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SUMMARY

The main assertion of this thesis is that both 19th Century and contemporary Gothic literary texts are characterised by fugitivity. This fugitivity is embodied by the fugitive "figure" which through its ambiguity is - re-deploying the distinction proposed by Ross Chambers - inescapably both narrative and textual. The fugitive figure is intimately related to desire and its textual mobilisation. This mobilisation simulates the paradoxical experience of the sublime in which the pursuer of the fugitive figure is left speechless before the feared and desired unnameable other.

To support these assertions, I discuss the five contemporary texts which comprise Anne Rice's *The Vampire Chronicles*. I analyse three seminal Gothic texts, *Frankenstein*, or *The Modern Prometheus*, *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* and *Dracula* and refer, in general terms, to a range of other Gothic texts and secondary readings. I also allude to films which are (modern) adaptations of the major texts. Fugitivity occurs across a range of different media and is also prevalent in different literary genres although it is especially evident and evocative in the Gothic because of its preoccupation with desire and the "return of the repressed".

The analyses of these texts constitute a "genealogy". However, this genealogy is conceived and executed not in traditional, but in poststructuralist terms. Typically therefore, it consists of a deconstructive analysis inflected by psychoanalytic inputs. The genealogy is applied to indicate the importance of the family structure and its potential for dissolution in Gothic texts. It also recreates a search for origins which is a recurring theme in Gothic writing. This search mirrors the pursuer-pursued process occurring at the narrative level of these texts. This thesis does not provide a chronological account because such an account would assume linearity, progression, a telos that the chaotic Gothic world undermines and disavows.
The fugitive figure, through its embodiment of insatiable desire, is beyond either narrative or tropaic apprehension. It is in continual metamorphosis and invites pursuit in its different guises. However, although it appears as the objectified pursued, it actually arises from within the pursuer, so any attempt to arrest the disruptive flow it signifies is, although unavoidable and very necessary, a self-deceptive act doomed to failure. This failure is registered simultaneously at narrative and textual levels.
INTRODUCTION

All things are always changing, but nothing dies. The spirit comes and goes, is housed wherever it wills, shifts residence from beasts to men, from men to beasts, but always it keeps on living... Nothing is permanent in all the world. All things are fluent; every image forms, wandering through change. Time is itself a river in constant movement, and the hours flow by like water, wave on wave, pursued, pursuing, forever fugitive, forever new. (Ovid 1974, 339)

Poststructuralism, with its relentlessly rigorous deconstruction of the literary text, has inescapably indicated the gaping referential chasm between the signifier and signified. The text constitutes itself as a tissue of disseminations. This prevailing mode of thought and its concomitant methods have opened up a critical paradox in the field of literary analysis in which traditional pursuits of an underlying meaning have been profoundly problematised. Rejecting the idea that an objective position of authority can be assumed outside the text, poststructuralism foregrounds the radical indeterminacy in texts and operates in a "framework" defying any universal claim to truth.

The paradox referred to above is that in the wake of this poststructuralist theorising, the critic is left with two choices - reject what poststructuralism has to say, or accept it but factor it into the analysis. Critics have traditionally been obsessed with uncovering a final "meaning" to texts, or at least moving towards it. Thus, the only way to legitimately make a claim to authority about a text is to do so with an appropriate degree of self-referentiality. The problem faced by contemporary textual analysts is that of making a "meaningful" interpretation of a text while not claiming to stand outside either the primary text or their own criticisms of it. The critic must refer to what the text signifies but also make clear the representational practices that enable this signifying act and that of the criticism.
The "Gothic" is a problematic concept to investigate for two main reasons. Firstly, it refers to a large body of texts which have emerged from a wide range of artistic and cultural forms. Secondly, the texts which may be classified under this title extend over a long period of time. Moreover, in certain fields - architecture for instance - "Gothic" is quite historically specific while in many others, especially "literature", what may be seen as Gothic is not limited to a particular moment. Furthermore, there are varying degrees to which a text may be regarded as "Gothic"; it may exhibit many of the recurring structural characteristics of the form or may just have certain elements which may be described as "Gothic". This problematic categorisation is partly due to the process of classification itself which, in the humanities at least, is a notoriously flawed endeavour. Indeed, the modern history of literary creation and criticism is littered with the generation of generic categories into which texts are grouped only for the next generation of texts to come along and, through their polysemic hybridity, shatter these fragile conceptions of genre before a new and equally precarious set of generic conventions are formulated. The "modernist" (one is apprehensive about applying the limiting labels exemplifying the above point here) texts of Joyce and Beckett evidence the perils of literary taxonomy. In the former's Ulysses for instance, the assemblage of an enormous range of allusions of varying obscurity to other texts, highlights this novel's simultaneous affinity with and independence of these texts. The erudite hybridity of Joyce's text might seem to place it easily within a "modernist" classification, yet the very act of classifying the novel - even if the rather loose term "modernist" itself could be pinned down - seems to understate its polysemic overstatement. However, "Gothic" is an especially problematic concept for the specific reasons outlined above. On the one hand, it can apply loosely to certain visible textual characteristics and, on the other, it can designate a particular time and a set of relatively conventional structures.
In approaching "Gothic literature" (a small "l" indicates that, as an historically marginalised genre, there is no official canon to warrant an "L") or, perhaps more correctly, the literary Gothic, this looseness of referential possibility has allowed for the production of a greatly varied range of critical texts. This is especially so over the past twenty or thirty years with the displacement, in Anglo-American English departments, of traditional formalist criticism with the less universalising reading strategies of poststructuralism. The prevalence of Gothic narratives in the popular cultural forms of films and comics provides a rich vein of material alongside the "high" literary incarnations of the genre. Subsequently, many people with very different intentions and theoretical trajectories have utilised the Gothic as a means of asserting their own readings of related cultural phenomena. In so doing, they have added further layers to an already dense field. This has not served to consolidate the generic boundaries of the Gothic. On the contrary, the diverse uses to which "Gothic" texts have been put illustrate and perpetuate their signifying variety and classificatory slipperiness.

Examples of the different agendas and (theoretical) frameworks which have been served through the idea of the Gothic include reading Frankenstein's monster as a hideous embodiment of the revolting working class (O'Flinn 1986) and, in another configuration, as a figure for the threat of nuclear war (Easlea 1983). Other ways in which Gothic texts generate diverse tangential criticisms will become evident in due course. Suffice it to say here that the "problem" of conceptualising the Gothic is a bittersweet one. A degree of vagueness can accompany an attempt to classify the object texts of the studies concerned as "Gothic". However, this allows a certain flexibility conducive to a creative deployment of the concept.

This analysis enters the field with an awareness of these problems of generic classification. Like comparable earlier theoretical excursions, it recognises the futility of seeking
a "hard and fast" definitional matrix. It utilizes the fluidity of the concept to advance a set of ideas which will add to this fluidity. The fundamental difference between this analysis of Gothic texts and those already situated in the field is that the primary focus of it is the fluidity of the Gothic text itself. In other words, not only does this critical exposition exploit the fluidity of the concept of the Gothic to assert a set of related ideas, it utilizes the fluidity to foreground itself, to make self-conscious the self-consciousness of the Gothic. It tackles the paradoxes generated by Gothic texts by suggesting that this generation is symptomatic of a larger endemic paradox: the fluidity of the concept of the Gothic perpetually guarantees its fluidity.

In order to adhere to the critical task of "making sense" of Gothic texts, a theory of fluidity needs to be developed to counteract the possibility of being mired in interminable paradoxical reiteration. The way in which this dissertation attempts this is through the image of the fugitive figure. This image has been generated through the utilisation of the fluidity of the "Gothic" concept. However, the fugitive figure is not extrapolated from the Gothic, but is always already inscribed into this concept. It does not exist in a relationship of tangential exteriority to the Gothic but is incorporated into the generation of Gothic fluidity itself. In a sense then, this thesis positions itself in the littered field of Gothic studies not by using the Gothic as a point of reference or departure, but by reflecting on the paradoxical principles of this "point of reference" itself. Rather than using the Gothic novel to create a novel concept related to the Gothic, this is a project of gazing into the mirror of the Gothic and disentangling it from its reflection.

This thesis engages with texts which foreground the pursuit of the narrative/textual fugitive "figure", an ambiguous term simultaneously referring to (fictional) characters in the literary narrative, and how these characters and the action in the text itself is signified or symbolised. This pursuit is mirrored by the critic's pursuit of the tropic or "textual" fugitive
figure (which inescapably runs into narrative). This study will investigate the textual pursuit of the fugitive figure and each text's pursuit of and vulnerability to pursuit by other texts. It aims to delineate the differences between narrative and textual fugitivity, while emphasising their interdependence and interaction in problematising the acts of representation and figuration. It seeks to emphasise that the term "fugitivity" is self-reflexive through evading definitive apprehension. The fugitive figure combines insight and seduction with concealment and deception. Ultimately, it represents semantic and textual evasiveness. All one can do is provide a list of recurring characteristics of fugitivity to counteract this terminological duplicity and ambiguity.

The dissertation explores instances of fugitive figuration in a range of texts, notably those of the "Gothic" genre, to provide specific literary examples of fugitivity and thus comment on its role in the processes of signification occurring in these texts.

This analysis, while incorporating texts from a wide range of historical periods, is quite specific as to the generic positioning of these texts. All of the novels are "Gothic". Although a genealogy of Gothic fugitivity is being attempted, the process discussed is not limited to this genre in which it is simply most noticeable and significant. Indeed, the origin of the concept of fugitivity explored in relation to these texts is not necessarily reducible to this genre. Fugitivity is observable not only in different media but also in a vast range of literary texts. Texts written in a number of different historical periods and cultural situations reveal that fugitivity is a recurring topos/trope. It is an elusive/allusive metaphorical turn existing both on the level of narrative structure and within the deeper textual levels of certain early modern works/texts and those which follow.
However, fugitivity is evident in such wildly varying sources as contemporary women's poetry, Aboriginal writing, the lyrics of rock songs, crime fiction and - as my epigraph suggests - in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. This ubiquitous variety poses a problem of the fugitive figure being everywhere but nowhere; that is, it recurs continually but cannot be pinned down. Yet this indeterminacy is fundamental to the desire to pursue the figure through textuality. With deference to this indeterminacy, some quotes from these different sources - tantalising fragments of fugitivity - are interspersed throughout the thesis. Moreover, fugitivity is not only a widespread literary topos, but simultaneously a trope, deeply embedded in all textual acts.

The roles of the writer and researcher of fugitivity are problematised to show that even an awareness of its effects cannot lead to their reduction. No engagement with any text can take place from a detached position of objectivity. The act of textual engagement coincides with the agent's emergence as an interchangeable and self-effaced identity in the random, objective desires of the process of pursuit (recalling Eagleton's memorable statement about the postmodern world requiring our submission to the "brute objectivity of random subjectivity" [1985, 70]). All texts are inescapably intertextual due to this process of fugitive pursuit and all representation or figuration is an image of the image of the image (De Man 1979).

