Greatest Case* (171), which was published in 1885, predating Stoker's *Dracula*. Before 1885, the American

reading public thrived on tales of true crime and reports of court and legal proceedings. Since the mid-eighteenth century, “gallows [dime] broadsides” were popular with American audiences (173). The horror genre tended toward the realistic or real crime matters; the idea was to “invoke the supernatural only to rationalize it” (173). Thus, although *Detective Brand’s Greatest Case* was something new to American audiences, it also continued in this same vein. The American press used the term “vampire” to refer to people who took advantage of others or to wasting diseases. Similarly, the novel is a detective crime story in which the vampire is merely an evil, psychotic man using the vampire guise to commit crimes. Although the novel does use the artifice of a vampire, the supernatural horror is ultimately revealed as human “trickery” (173).

The Vampire in Nineteenth-Century Literature: A Feast of Blood includes a diverse collection of essays that examines critical moments, issues, and themes in the Victorian vampire tradition. It explores widely the progenitors and influences of vampire legend, globally and in British literature, and adaptations and reiterations, both Victorian and modern. The collection also narrowly focuses on critical themes in Victorian vampire studies such as colonial xenophobia, lust and desire, and time while also exploring new ideas found in the figure of the vampire. This is a valuable resource for anyone researching vampire lore and literature and the relation to the Victorian period.

Toni Thibodeaux teaches composition and literature courses for Columbia State Community College and Colorado Christian University and is currently working on her PhD at Middle Tennessee State University. She has written, published, and presented on topics relating to fairy tales, children’s literature, Walter de la Mare, and Robert Louis Stevenson.