The vampire powerfully symbolises narrative/textual fugitivity and profound epistemological, textual and sexual ambiguity. This figure exudes and is suffused with deep psychic and societal desires. It is simultaneously responsible for generating while being generated by these desires. The writer and researcher are metaphorical vampires, the researcher biting the biter. A parasitic relationship exists between writer and text, critic and text and vampire and victim. There are alternative figures appropriate to an analysis of fugitivity, but the vampire/Gothic monster is the most apt because of its embodiment - or figuration - of desire.
Paradoxically, it is significant that certain texts are pervaded by fugitivity, yet one is not capable of finding a satisfying definition of the term. Ultimately, "fugitivity" is indeterminate: one can enumerate a list of characteristics, but this list is neither finite nor can it be resolved into a self-contained unit. Yet this is, in a nutshell, the thesis. The writer is in the peculiar (yet familiar) position of being compromised by the written. The fugitive figure emerges from the fissure between the apparent authority of the pursuer (author/reader) and the evasion of the pursued text. Thus the fugitive figure is one of deception and mockery.

The insatiable vampire-figure is the bloody wellspring of an abundance of material on desire. Furthermore, like fugitivity, the vampire - as Gelder (1995) and Levine and Knoepflmacher (1979) have pointed out in different contexts - surfaces under different social, historical and aesthetic conditions, continually rising from and returning to its grave in a process of decay and renewal. Given this recurring process, a genealogy of the Gothic seemed appropriate, one concentrating on famous literary vampires. Moretti once described Frankenstein's creature as "a metaphor [that] gets up and walks" (1983, 106). Dracula and the other "villains" of these novels could be described in the same way. This pithy statement is reappropriated here as a succinct encapsulation of what fugitivity "is" - a narrative and textual simultaneity, a paradoxical vitality of something dead. Hence a genealogy of "Gothic" fugitivity.
"A METAPHOR GETS UP AND WALKS"

Etymologically, the term "fugitive", while inviting pursuit, does not lead anywhere other than into a cul-de-sac from which it conveniently, and typically, escapes. It assumes the characteristics of being evasive and treacherous, and in the attempt to trace a genealogy of it, one encounters the same set of associated words which form a group of fugitive signifiers - "fleeting", "transient", "ephemeral", "evanescent", "shifting" - all secretive regarding the full implications and ramifications of the family of fugitivity. When terms like these are applied to actual people regarded as "fugitives", they tend to carry with them a freight of derogatory connotations, thus reinforcing the sense that fugitives are subversive, dangerous or threatening people. This sense extends to literary texts when the fugitive figure (i.e. the signifier rather than signified) is positioned as subversive, or in Ross Chambers' terminology, "oppositional".¹ The simultaneous concealment and revelation of these signifiers of fugitivity is fugitive in itself, mirroring the process of pursuit contained in every narrative and textual act inescapably enmeshed in numerous networks of desire.

Whereas negative associations coagulate around the term "fugitive" applied to "real" people, in "fiction" the subversive threat of the fugitive has a more bittersweet tinge because of the desire evoked or exuded by this fugitive. There are many memorable fugitives in literary (or textual) history and the term itself became ingrained in popular culture through the 1960s television program, The Fugitive. This program blurred pursuer/pursued by having Dr Richard Kimball pursuing his wife's killer while himself being chased by the police who believed he was responsible for her murder. While the program's title most obviously refers to the doctor, it ambiguously refers to the unknown perpetrator(s) of the crime. It also suggests the process of
pursuit itself and its being beyond satisfactory resolution. The compelling nature of this television series and its subject matter is indicated by the 1990s film version starring Harrison Ford in which audience sympathy is again directed towards the bewildered and (wrongly) accused fugitive who, despite being the ostensible "villain", is heroic.

In the notion of textual fugitivity, the word becomes defamiliarised from its popular usage and more specifically literary in a theoretical extension of the narrative image of pursuit in which the terms "fugitive" and "figure" become intertwined, because the fugitive is figured and the figuration is fugitive. Two theorists whose work enables a context for textual fugitivity are Chambers and De Man, both of whom are deeply concerned with the problems (and possibilities) of figuration.

There are many points at which Chambers' ideas about the oppositional intersect with the fugitive figure and it is important to elaborate on some of the implications of this interaction. In Room for Maneuver: Reading (the) Oppositional (in) Narratives (1991), Chambers extends the ideas he formulated in Story and Situation: Narrative Seduction and The Power of Fiction (1984). What is striking about the earlier book and its relation to the more recent text is Chambers' ideas on the self-reflexivity of the literary text and its use of a range of narrative techniques to situate or "figure" itself. This thesis explores this idea and the associated notions of "narrative function" and "textual function" because they shed light on fugitivity itself, particularly as fugitivity can be seen as an emergence of what Barthes (1975) would call the scriptible (writerly) from within the lisible (readerly). This explains why some 18th and 19th century novels may be deconstructed and read as markers of a kind of evasive desire and polysemy. In other words, the ways in which fugitivity relates to Chambers' ideas of narrative
function and textual function provide an important focus for defining (the role of) fugitivity in Gothic texts.

Roman Jakobson provides the source of the distinction between narrative and textual functions which proves so fundamental to an understanding of the fugitive figure. In his famous statement, "Linguistics and Poetics" (1960), he identifies six factors present "in any act of verbal communication" (353). These factors are an addressee, an addressee, a context, a message, a contact and a code. According to Jakobson,

Each of these six factors determines a different function of language. Although we distinguish six basic aspects of language, we could, however, hardly find verbal messages that would fulfill only one function. The diversity lies not in a monopoly of some one of these several functions but in a different hierarchical order of functions. The verbal structure of a message depends primarily on the predominant function. (353)

Six functions of language are determined by each of these factors. These functions are, in respective order, the emotive, the conative, the referential, the poetic, the phatic and the metalingual. It is necessary to consider each of these functions in turn.

According to Jakobson, "[t]he so-called EMOTIVE, or 'expressive' function, focused on the ADDRESSER, aims a direct expression of the speaker's attitude toward what he is speaking about" (1960, 354). Thus, the way in which a person places emphasis on certain words in an utterance as well as the nature of this utterance will produce subtle variations in how the addressee understands the message.

Jakobson states that "[o]rientation toward the ADDRESSEE, the CONATIVE function, finds its purest grammatical expression in the vocative and imperative" (1960, 355). Thus, an
utterance would be primarily conative if the addressee to do something - for instance, "Drink!", to use Jakobson's example.

The emotive and conative functions are closely associated with the referential function. If we take these three functions respectively, we have "the first person of the addressee, the second person of the addressee and the 'third person,' properly - someone or something spoken of" (1960, 355). Jakobson cites spells and incantations as working examples of this function.

Jakobson utilises Malinowski's idea of the "phatic" to describe another function of language in which there is "a profuse exchange of ritualized formulas, by entire dialogues with the mere purport of prolonging communication" (1960, 355). In this function, "there are messages primarily serving to establish, to prolong, or to discontinue communication, to check whether the channel works... to attract the attention of the interlocutor or to confirm his continued attention" (1960, 355). Examples are messages like "Hello, do you hear me?" or "Are you listening?".

Jakobson argues that a "metalingual" function is performed "[w]henever the addressee and/or the addressee need to check up whether they use the same code [and] speech is focussed on the CODE" (1960, 356). Thus the addressee may ask, "what do you mean?" or, conversely, "the addressee in anticipation of such recapturing questions inquires: Do you know what I mean?" (1960, 356).

Finally, the "poetic" function - which may include poetry, but is not exclusively articulated in poetry - "focus[es] on the message for its own sake... This function, by promoting the palpability of signs, deepens the fundamental dichotomy of signs and objects" (1960, 356).
Jakobson also draws attention to the properties of metaphor and metonymy, poles which the fugitive figure collapses through its simultaneous inscription as trope and topos. Chambers, through his analyses of La Fontaine’s fables, 19th Century French literature and diverse postcolonial writings, provides the indispensable theoretical foundations of the concepts of the narrative and textual functions which the fugitive figure simultaneously occupies.

Chambers argues that texts have a "referential function", a "narrative function" and a "textual function". Each of these "representational functions" is formulated by combining two of Jakobson's "functions" of discourse from the latter's "Linguistics and Poetics". Thus, the referential function combines Jakobson's "referential" and "poetic" functions; the narrative function fuses the "emotive/expressive" and "conative" functions and the textual function is a mixture of Jakobson's "metalinguistic" and "phatic" functions. According to Chambers,

"text, then, performs in all three signifying "functions" - the "referential," the "narrative" and the "textual" - to which correspond three modes of production of context - by reference, that is production of a "world" given as preexisting, by simulacrum, the mode of production of the narrative relationship, and finally by self-figuration, the mode of production of a reading context. These functions are simultaneous in the sense that there is normally no discrete segment of text that can be perceived as exercising, specifically or uniquely, any one given function. (1991, 36)

This dissertation works with the ideas of narrative and textual functions. Indeed, Chambers focuses primarily on these two functions by accepting that the referential function, although not transparent, provides the other functions with a representational framework. It is the narrative and textual functions which provide the author/reader with the "room for manoeuvre" to act as an oppositional agent of change. He concentrates his analysis on the manoeuvrings within these functions rather than the referential, although all three are interdependent to some degree.
The narrative and textual functions Chambers describes may be further delineated in the following:

[Int]o an oppositional narrative, a "narrative function" that respects the power structure serves as a form of disguise for a "textual function" whose operation is more covert, but ultimately more significant, and serves as an appeal to the "readerly" activity of interpretation, thereby subverting notions such as those of the autonomous subject or the discursive "transmission" of information that the "narrative function" enacts. (1991, 13)

He also argues that the traditionally antithetical poles of reader and writer, self and other are problematized by the literary text allowing for the possibility of change within the production of meaning:

[My] role as reader of a text is not so much to receive a story (identifying with the narratee position) as to collaborate with the text in the production of meaning, a task that redistributes - perhaps equalizes - the power relationship, and certainly dissolves the simplistic distinctions of self and other, sender and receiver that are inherent in the concepts of narrator and narratee. (1991, 26)

The blurring of self and other and the oppositional possibilities inherent in this process indicate the mobilisation of the narrative and textual fugitive figure. This figure is simultaneously outside and inside any system of representation, marginalised but seeking to undermine the system from within. The fugitive figure makes the simultaneity of the narrative and textual functions in literary texts possible because of the intersection between the movement of narrative figures and the tropaic sliding of linguistic figures across the page, both fugitive figures in search of "meaning". Chambers acknowledges the importance of movement to oppositionality, seeing that the transient nature of the oppositional agent allows it the element of surprise and unpredictability while protecting itself from exposure. For instance, he explores
Nerval's "Angélique", a melancholy work tracing the movement of protagonists across France's Valois region. This text details the narrator's farcical search for a missing book supposed to provide an historically accurate impression of the adventures of the Abbé de Bucquoy. Instead, because of the book's continued unavailability, a self-consciously serious daily explanation of the pursuit of the missing book is ridiculously conducted. Chambers argues that this futile pursuit mirrors the loss of identity itself:

The missing book signifies the unavailability to writing of an absolute referent that might guarantee something like historical accuracy; but its loss - the fact that it was once glimpsed but now cannot be found - underpins the melancholic dimension of the theme of lost identity, an identity which once was but can now only be mourned. (1991, 117)

The "other side" of this process is the elusiveness of the "meaning" sought. Chambers spells out the implications of this in the following passage, extending on ideas expressed by Deleuze and Guattari in *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*:

Both deterritorialization and nomadism figure the melancholic sense of an identity that makes "I" a function of the "other". If I am the other, "my" territory is not mine - there is no there there, as Gertrude Stein might say; and my search for myself - for a self that might stand in resistance to the other(s) that constitute(s) me - can only engage me in an endless wandering, and in an oppositionality of elusiveness. It becomes a directionless pursuit that takes me from point to point in seemingly aimless and endless fashion, from moment to moment and from mood to mood, across a landscape of identity that has no center. (1984, 108, emphases in original)

Chambers argues that the changes wrought by the oppositional wanderings of the narrative/textual figure are an ongoing process that is both inevitable and desirable. However, the direction of these changes is always concealed from the agent/reader. "Meaning" is not
apprehensible then, but the text continually alludes to "a meaning" which is then pursued while "Meaning" itself proves elusive: "At the heart of things there is a central darkness, an impenetrable void, knowable only by the signs of its presence, which are also the signs of its elusiveness" (1991, 199, emphasis in original). The fugitive figure promises "Meaning", delivers "meanings" and invites pursuit again, thus maintaining its place in the text and encouraging an ongoing revision of what Chambers ironically refers to as the "last word":

Reading itself cannot be assumed, therefore, to be capable of providing the last word the text is itself incapable of; it cannot restore the text's lost order or complete its project. The appeal is rather to a conversion of the reader - a conversion away from the understandings and desires that encourage conceptions like the idea of a "last word" - such that the textual "influence" is shifted endlessly onward, making of it an agent, not of closure but of change. The possibility of change can only imply further change; so that any change produced in the reader cannot close the process, it merely opens a prospect of yet more change. (1991, 244, emphases in original)

Like Chambers, De Man, in Allegories of Reading (1979), suggests the interaction between narrative and textual levels. He does so through an analysis of passages of The Will to Power, arguing that Nietzsche's ideas on rhetoric and figural language are vital to an understanding of his writing. The interdependence of the literal and the figurative is fundamental to the simultaneous narrative and textual nature of fugitivity. The literal asserts itself in the domain of the narrative function while the figurative operates in the textual function. De Man demonstrates this literal/figurative interplay in his work, arguing that the moment philosophical reflection is undertaken, it places itself/is placed under threat of self-annihilation and this threat remains throughout the process of inscription. Whatever the object of philosophical discussion, the threat is "figured", moulding itself to the contours of the subject matter as it is sequentially narrated. At the literal level, the author objectively controls this subject matter, but at the
figurative, this very authority is being undermined by the text to the point of its complete entropic collapse. The continual simultaneity of expression and self-destruction is a necessary consequence of the act of obsessive self-reflection as it is embodied in the text.

This self-destruction is not unique to philosophical texts. It is as evident in the novel form, indicating that it occurs as soon as writing begins, rather than being invoked by a particular subject matter or mode of writing. In the novel, the threat of self-destruction is immediate because the text, whatever its subject matter, is the figured incorporation of the author's obsessive self-reflection. This writer-text relationship is mirrored by that of the reader-text which, while configured differently for each individual, enacts in every case the same obsessive self-reflection. So, whether the text is "philosophical" or "literary", its capacity to collapse in on itself (the pursuer-pursued becoming indistinguishable) is ever-present. The particular way in which this threat is made manifest in the ongoing sequence of the text's narration or inscription is through the continued emergence of the fugitive figure in its motley illimitable range of guises. The novel is an ideal form to see this fugitive figure at work because it often works with the "I" of identity, detailing the progress of a particular subject through different life experiences. The Gothic novel is especially useful, not only because it threatens the self-destruction of the subject. Its narrative function engages with subject matter which, paralleling what is foregrounded by the textual function, is fundamentally concerned with obsessive self-reflection leading to an inevitable self-destruction.

This will become amply evident in the ensuing analysis of the chosen texts. However, a brief example may be afforded here by Wilde's fin-de-siècle novel The Picture of Dorian Gray. This is the well-known story of the title character's wanton and reckless life conducted with immunity from the usual physical consequences of prolonged debauchery. Instead of his own
face evidencing the years of vice and sin, his decadences are countenanced by the face of his portrait. The self-destruction of the eponymous hero is conferred onto the picture and is thus avoided in life. However, this transference is only temporary - it is more of a deferral than a conferral - and the novel ends with Dorian's eruption of guilt and shame as he stabs the picture. This act coincides with his own impalement. The narrative function works to represent the destruction of the subject through the ironic deployment of the picture as means of self-reflection. In terms of the simultaneous mobilisation of the textual function, the novel is replete with the pithy witticisms of Wilde, whether mouthed by Dorian or by other characters, notably Lord Henry Wotton. Wilde's favourite textual strategy was paradox, the form which best mirrored his own tantalising ambiguities. The use of paradoxical aphorisms in the novel serves to undermine its apparently tragic teleology by forcing the reader to focus on the duplicitous surface of the text rather than/as well as the narrative development. In this way, it can be said that the novel represents the destruction of the subject, but at the same time, self-effacingly - just as Dorian attacks his "own" visage - it presents the destruction of this representation. The textual function and narrative function are working - and undoing - in a similar manner, but at different levels.

An indication of the way in which textual fugitivity (the fugitivity of figuration) borrows from, is inextricably linked to, and an extension of (the image of) narrative fugitivity is to be found in De Man's analysis of the mode of Nietzsche's argumentation in The Will to Power. He claims that in Nietzsche's arguments about the chronological reversal of cause and effect, subject and object in the "phenomenalism of consciousness".
Here, De Man reveals the rhetorical strategies utilised by Nietzsche in his interrogation of polarities. These strategies are relevant to a discussion of fugitivity because they indicate the extent to which the pursuer and pursued are intertwined - or, to use De Man's term, "scrambled". De Man's analysis of the strategies themselves points to the fact that no position of authoritative exteriority can be assumed by Nietzsche despite (or because of) the rhetorical nature of his assertions. Nietzsche's claim that the subject and object of perception exist interdependently cannot escape its own implications. Furthermore, taking this reasoning to the next degree, neither can De Man's assertions, nor of those who follow him. This argument is best exemplified by the ostrich paradox in Poe's "The Purloined Letter" (1988) to which this work will continually refer (defer).

De Man continues his exploration of the rhetoric of Nietzsche's speculations on rhetoric by looking at the latter's On Truth and Lie in an Extra-Moral Sense. Nietzsche argues that rhetorical features of language like metaphors and metonymies lead to an illusory consolidation of ideas as "Truth" that effaces the creative lie of the metaphor in its originating moment. De Man indicates that Nietzsche is concerned with exposing the profoundly figurative nature of language that is hidden by a "false literalism". The most fundamental of these metaphorical lies is that through which the subject centres himself/herself in a privileged interpretive position to dispel the unthinkable truth of his/her cosmic insignificance. De Man describes this process in the following way:
Making the language that denies the self into a center rescues the self linguistically at the same time that it asserts its insignificance, its emptiness as a mere figure of speech. It can only persist as self if it is displaced into the text that denies it. The self which was at first the center of the language as its empirical referent now becomes the language of the center as fiction, as metaphor of the self. What was originally a simply referential text now becomes the text of a text, the figure of a figure. The deconstruction of the self as a metaphor does not end in the rigorous separation of the two categories (self and figure) from each other but ends instead in an exchange of properties that allows for their mutual persistence at the expense of literal truth. (1979, 111-12)

In terms of the aims of this thesis, the ambiguity of the term "figure" is useful because it simultaneously conveys the narrative and textual "meanings" of fugitivity. This is why the term "fugitive figure" is used so often - to refer to more than just the popular understanding of the fugitive being: the outlaw fleeing into the distance from the forces of justice. This pursuit scenario may take the form of the fugitive pursued by those who desire the knowledge promised by it. In this case, the "fugitive figure" is fleeing, like Frankenstein's monster, into the "dark distance" of textuality from those who would wish to apprehend it and unravel the secrets of Frankenstein's transgressive activities, (no less than the secret of life itself, a secret the erotic instinct within us all pursues), imagining the capture of the fugitive through the figure, but finding that the figure is itself fugitive and that the fugitive is itself a figure - hence the indissoluble blurring of "fugitive figure" indicating an indeterminate and irresolvable process of pursuit.

In a sense, the narratives of fugitivity analysed in this thesis are odysseys of the self, and hence are exercises in self-consciousness, narcissism and the quest for ultimate identification and self-realisation. De Man implies this in Nietzsche's work when he speaks of the merging of self and figure above. His analysis of figuration is conducted through an investigation of the texts of
major literary and philosophical thinkers like Rilke, Proust and Rousseau as well as Nietzsche. De Man argues that in *On Truth and Lie*, the demystifier of rhetoric is (unavoidably) implicated in his own rhetoric:

All rhetorical structures, whether we call them metaphor, metonymy, chiasmus, metalepsis, hypallagus, or whatever, are based on substitutive reversals, and it seems unlikely that one more such reversal over and above the ones that have already taken place would suffice to restore things to their proper order. One more "turn" or trope added to a series of earlier reversals will not stop the turn towards error. A text like *On Truth and Lie*, although it presents itself legitimately as a demystification of literary rhetoric remains entirely literary, rhetorical, and deceptive itself. (1979, 113)

This is relevant to the fugitivity of figuration because rhetoric is concerned with the strategic deployment of literary figures and what is at stake is precisely the "truth". It is the "truth" that the fugitive figure problematises through its ironic, uncanny appearance and disappearance. It promises to reveal this truth, but is endlessly evasive, treacherous and slippery and its promise seems to be illusory, a subversive defamiliarisation and seduction. De Man implicitly positions Nietzsche as a kind of fugitive figure when he exposes the seductive promise of *On Truth and Lie*, at first a revelation of the falsehoods we have been unwittingly accepting and then a concealment of its own artificial nature, its own strategic agenda and status as fabricated rhetoric. This process could be continued by criticising De Man (there are famous examples of such criticism occurring, as in Derrida's critique of Lacan's analysis of Poe's "The Purloined Letter"). The main point here is that all texts are instantly and unavoidably intertextual, rhetorical and thus fugitive (in the deliberately negative sense of the term). This means that the text is a complex network of fugitive figures and the writer becomes a fugitive figure as well. Even if occupying the apparently unassailable position of a third-person omniscient narrator, the
writer is not aloof and detached from a great, objective work, but is thoroughly implicated in the 
decceptive and seductive rhetoric of the fugitive figurations of the text. The inherently 
self-destructive nature of any text, even as it deconstructs other rhetorical seductions and 
deceptions, is indicated by De Man:

Philosophy turns out to be an endless reflection on its own destruction at the 
hands of literature.
This endless reflection is itself a rhetorical mode, since it is unable ever to escape 
from the rhetorical deceit it denounces... The wisdom of the text is self-destructive (art 
is true but truth kills itself), but this self-destruction is infinitely displaced in a series of 
successive rhetorical reversals, which, by the endless repetition of the same figure, keep 
it suspended between truth and the death of this truth. (1979, 115)

A key element in Gothic fugitivity and textuality is the sublime. An idea explored in the 
philosophical terms of Kant and Burke, it has been recontextualised in debates about 
postmodernism. The sublime in its diverse historical manifestations will be explored in some 
detail a little later. One theorist of postmodernism, Eagleton, in a famous analysis of this 
contemporary "cultural logic" (to use Jameson's terminology), supports De Man's contention 
about the unavoidable self-destruction of "literature" and, in so doing, utilises an image of 
narrative fugitivity:

Literature, that aporetic spot in which truth and error indissolubly entwine, is at 
ounce practice and the deconstruction of practice, spontaneous act and theoretical fact, a 
gesture which in pursuing an unmediated encounter with reality in the same instant 
interprets that very impulse as metaphysical fiction. (1985, 65)

The fugitive figure simultaneously promises "an unmediated encounter" and invites the pursuit of 
this but then reveals the impossibility of such an encounter. It is relevant that the language
Eagleton uses to describe this process is so metaphorically evocative of a kind of narrative pursuit. This narrative/textual doubling, as Chambers would argue in relation to more overtly literary texts, recurs in critical discussions of representation and figuration. It supplements the sense that the fugitive figure is at work in all texts because such theorists are using the fugitive figure to evoke a sense of the fugitivity in texts. Therefore, a process of infinite regression is mobilised as in the Nietzsche-De Man (or Poe-Lacan-Derrida) configurations. In this case, Eagleton cites the impossibility of "pursuing an unmediated encounter" and in so doing is himself unavoidably pursuing an unmediated encounter, just as I am in exposing his pursuit.

The researcher is a kind of vampire, a parasite feeding on the ideas of others and providing a transformation of these ideas which is of general use for other parasitic researchers and writers. This is suggested in the fact that the word "research", deriving from the French "recherche", means to look for intensely, pursue. It is an active metaphor of pursuit and its indication of the state of being already excessive and unoriginal, draws on the "search" that the previous and by no means original searcher/researcher has conducted. There exists a symbiosis of pursuer-pursued and the more the researcher becomes drawn into the text being analysed, the more aware s/he is of his/her status as pursued as much as pursuer. In every case, what is initiated in all reading and writing, in all textuality, from the moment it is entered into, is an irresolvable dialectic of pursuit in which one who enters is simultaneously entered in a constantly changing flow of desire. The spontaneous reciprocation of desire between pursuer and pursued which permeates the writing process is characterised by a libidinous fluidity recalling Deleuze and Guattari's theories of desire in Anti-Oedipus. They identify desire as an uncodable flow which exceeds and disrupts the signifiers intended to contain it. Desire preexists and flows over the signifier:
[T]hrough the impasses and the triangles a schizophrenic flow moves, irresistibly; sperm, river, drainage, inflamed genital mucus, or a stream of words that do not let themselves be coded, a libido that is too fluid, too viscous: a violence against syntax, a concerted destruction of the signifier, non-sense erected as a flow, polyvocity that returns to haunt all relations... the prohibition of incest referred, not to Oedipus, but to the noncoded flows that constitute desire, and to their representative, the intense prepersonal flow. (1984, 131-173)

The description of the flow as "schizophrenic" is important because it indicates the diffuse nature of desire and its defiant disintegration of identity. As will be observed in due course, the fugitive figure, as a marker/embodiment of this desire, is correspondingly schizophrenic, characterised by its force, lucidity and presence, yet frustratingly aloof, insubstantial and irrecoverably multiple.

Just as Deleuze and Guattari use the tropaic fugitive figure to evoke the presence-absence of the fugitive figure, this deployment recurs within Derrida's arguments. In the following statement from Of Grammatology, in which Derrida attempts to deconstruct Saussure's linguistics, he is (implicitly, through the figurative use of the trope of the fugitive figure) establishing a close kinship between poststructuralism and fugitivity:

[O]ne realizes that what was chased off limits, the wandering outcast of linguistics, has indeed never ceased to haunt language as its primary and most intimate possibility. Then something which was never spoken and which is nothing other than writing itself as the origin of language writes itself within Saussure's discourse. (1976, 44)

This builds on Derrida's argument that the inside is always already infiltrated by the outside and that the two are intertwined, as expressed in the following:
One already suspects that if writing is "image" and exterior "figuration," this "representation" is not innocent. The outside bears with the inside a relationship that is, as usual, anything but simple exteriority. The meaning of the outside was always present within the inside, imprisoned outside the outside, and vice versa. (1976, 35)

The sense Derrida provides here of writing always already being there corresponds to this project of genealogy in which fugitivity is not something particular to contemporary writing or "art", nor an idiosyncratic feature of modernism/postmodernism. Fugitivity is incipient in all writing, but especially potent in the Gothic genre with its figuration and evocation of desire, as the field for marking out the continuous existence of the fugitive figure through different historical and cultural contexts.

The notion that any pursuit of the fugitive figure will involve a simple and successful chase and capture has been thoroughly displaced by Derrida's notion of the trace, described in Of Grammatology, which (especially in its duplicitous adoption of both nominal and verbal forms) indicates the way in which the fugitive figure remains aloof, beyond reach, unattainable. The kind of genealogy conducted here, as in the texts of Foucault, opposes the imperial and linear trajectories of traditional genealogies. A crucial element in this kind of approach is the underpinning epistemological conviction that the traditional search for an originary point of meaning from which the idea of identity is begun and to which it is retrospectively tracked, is a fiction of patriarchal, phallogocentric discourse.

The aim is to indicate a pattern of fugitivity in a range of Gothic texts over a large period of time. This emphasis on history is necessary, but the proliferation of the fugitive figure in these texts is a sign of disruption, of the desire for a radical and subversive anti-history that acknowledges its appearances (and sudden disappearances) but does not attempt to resolve these
figurative incorporations into a fictitious unity dependent on a foundationalist point of origin or *sine qua non*.

To resist the very structures one is working within results in paradoxical figurations in the strategic attempt not to implicate oneself in the fallacious theories one is critiquing and trying to displace. Such a paradox is inherent in the desire to indicate a recurring textual process and emphasise the displacing effect of these recurring figures while not making the mistake of reducing this process to a single, monolithic, original cause. Derrida, like Foucault, is profoundly conscious of this need to escape the linear, patriarchal and imperial, to resist what might be referred to as the "tyranny of the Original" or "Law of the Father". However, he still needs to figure the fugitivity of figuration and these two purposes prove difficult to achieve. The question of origin (or anti-origin) is addressed by Derrida in his discussion of the trace and he suggests that it makes its mark only for its origin to be erased. In fact he claims this origin never existed, being only an illusory reflection of the trace itself. He goes on to state this in the following strategically paradoxical manner, thus indicating the fugitivity of figuration:

From then on, to wrench the concept of the trace from the classical scheme, which would derive it from a presence or from an originary nontrace and which would make of it an empirical mark, one must indeed speak of an originary trace or arche-trace. Yet we know that that concept destroys its name and that, if all begins with the trace, there is above all no originary trace. (1976, 61)

Derrida goes on to argue for the impossibility of a transcendent utterance:

Articulating the living upon the nonliving in general, origin of all repetition, origin of ideality, the trace is not more ideal than real, not more intelligible than sensible, not more a transparent signification than an opaque energy and no concept of metaphysics can describe it. (1976, 65, emphasis in original)
Derrida argues that we have been trapped in (phal)logocentrism, a repressive and patriarchal metaphysics. Yet even while he attempts to deconstruct the ideas and ideologies of this system and realises the weaknesses of it - its inability to "describe" the "opaque energy" of what I call the fugitive figure - he is still forced to work from within the system itself. Thus he positions himself as an outlaw, a narrative fugitive figure, whose use of the textual figure in pursuit of the textual fugitive figure is an attempt to move beyond the limiting subject/object problematic of logocentric metaphysics into the process of pursuit in which the subject is split and the self is (always already) other. As Derrida puts it, "[c]onstituting and dislocating it at the same time, writing is other than the subject, in whatever sense the latter is understood." (1976, 68)

It is this pursuit, this blurring of the self and other that the vampire figure especially exudes (indeed it is the most fugitive of fugitive figures). The ensuing textual analyses will focus on this pursuit in an attempt to work within/escape the metaphysics of presence in an elucidation of the figure of simultaneous absence and presence, appearance and disappearance, the treacherous and liberating fugitive figure. As Derrida states: "The self-identity of the signified conceals itself unceasingly and is always on the move [the narrative and textual figure in one]. The property of the representamen is to be itself and another, to be produced as a structure of reference, to be separated from itself." (1976, 49-50)

The fugitive figure, represented symbolically by such "figures" as Hyde, Frankenstein's monster and Dracula, is the disruptive other, most horrifying because of its familiarity with the self: there is no reflection in the mirror because the fiend does not really exist except in the split within the subject's constitution.
Fugitivity plays an important role in Gothic novels in terms of its figuration of the unconscious and undeniable eruptings (and irruptings) of desire into the repressive order of the everyday. This erupting/irrupting of desire remains fundamental to definitions of the "Gothic". According to Jackson, the genre evolved from its escapist romantic origins into a form which began to question the contradictions in society and the role of the uncertain individual in confronting these contradictions:

The subject is no longer confident about appropriating or perceiving a material world. Gothic narrates this epistemological confusion: it expresses and examines personal disorder, opposing fiction's classical unities (of time, space, unified character) with an apprehension of partiality and relativity of meaning. (1981, 97)

This unexpected descent into the disorderly is crucial to focusing a genealogy of fugitivity on the Gothic, because the subversive fugitive figure, in its sudden appearances and disappearances, threatens order. This explains the continuous sighting/citing of the fugitive figure in Gothic texts, implying the special significance this genre has in relation to the subject matter of this thesis.

The texts to be analysed all explore Gothic articulations of fugitivity in a manner which enables them to stand out from other candidates for analysis. One important reason for this is that they are all about vampires, in a broad sense of the term. While both Frankenstein's monster and Edward Hyde are hideous creatures, they are not bloodsuckers as Count Dracula, Lestat de Lioncourt or Louis de Pointe du Lac are. However, what is most interesting (and disturbing or liberating) about these creatures is that, metaphorically speaking, they emerge from within the psyches of their benevolent alter egos. They function in a similar way to the vampire in that they are not outside threats, but uncanny internal ones. Thus both Jekyll and Frankenstein believe they can control the monsters they themselves generate by artificial means. Indeed, as will be argued
more extensively in the relevant chapters, they indicate the parasitic self/other configuration incorporated by the vampire figure. They metaphorically embody desire in similar ways to Dracula, the most potent example of desire incarnate.

Hyde and Frankenstein’s creature are both generated scientifically. This appears to introduce a sharp distinction between them and the vampires discussed in the other novels, given that the latter are ancient and embody the supernatural realm - in Rice’s version, through a mysterious, long forgotten alchemical process. In contrast, Hyde and Frankenstein’s creature emerge in the era of their inscription. However, Hyde is produced through a chemical concoction which has resonances with the origin of Dracula whose life is prolonged through mysterious undisclosed alchemical means. Shelley’s monster, although a product of technological advance (the discovery of galvanism), is made possible through Victor’s appreciation of the lessons of discredited alchemists. Therefore, despite their much later, more scientific appearances, these monsters are created through similarly uncanny means to the vampires. Moreover, the means of generation are not as important as the fact of their generation. The means only exist to allow for issues of desire and identity which the creatures represent to be explored. This explains why none of the creators divulge their secrets and the means of creation become lost, forever hidden from the reader. Metaphorically speaking, these creatures of desire are generated by desire and the technical means of their appearances are irrelevant. In fact, the narrative ploy of destroying the generative means, as well as being a convenient narrative device, also mirrors Derrida’s insistence that the trace erases its origin as soon as it makes its mark. This will become apparent as each text is analysed in more detail in later chapters.

That this desire is inverted or perverted (e.g. homoeroticism and the incest taboo in Frankenstein, as well as the concealed activities of Hyde in the seamy underworld of London
nights) reinforces that their embodiment of desire, without its sublimation in legitimate social practices, is irrational and destructive. Hyde and Frankenstein's monster both function very much like vampires, symbols of the threat of illegitimate gratification of these desires and the thrill of this illicit satisfaction. This is a thrill Walton feels when even after Frankenstein has poured out his tale of woe to the stranded mariner, he still wants the stricken scientist to divulge the hideous secrets of his sacrilegious experimentation.

Therefore, the vampiric characteristics shared by the hero-villains in these texts is important to this thesis. In all four texts (regarding The Vampire Chronicles as one extended "text" here), the authors are acutely aware of the means through which the "story" is narrated. The patchwork structures, changing forms of representation and shifting perspectives through which the narrative is focalised evidence this awareness. These techniques form a discourse in which representation and figuration are problematised and the fugitivity of these texts evidenced through the mobilisation of narrative/textual fugitive figures. Poststructuralists would argue that a deconstruction of any text would reveal this process of self-reflexive problematisation. Yet the subject matter and the ways in which it is presented (through distant voices and intersecting narratives for example) strengthen these Gothic texts' evocation of fugitivity and their permeation by it. As suggested earlier in the discussion of the origin and meaning of Chambers' "narrative function" and "textual function", the disorder that Gothic texts inscribe through the textual function mirrors that which is described through the narrative function. In Gothic texts, the fugitive figure of disorder is not only signified textually but also thematically. There are many instances of the simultaneity of narrative and textual fugitivity. These instances highlight the way in which Gothic texts resist closure in favour of displacement. In this process can be
seen the wilful and aberrant signifiers the vampire *figures* so powerfully and persuasively embody.

Vampires are especially appropriate figures for fugitivity because of the way in which they so conspicuously blur binaries, especially the life/death dichotomy. Indeed, they problematise the vital question of mortality - another key aspect of fugitivity, as I will discuss later in relation to the sublime. It is interesting to note that texts about vampires have attracted a wide range of commentators with different agendas. The various uses to which *Dracula* has been put in critical discussion is quite phenomenal and rivals the range of films, plays and "sequel" texts it has spawned. For instance, it has been described as a myth whose vitality depended on "popular apprehensions which clustered around the appearance in England of great numbers of Eastern European Jews at the end of the century" (Zanger 1991). It has also been seen as mediating "the feminine: Bisexuality, Homosexual Desire, and Self-Expression" (Howes 1988), and as sending "mixed messages" about science (Jann 1989), to cite just three examples. Therefore, it is because vampires are such peculiarly marginal creatures that the thesis approaches the Gothic in general and vampires in particular. There are other fugitivities and other desires, but the Gothic fugitivity of implicit/explicit vampires has a seductive, resonant and lingering appeal.

Besides the preoccupations each novel has with the desire for transgression and its simultaneously seductive and dangerous consequences, there are important similarities between these texts on the level of form which indicate the efficacy of the Gothic in foregrounding fugitivity. For example, the earlier Gothic novels provide within their own structures written records which are accumulated and pieced together. This is evidence of a valorisation of a kind of historical consciousness about narrated occurrences and a desire to perpetuate the events
narrated in a lasting textual form for future generations. This almost cumbersome and excessively meticulous strategy performs the same function as an historical account with its desire for continuity, record-keeping and the preservation of historical identity through textuality.

This desire for continuity is evident in the extreme methods undertaken by the guardians of civility and order in the texts - the respective "Crews of Light" - to keep the perceived evil at bay. Jekyll, Jonathan Harker and his colleagues, and Walton and Frankenstein all ostensibly value the coherence of psychic integrity because it enables them to occupy an esteemed place in the social order. However, the monsters that emerge from within them are potent symbols of disintegration. They threaten the subject with the repulsive otherness of the abject and the apparently self-contained, integrated ego with permeation. It is a feared (and yet secretly desired) penetration from the outside that is already inside - through the many points of rupture on the surface of the psyche and the bodily orifices - although never acknowledged as such.

Dracula, Hyde and Frankenstein's monster then are all embodiments of a radical and disturbing discontinuity. If we read these figures/figures as being metaphorical for a displaced cultural fear, this fear is, generally speaking, the fear of the margins and the fugitive other seen to lurk on those margins. In these three texts, one of the most important displaced issues of otherness is illicit sexuality: female assertiveness, incest, paedophilia and homosexuality. These others are fought by men, the keepers of the patriarchal law of what Wittig and Butler refer to as "compulsory heterosexuality" with the aim to reproduce at its foundation. Butler (1990) contests the univocally paternalistic signification of gender within a phallogocentric linguistic economy, just as the fugitive figure does through its blurring of traditionally antithetical opposites in an irresolvable dialectic leading to a narrative/textual unhinging of teleological "meaning". If we take the taboo of homosexuality, which Dracula, Hyde and Frankenstein's monster can be seen to
transgress, then the following statement from Butler, citing Douglas, fits in with the notion that the "heroes" in these texts are fighting to preserve an illusory self-continuity:

Douglas suggests that all social systems are vulnerable at their margins, and that all margins are accordingly considered dangerous. If the body is synecdochal for the social system *per se* or a site in which open systems converge, then any kind of unregulated permeability constitutes a site of pollution and endangerment. Since anal and oral sex among men clearly establishes certain kinds of bodily permeabilities unsanctioned by the hegemonic order, male homosexuality would, within such a hegemonic point of view, constitute a site of danger and pollution, prior to and regardless of the cultural presence of AIDS. (1990, 132)

Relating these issues of identity to the production of detailed, interwoven narrative patchworks functioning as recorded histories of the monster's emergence and (apparent) expulsion, then it can be seen that these narratives are an attempt to seal the monster out once and for all, to hide it behind impenetrable layers of "darkness and distance", to deny its capacity to show up its "author's" discontinuities.

Similarly, Maharet's great tapestry in Rice's *The Queen of the Damned* is a metaphor for the self-deluding act of "drawing the threads together" and mirrors the narrative patchwork of the texts and the collusion of different perspectives. In these means of representation, as well as in their evocation of the desire exuded by the vampire figure in many memorable scenes, these texts warrant detailed discussion of their permeation by fugitivity.

The Sublime Fear of and Desire for "Degree Zero"

Inherent in the popular meaning of fugitivity is the issue of mortality. If something is fugitive, it is potentially ephemeral and fleeting. When applied to human existence, the universal realisation
of the relative brevity and insignificance of our lives can be the catalyst for a paralysing anguish. This disabling angst - what Sartre saw as "nausea" - is recorded and philosophised upon in a vast range of cultural texts. This anguish is the melancholic perception of the alienation each individual experiences through the process of individuation or differentiation in negotiating the Symbolic order of existence. In psychoanalytic terms, the melancholy results from the infant's separation from the mother. It is keenly experienced at moments when what Lacan in his Écrits (1977) calls the "objets petits a" symbolising the futile desire to reappropriate the mother remain unattained or are unsatisfying in their attainment. In these moments, the erotic impulse which generates quests for satisfaction is displaced by thanatos and a profound awareness of the aloneness, vulnerability and contingency of the split subject. The narrative description of physical mortality in literary texts (or the anguish which knowledge of this mortality causes) has, as its corollary, an anguish of textual mortality, what Barthes (1967) would call the "degree zero" of signification.

The link between narrative and textual mortality is discernible through the fugitivity of the figure (in its evocatively ambiguous polyvalence). In terms of narrative mortality, the fugitive figure is the protagonist who pursues a coherent and satisfying meaning in response to the insatiable desire which motivates human activity, the erotic instinct. The "mortality" experienced within the narrative is the death of each quest, the realisation of the impossibility of fulfilling the desire, the incapability the protagonist has of making the signifier and signified unified and transcendent through a transformation of the objets petits a into a kind of "grand A". Narrative mortality occurs when the protagonist pursuing meaning (embodied by the fugitive figure of the other) and perceiving this meaning to be fugitive and apprehensible suddenly realises the futility of these actions and perceives this fugitive other as somehow the self. This means that the self
becomes perceived by the self as a fugitive figure, or as someone who "makes" a fugitive figure, indicating that the pursuer has always already been the pursued. This (belated) realisation causes the "I" to be irrevocably split, schizoid, the subject of its own otherness. This will be evidenced in the texts to be analysed.

Many of Stephen King's texts provide contemporary examples of this process. In his short novel "Secret Window, Secret Garden" (1990), writer Mort Rainey is harrassed by an irate figure called John Shooter who claims that Mort has plagiarised one of his books. This man demands that Mort write him a story with Shooter's name on it to make amends. Mort angrily denies the accusation and refuses Shooter's demands, telling other people about his accusation. He searches the past in his mind, trying to find out who Shooter is and desperately tries to prove to his accuser that his work is original. Shooter retaliates by committing a series of violent acts, killing Mort's cat, murdering two men using Mort's tools and burning down Mort's ex-wife's house. While Mort is shaken by these acts, he becomes obsessed about verifying his "original" authorship. As the plot unfolds he becomes increasingly paranoid, imagining that Shooter is everywhere he turns. Eventually, he makes the chilling realisation that the pursuer and pursued are (a schizoid) one:

There was no John Shooter.
There never had been...
You killed two men... Why did you do it, Mort? This whole elaborate and homicidal episode? Shooter kept saying he wanted a story, but there IS no Shooter. What do YOU want, Mort? What did you create John Shooter FOR? (King 1990, 327-9, emphases in original)

Textual mortality occurs when the realisation made by the protagonist (who is, in a sense, his/her own antagonist) becomes embedded in the discourse and the self-consciousness of the
protagonist is mirrored in the inefficacious strugglings of the text itself. Textual mortality is evident in a wide range of texts. Particularly evident in Gothic writing, it is comparably conspicuous in modernist texts which so relentlessly interrogate the signifiers mobilised in them.

Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* (1989) is a notable example in which - as the title suggests - the main character Marlow is incapable of adequately describing his experiences. Marlow is travelling up the mysterious Congo in the 1800s in pursuit of the renowned Kurtz, the colonialists' representative in the jungle. Marlow's experience of this wilderness (or "waste land") parallels a feeling of spiritual desolation. The pursuit of Kurtz assumes metaphorical importance for Marlow as a search for his own identity. This mirroring process is a part of the narrative mortality referred to above. As a result of the sense of physical and spiritual wilderness, Marlow's narratorial voice loses its authority in the text and begins to describe what he sees in such terms as "[i]t was the stillness of an implacable force brooding over an inscrutable intention" (1989, 66). This marked use of negative adjectives signifies the absence of sense implied in the novel's title. The pursuer and pursued collapse into each other and the apparent rationality underpinning the pursuit is stripped away. The protagonist's confusion in the "story" is replicated in the narrated discourse of the text. These are moments of textual mortality. *Heart of Darkness* is replete with such empty signifiers as markers of fugitivity. The fugitive figure's quest is simultaneous with that conducted by and through the fugitive figure. The moment narrative pursuit of the fugitive figure begins, the text's chain of signifiers is pursuing instances of transcendent meaning, the textual equivalent of *objets petits a*. This is so even if it does not become apparent until the pursuer is forced in front of the mirror (or in Dorian Gray's case, his picture) which has all along been avoided: the hideous truth of the pursuit for self-gratification.
The intersection of narrative and textual mortality is the self-conscious awareness of the infinitely regressive narcissism of the movement of the fugitive (figure).

Another important aspect of fugitivity related to the fear/desire produced by the conditions noted above is the sublime. The notion of the sublime, articulated by Kant and Burke and, since then, reconfigured within theories of postmodernism by Lyotard and Jameson, is evident in the texts I discuss. Jameson summarises the term "sublime" as it has been formulated in the works of Burke and Kant in the following succinct manner:

The sublime was for Burke... an experience bordering on terror, the fitful glimpse, in astonishment, stupor and awe, of what was so enormous as to crush human life altogether: a description then refined by Kant to include the question of representation itself - so that the object of the sublime is now not only a matter of sheer power and of the physical incommensurability of the human organism with Nature, but also of the limits of figuration and the incapacity of the human mind to give representation to such enormous forces. (1992, 34)

The reaction to natural sublimity - of fear and exhilaration and of a lapsing into either hysteria or profound silence - relates to a kind of textual sublimity in which the text moves towards the realisation of its own annihilation, its plunging into the abyss, into the silence of the "degree zero" of signification. This paradox of simultaneous fear and exhilaration leads to excessive signification, a redundancy or annihilation of meaning intimately related to the evocation of fugitivity. Furthermore, the fugitive figures in the analysed texts witness this sublime paradox of natural mortality at the narrative level. Through the unnameable and hideous monstrosity of their alter egos, their aberrant and abhorrent signification, they are also, at the textual level, the subversive and oppositional agents of this destabilising, disruptive sublimity. Jameson provides a contemporary context for the fugitive figure through his analysis of the sublime in postmodern
culture and its paradoxical invocation of radically contradictory emotions and sensations. The powerful and apparently contradictory experience of the sublime is well described by Jameson in the following passage from *Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*:

In our present context, this experience suggests the following remarks: first, the breakdown of temporality suddenly releases this present of time from all the activities and the intentionalities that might focus it and make it a space of praxis; thereby isolated, that present suddenly engulfs the subject with undescrivable vividness, a materiality of perception properly overwhelming, which effectively dramatizes the power of the material - or better still, the literal - Signifier in isolation. This present of the world or material signifier comes before the subject with heightened intensity, bearing a mysterious charge of affect, here described in the negative terms of anxiety and loss of reality, but which one could just as well imagine in the positive terms of euphoria, the high, the intoxicatory or hallucinogenic intensity. (1992, 27-8)

Later, in the same article Jameson, engaging with the implications of postmodern aesthetic practice, its preoccupation with the urban and its impact on the observer, argues that the human body experiences exhilaration/alienation in response to "urban squalor". He states that the privileged space of the newer art is radically anti-anthropomorphic, as in the empty bathrooms of Doug Bond's work. The ultimate contemporary fetishization of the human body, however, takes a very different direction in the statues of Duane Hanson - what I have already called the simulacrum, whose peculiar function lies in what Sartre would have called the *derealization* of the whole surrounding world of everyday reality. Your moment of doubt and hesitation as to the breath and warmth of these polyester figures, in other words, tends to return upon the real human beings moving about you in the museum, and to transform them also for the briefest instant into so many dead and flesh-coloured simulacra in their own right [a succinet image of Dracula and the "Un-dead"]). The world thereby momentarily loses its depth and threatens to become a glossy skin, a stereoscopic illusion, a rush of filmic images without density. But is this now a terrifying or an exhilarating experience? (34, emphasis in original)

Jameson's rhetorical question at this point is appropriate because the experience of the sublime leads to this uncertainty in which the question is not so much "But is this now a terrifying or an
exhilarating experience?" as "But how can this be terrifying and exhilarating all at the same time?" His question implicitly insists that the pre-modern subject was used to experiencing clear, distinct emotions or sensations. The confusion of the subject is cleverly rendered in his question because it replicates the confusion that the sublime generates through its characteristic blurring of apparently distinct (if not opposite) emotions.

This creation of confusion within the subject is related to defamiliarisation or what Jameson, citing Sartre, refers to as "derealization". This is important because the fugitive figure performs this defamiliarising or derealizing function, indicating that this figure emerges in sublime, fantastic instances. Here a connection is discernible between the postmodern sublime and Freud's uncanny, both of which have informed modernist writing and have become part of the theoretical framework underpinning (contemporary) notions of the fantastic such as those expressed by Jackson. I will argue this in more detail in my textual analysis. A brief example is the appearances of Frankenstein's monster in such sublime settings as the alpine glaciers. Here, narrative and textual sublimity simultaneously occur through the appearance of the fugitive figure. In this instance, defamiliarisation or derealization occurs because the figure/figure of Frankenstein's monster, like the Alpine glaciers themselves, is excessive, beyond words, ineffable, and thus transforms Frankenstein/the writer/reader into a mute witness of something extraordinary and exhilarating, something unknowable paradoxically manifest within the context of the everyday. Frankenstein's creature is a figure of/for the romantic sublime, but in its narrative and textual excess, acts as a precursor of the type of hysterical sublime Jameson proposes. The creature is situated between these two phases of the sublime and works to collapse the progressive development of the idea through being metaphorically capable of adapting to different readings.
Jameson refers to "so many dead and flesh-coloured simulacra". In the sublime experience he is recalling (in which there is the narrative sublimity of the physical, sensory experience and the textual sublimity of the signification of this experience), these simulacra are fugitive figures. They are simultaneously less and more than human beings. This is evident in their functioning as replicas of human beings and how they force the observer to question whether the "real human beings" in the building have "breath and warmth". The statues encourage a sense of unreality ("derealization") and this leads to a sense of meaning escaping, becoming excessive through the artificial figures being too human as evidenced by the narrator's desire to consider the possibly artificial nature of the humans around him. Through this excess, meaning ends up not existing at all ("[t]he world thereby momentarily loses its depth and threatens to become a glossy skin, a stereoscopic illusion, a rush of filmic images without density"). In other words, the fugitive (polyester) figures make meaning and the search for it as dead as themselves through the way they draw attention to themselves. Their strange familiarity (or familiar strangeness) invites investigation, deceptively so because capture is not possible. The pursuer is ensnared in the pursuit and is led to share the indeterminacy of the pursued, a shared "deadness" of meaning that is the "degree zero" of narrative and textual sublimity - the rich, excessive struggle towards what is ultimately the abyss of signification, the realisation of mortality and annihilation or self-destruction.

Despite the inherent dangers of pursuit in which the pursuer inevitably becomes confusingly entangled with the pursued, it is not avoided. Frankenstein does not kill himself when his life is in ruins around him and all his loved ones are dead; he decides to pursue the monster he has created to exact revenge. Eventually he does, like Henry Jekyll, submit to thanatos. However, this is only after a pursuit of the most intense and (self-)absorbed nature. The
answer to the question as to why neither he nor Jekyll give up their lives earlier is more complex than the fact that both are egotistical, conceited beings unable to admit that their creatures are their masters and are wildly out of control (although this is an important element). As the reference to Freud's notion of thanatos implies, there is something deeper, more unconscious at work here: the pursuit (and its obsessive continuation even against the odds) is motivated by eros which explains the strong sexual currents running through all of the novels analysed in this thesis. Pursuit is not merely consciously entered into; it is demanded through psychic (and textual) desires. The complex relationship between this desire and fugitivity needs to be examined next.

As well as being generically similar, the texts studied in this thesis all occupy unusual positions with regard to the popular/literary dichotomy. While none of these texts have received much critical attention until relatively recently and have not, generally speaking, been seen as a part of "serious" literary history, a kind of grudging canonisation has nevertheless taken place. For instance, Frankenstein is revered for the precocity of its author, Mary Shelley, its insights into the psychodynamics of family life and the frighteningly human face of the horrific other, while the text is also criticised for the excessively formal nature of Shelley's writing and for her naive and, at times, clumsily contrived narrative (see King 1981, for instance). For all this, it has been subject to extensive study. There is a glut of critical information on this text, especially over the past twenty or thirty years. As for its popularity, the myth is continually re-worked (more and more modern - or postmodern! - Prometheuses) in countless films and dramatic adaptations.

A similar story can be told for Dracula, deeply immersed in the myth-reservoir of popular culture, while proving useful to literary critics and psychoanalysts for its extraordinarily powerful evocation of desire through the symbolic figure of the potent Count. Stevenson's
Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde (hereafter Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde), while not as intensely analysed or reappropriated as Shelley and Stoker's books, has proven a fruitful text for the analyses of the role of the unconscious, criminality and deviance and of course, the doppelganger figure (see Miyoshi 1969, for example). On the popular front, like Frankenstein and Dracula, it has insinuated itself into the set of myths recycled by the popular imagination and available for mass consumption, in numerous adapted forms (such as the recent musical by Bricusse and Wildhorn).

Meanwhile, Rice, the one contemporary writer among those whose texts are analysed in detail, is one of the world's best-selling authors. Her novel, Interview with the Vampire, the first of The Vampire Chronicles, has recently been made into a "blockbusting" movie. Her work is beginning to attract critical interest despite (or perhaps because of) its enormous popularity, and there are two main reasons for this. Firstly, there is in Rice's texts the kind of blurring between high and low culture which postmodernism enacts and encourages. Her novels, while not overtly experimental, do deal with what might be regarded as postmodern themes - the global village, cosmopolitanism, androgyny and gender confusion, to name just a few. Secondly, her texts deal with and are saturated by desire, a focus (issue) of much contemporary theoretical interest (see for example Fuery 1995).

In a few words then, these texts are "united" by their Gothic affinities and also by what appears to be a coincidental hesitation between high and low culture, oppositional categories which they blur through simultaneously occupying space in both and neither of these realms. However, this hesitation is profoundly coincidental in that the coincidence is related to the prevalence and treatment of desire and its mobilisation through symbolic figures - that is, narrative embodiments/signifiers of desire such as Count Dracula, Frankenstein's monster,
Edward Hyde, Lestat de Lioncourt, Memnoch the Devil. Importantly, because they are Gothic texts, they inscribe desire deep within their narrative structures, so the correspondence these texts share through their evocation of and saturation by desire has an important external manifestation: their indeterminate and transgressive status in terms of their place in the traditional high/low culture dichotomy.

Desire has been isolated as the driving force of these texts, making them significant to popular audiences and critical theorists alike. As already argued, the fugitive figure cannot be satisfactorily pinned down; its polysemic richness resists such an apprehension. There is no cause and effect relationship between desire and fugitivity. Like the pursuer and pursued, the terms are interchangeable and interact within a constantly changing and irreducible process of pursuit: desire is fugitive and the fugitive is desire.

The focus of this survey is a function of the desire to elucidate the many instances of fugitivity in these texts in detail. This method of textual analysis mirrors the painstaking pursuit of the fugitive figure on the narrative level that is carried out in each of these important works.

Barthes' (1975) exploration of the notion of orgasmic bliss or jouissance as a disruptive, subversive and irresistible force also relates to the emergence of the fugitive figure. If the pursuit of the fugitive (figure) is related to the desire to apprehend a flee(t)ing, fragmentary being and restore to it a coherent wholeness, then the kind of gathering of fragments such an eclectic research process involves mirrors the narrative pursuit of the fugitive (figure), as well as fitting into the celebratory pluralism of postmodernism.
A Genealogy of Teratology: Pursuing the Irrecoverable

According to the aim of providing not just an historical overview, but a genealogy, the first text(s) looked at are Anne Rice's series of five books on Lestat de Lioncourt and associated vampires, *The Vampire Chronicles*. After a detailed analysis of these novels, I will attempt to pursue the fugitive figure in the literary ancestors of Rice, namely Stoker, Stevenson and Shelley (as befitting a genealogy, in reverse chronological order). Throughout these analyses, the lines of connection between these texts will be observed in order to establish a kind of "blood-line" or "genetic" continuation of particular traits which manifest themselves in the differently achieved evocations of fugitivity in each case.

The analysed texts are, broadly speaking, distributed evenly across three historical periods. These periods are early modern/romantic (*Frankenstein*), modern (*Jekyll and Hyde, Dracula*) and postmodern (*The Vampire Chronicles*). This structure is meant to indicate the extent to which fugitivity has remained fundamental to Gothic texts as they have adapted to different historical periods.

A genealogy, ostensibly at least, is a traced lineage indicating familial relations. While this thesis attempts to establish the links which indicate these "familial relations", it also aims to ironically invert (or subvert) the traditional "traced lineage". A genealogy of the Gothic could not avoid this ironic anti-linear approach since it is a genealogy of monstrous and disowned mutations. These monsters emerge from within the self and the family as powerful and disturbing embodiments of the "return of the repressed". This means that they cannot simply be labelled as external, alien threats which, for all their menace, do not endanger the psychic integrity of the "coherent" and "whole" subject. Moreover, their otherness is the unacknowledged strangeness of
the self and it is their uncontrollable arising from within which is most terrifying and yet peculiarly liberating.

Importantly, the presumed "psychic integrity" of the subject, maintained through the fallacious distinction between the inside and the outside, self and other, is shown to be a falsehood through the monstrous and uncontrollable acts of the alter-egos in these texts. The "monsters", through their sublime fugitivity, indicate the extent to which the subject is irremediably split. This process requires a genealogy of Gothic texts to proceed from radically anti-imperial and anti-patriarchal grounds because it establishes that the subject is not merely constituted through a linear progression, but possesses monstrous characteristics which are not so neat and orderly.

Completing a poststructuralist genealogy of the Gothic entails consulting the seminal models of Foucault's deconstructive genealogies in such texts as *Discipline and Punish* (1979) and *The History of Sexuality Vol. I* (1988). Foucault draws attention to the nexus between the cultural construction of meaning and power relations. He challenges this simultaneously generative/prohibitive nexus of power/culture through an ironically inverted strategy of anti-linear genealogy. The fugitive figure is an ironic inversion and thus its genealogy will be traced in the Gothic texts which are the focus of this thesis.

A genealogy establishes connections, the blood-lines, so very important to a sense of identity. It is crucial at the end of *Dracula*, for instance, that Quincey Harker, whose blood is so thoroughly mixed and in fact vitiated by the Count's ancient and corrupted blood, is held up as the great hope of the future. This is ironic because Dracula exhibits great pride in the continuation of his ancient family line when Harker is his "guest" in Transylvania. It seems that this line has been unwittingly - or unconsciously - preserved by the Harkers. Furthermore, there
is the implied incest in *Frankenstein* in which the title character is betrothed - in the earlier edition at least - to his "cousin". Also relevant here is Maharet's great family tree in *The Queen of the Damned*. In all of these texts then, patriarchal genealogies play an important, embedded, role in the signifying process.

As already suggested in my discussion of Quincey Harker's "vitiated" blood, one reason why genealogy resurfaces continually in these texts is that it is crucial to identity formation and a sense of origins within the patriarchal symbolic order. In *The Queen of the Damned* for instance, it would seem that Maharet keeps such a detailed genealogy in the painstaking manner in which she does in order not to lose the sense of identity and origins she has constructed. The danger of doing so is quite marked for vampires because they exist for so many hundreds of years, and this sense of origins can evaporate. For her, original identity is what is threatening to escape and it takes on the characteristics of the fugitive figure which is precisely why she wants to capture this lost past. However, just as Quincey Harker is held up as the great hope of the future in *Dracula*, so too is Maharet's mammoth genealogy, for vampire figures are those which are poised in the tantalising crevice between the ancient and the modern.

A genealogical approach to Gothic narratives is especially appropriate because of the preoccupation these texts have with the repression and eruption of sexuality within a family structure. Taboos and transgressions play strong roles in all Gothic fiction which is an important reason why they have proven fertile ground for psychoanalytic lines of critical inquiry. In popular culture, a genealogy serves the purpose of tracing one's ancestors and establishing a line of descent. However, a genealogy of monstrosity uncovers the concealed facts of which a family is ashamed - the bastards and illicit and/or incestuous liaisons which are such suggestive elements in *Frankenstein* for instance.
A Foucauldian genealogy differs from the traditional genealogy which aims at a definitive apprehension of specific historical facts and attempts to arrange these historical phenomena into a fully enclosed and understood unity. Foucault's methods are concerned with the radical disruption of such desired unity - to expose the discontinuity inherent in "traditions", rather than the supposed trajectory of continuity that linear, imperial readings of history aim to project. This reading attempts to indicate the fissures in the midst of this perceived continuity and to figure these crevices or signifying slippages through fugitivity. This genealogy will arrive at aporia, points of impasse at which an ideal imagined hermetic world is ruptured from the "outside". The trouble is that this rupture is really more of an ambush because the "now" gets swarmed by the hidden "origins" of the past and the unknowable vastness of the all-engulfing future in a kind of spontaneous deconstruction. This leads to a sense of there being an impossible distance between ourselves and our histories which can be related to the contemporary situation in cultural production. Jameson observes this process, drawing on the Platonic idea of the "simulacrum", "the identical copy for which no original has ever existed" (1984, 66). He argues that history has been effaced by the postmodern capacity for pastiche, a blank ironic mimicry of past dead cultures through "pop images and simulacra" of an irrecoverable history. He claims that we are

driven back inside a mental space which is no longer that of the monadic subject, but rather that of some degraded collective 'objective spirit': it can no longer gaze directly on some putative real world, at some reconstruction of a past history which was once itself a present; rather, as in Plato's cave, it must trace our mental images of that past upon its confining walls. (1984, 71, my emphasis)
Where this genealogy is different is that it accepts (perhaps like Cotta and Naso in The Last World, those intrepid gatherers and interpreters of fragments) the moment in all its frightening and exhilarating brevity (the postmodern basking in polysemic excess) and does not fight the discontinuities, the crevices, the contradictions which emerge. Moreover, the fugitive figure of which this work is a genealogy is best illuminated in these incomplete contexts. This genealogy, like any other, cannot be complete because it is impossible to confront the monster and know/write it totally. This genealogy of fugitivity will be approached in a manner similar to that employed by Frankenstein and Walton in their encounters with Victor's unleashed monster (his "hideous progeny"). The fugitive figure, of which this monster is a particularly memorable and grotesque embodiment, must be encountered circumspectly, read between the lines of a duplicitous report and glimpsed fitfully in the savage and blinding snowy wastes in which it appears and disappears from history and textuality without a trace.

It is ironic that one of the traditional social functions of a genealogy is to establish a pedigree but this genealogy is of texts which specialise in the recorded history of teratology. The irony is quite appropriate to this thesis because the fugitive figure is an ironic one. It is subversive or "oppositional", to use Chambers' adjective once more. The fugitive figure attempts to problematise things as they are perceived or represented and to defamiliarise the familiar (through appearing and disappearing in an uncanny manner).

This appearance and disappearance has wide implications. In psychoanalytic terms, for example, it indicates that the ego has little control of the id which the fugitive figure represents. A classic example of this is Henry Jekyll's decreasing control over Edward Hyde. In the three nineteenth century texts analysed in this thesis, there is the implicit message that desire cannot be repressed or it will return in devastating fashion in such murderous guises as Hyde or
Frankenstein's monster. As such, these texts draw attention to the necessity to sublimate desires, listen to them and express them in a socially acceptable manner. This can be seen in the (fugitive) figure of Renfield in *Dracula*, the madman whose numerous if cryptic warnings about the proximity and devilish intentions of his master, the Count, pass unheeded by the "Crew of Light", with terrible consequences. In other words, the implied message is: *listen to the madness or you'll have Dracula to answer to.*

This liberal impulse to allow the monster to move about stealthily in society (not repressed but not roaming unleashed either) is realised in *The Vampire Chronicles* in which the madness is listened to and vampires are walking, talking, monstrous parts of the contemporary society. It could be argued that the vampires in Rice's texts occupy the opposite extreme to the repressed-and-erupting figures of the earlier novels discussed. In a cosmopolitan spirit, they are allowed to roam as much as they like, although the secret of their vampirism is always disguised even while it is ostentatiously flaunted by Lestat.

The simultaneous desire for and fear of the monster emerging from within in these texts is symptomatic of the uncertainty the uncanny appearance-and-disappearance of the fugitive figure generates. An ironic genealogy then (or one self-consciously aware of the deep ironies of a history of recorded mutations or deviations) aims to trace the fugitive figure, to track it down, while relinquishing the possibility of ever achieving such a thing and revelling in the ambiguous process of pursuit which the fugitive figure encourages and symbolically embodies.

In other words, while genealogies are ostensibly a means of reinforcing one's accepted place in society as a respected and coherent identity, they also embody the potential to displace the individual through exposing the transgressions that have led to the formation of the subject in question. Thus a genealogy is "radical" because it involves a tracing back in order to restore a
wholeness. However, this quest is often undermined by the subversive, disruptive information uncovered. The fugitive figures which emerge from within cannot be silenced and they resurface in the genealogy of which the Gothic text is a literary example.

Indeed, since Walpole's *The Castle of Otranto*, originally published in 1764, Gothic texts can be seen as virtual catalogues of the inherent instability of the family structure and of the repressed sexuality erupting from within this imagined ideal hermetic world. In this novel, a host of surreal and supernatural catastrophes unfold as a result of the tyrannical patriarch Manfred's illicit desire for and pursuit of his dead son's fiancée, Isabella. It is also significant (as shall be seen in the textual analysis conducted in this thesis) that a fundamental element of this family instability is the representation of the patriarchal father as a figure who is out of control. This is important in that this figure is, once again, textual as well as narrative and is symbolic of the ongoing decline (or dethronement) of phallogocentric culture, or the Law of the Father. In other words, as these texts engage with important issues of family and subjective identity on the narrative level, they also engage with issues of wider implication. These include the entire notion of identity as it is constituted through textuality and the symbolic dissemination of meaning even while the subject is still trapped in the foundationalist system (represented by the patriarchal family) that s/he is trying to escape.

Dracula is so terrifying not only because of his desire to seize upon the modern and mould it in his own hideous image, but also because he has existed for so long; he is an ancient being whose philosophies are accordingly dated and incongruous. While he has a logical place in Stoker's Transylvania overlooking the local peasants, his aristocratic feudalism collides jarringly with the mannered upper middle class of bourgeois Victorian England. However, his incongruity and raw, sensual primitivism has a seductive quality that makes him peculiarly appealing to the
modern protagonist. Therefore his power is doubly threatening. There is the threat of his tyranny, but also the threat of retrogression, especially in the sexual sense of this word, a return to the "oral" stage in psychic terms.

Ultimately, the Count is defeated largely due to the advantage the "Crew of Light" possess in their access to modern technology, as if it were inevitable that his power would be overcome by a superior - i.e. newer, more advanced or progressive - force (indeed, as Coe argues in his 1986 article, "It Takes Capital to Defeat Dracula"). However, Dracula's blood runs through the veins of Quincey Harker and this means that his immortality is ensured and that a vital place has been saved for him in the telos of British pedigree and progress. As such, Dracula may be read as a virtual allegory about the conception of Quincey Harker who, according to such a reading, is the textual embodiment of the multicultural hybridity of the modern individual (the racial implications of the birth of Quincey Harker and of Dracula in general are indicated by Arata [1990, 621-45]).

Similarly, in The Vampire Chronicles, Armand is a fugitive figure because he is unable to drag himself into the modern world and thus exists on the margins both as a vampire and as an existential outsider. Only through interacting with Lestat and then Louis can he feel a part of this strange and modern alienation. This is evocatively indicated by the memorable scene in the second volume, The Vampire Lestat (1985, 271-2), in which he is in a state of extreme agitation while rapidly and voraciously reading book after book and throwing them all around him - here he is lost in the textual as well as the physical world. Armand feels whole only through the other; he can feel as if he is himself, a full, coherent entity or unity only through this intimate interaction with the other. Indeed, this is why he is continually searching for a partner, as it were (and the homoerotic overtones are quite explicit), and why he attempts to seduce both Lestat and
Louis into his life to guide him in the strange modern world. He needs a partner to help him make sense of and be at peace in this world in which "'[a]ll things have eluded my understanding." (333) Meanwhile, Lestat, in his momentous discussions with the ancient bloodsucker Marius, feels as if he is on the cusp between the ancient and modern worlds. Indeed, Marius provides an historical perspective for Lestat. This is the dilemma of the vampire and what it is that makes vampires fugitive figures; a unique positioning between the old and the new in times of uncertainty and instability. This uncertainty, embodied by the fugitive figure of the vampire, is the hesitation between the narrative and textual functions of the text itself, in which the narrative structures offer the predictable and stale meanings from which art is trying to flee into the liberating and multiple possibilities of textual indeterminacy and differentiation. So the vampire is historically the narrative fugitive figure and the textual fugitive figure at the same time.

The desire to escape into the "liberating and multiple possibilities of textual indeterminacy and differentiation" as expressed through and embodied by the vampire fugitive figures in these novels, can be related to Jackson's discussion of the fantastic vampire as "non-signifying". In general terms, Jackson characterises this process of non-signification by arguing that "[s]tructured upon contradiction and ambivalence, the fantastic traces in that which cannot be said, that which evades articulation or that which is represented as 'untrue' and 'unreal'" (1981, 37).

According to these implicit concerns of the texts to be analysed then, it is appropriate to discuss both historical and textual concerns through genealogy. In terms of textuality, the activity of identifying ancestors and imagining a line that connects these people to us as well as one extending into the unknown future can be related to Derrida's notion of the "trace". One
important element here is the desire for a telos, both in genealogies and language itself. Although genealogies have a kind of teleology associated with them in that there is an attempt to preserve unbroken a line indicating origins and progress, there is no genealogy, like Maharet's, which exists in this complete form. Like discourse, language, all acts of signification, a genealogy is a chain, a link of signifiers, but most importantly, no origin or end-point to this chain can be found. It is a process without resolution, an exercise in endless deferment and displacement in which one association (or affiliation or alliance, to use the terms applied by Deleuze and Guattari [1984] to the systems of desire through which families are extended) leads to the next.

In attempting to provide a genealogy of these Gothic texts then, it is important to be aware of the historical and textual implications of doing so and of the limitations of a genealogy itself. Like all our gestures, (whether physical or textual), it is one which seeks to resist the inescapable fugitivity of a final and definite meaning. Drawing on an image from Ransmayr's *The Last World* (1990, 148), it is an attempt to carve in stone - one of the most durable materials available to humanity, but still prone to the relentless forces of erosion and weathering of the ceaselessly changing earth - a lament for human mortality.

According to Jackson, a fundamental element in fantastic modes of writing is metonymy, the textual mechanism through which agents/elements in the text become dissolved into each other, the perceived boundaries between them erased. She states that in fantastic texts, "[o]ther persons and objects are no longer distinctly other: the limit between subject and object is effaced, things slide into one another, in a metonymical action of replacement" (1981, 50). She refers to texts like Kafka's "Metamorphosis" which evidence this metonymic sliding and it is clear that the process of indefinite continual becoming that metamorphosis evokes is crucially related to fugitivity.
A richly allusive (and like the character Naso, highly elusive) text in this regard is the aforementioned *The Last World* (1990), which functions as a book about fragments as well as a recontextualisation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. This book details the search for Naso (the Roman poet Ovid) carried out by a young Roman, Cotta, who is disillusioned with the restrictive, bureaucratic and ideological apparatuses of Roman society. From the outset then, there is the narrative premise of pursuer and pursued. This idea is intensified through Cotta being regarded and classified as a "fugitive of the state" (Ransmayr 1990, 86). Cotta aims to recover Naso's masterpiece, an epic work which Naso burned when he learned of his banishment to the Black Sea isolation of Tomi. We have a search which is at the same time narrative and textual in nature - Cotta desires to find Naso the man himself, but also to capture his story (history) in a lasting form. Ultimately, Cotta is capable of achieving neither, but Ransmayr subtly and cleverly incorporates fragments from Ovid's work and has characters in the text tell Cotta stories of their interaction with Naso and the stories he told them (in this way there is an emphasis on orality shared by a number of the texts in this thesis).

Ovid is fascinated with transformation, as the title and theme of his epic work suggest, and the personal transformation of Cotta is significant in the latter's search for meaning sublimated through the apparently unsuccessful search for the great poet and his master work. The transformation is in the fact that Cotta accepts the fundamental truth that nothing can be captured because "he was aware for the first time that the world is built with a feathery lightness, that mountains are prone to become drifting sand, that the ephemeral sea evaporates into spiralling clouds, that stars burn like straw... *Nothing retains its form*" (65, emphasis in original).

While Cotta, by his own admission, accepts that this stark fact fills him "with a *Weltschmerz* as deep-felt as it was adolescent" (65), by the end of the novel his attitude to
mortality is profoundly changed. Although he neither finds Naso nor the complete text, only
fragments carved on stones and written on rags fluttering in the wind (another effective and
evocative image of fugitivity), he accepts his mortality, the mortality of Naso, Naso's stories and
of all stories in general:

His high spirits growing with every step and sometimes bursting from him in a
giggle, Cotta moved through chaotic debris towards the slopes of Trachila and climbed
the new mountain. Here Naso had walked. This was Naso's path. Banned from Rome,
from the realm of necessity and reason, the poet had finished telling his Metamorphoses
beside the Black Sea, transforming this barren craggy coast, where he froze and ached
with homesickness, into his coast, transforming these barbarians, who harassed and
drove him to the forsaken world of Trachila, into his characters. And in telling every
story to its conclusion, Naso had freed his world of human beings, of their rules and
regulations. And then no doubt he had himself entered his landscape devoid of humans -
an indestructible pebble rolling down the slopes, a cormorant sweeping above the
foam-crested breakers, a swatch of triumphant purple moss perched atop the last
crumbling wall of a town. (1990, 175-6, emphasis in original)

Here then, Cotta sees death as liberating rather than restricting. Ransmayr's novel explores
similar terrain to Malouf's An Imaginary Life (1978) in which Ovid's exile is fictionalised and the
theme of life/death is dealt with much as Ransmayr does through Cotta's pursuit of Naso. Like
Frankenstein, resigning himself to death aboard Walton's ice-bound ship, Cotta submits to the
sublime immensity of nature, resigned to being unable to assert mastery over nature and time, but
unlike the unhappy scientist, quite content to allow the fugitive to remain fugitive, to be involved
in the process of pursuit without demanding an outcome, a capture and an end. Cotta also points
to the triumph of Naso's story-telling and its capacity to shape lived reality. The implications of
Cotta's almost epiphanic realisations at the conclusion of this novel is that there is no closure
either to the self or to the texts which one produces (or figures). All things are mortal (and the
signifier heads inexorably towards the abyss of zero-signification) but are transformed from what
they fleetingly were in the past moment, to what they are now to what they will fleetingly become.

The real difference between a traditional genealogy and a genealogy of monstrosity is that the compiler of it cannot assert a position of authoritative exteriority to it. The "historian" must be aware of his/her own trajectories and insert them. This ties in with Foucault's refusal to universalise his rigorously materialist analyses of discursive formations. The researcher is always already implied in the research and must not disingenuously project an arbitrary teleology, an origin-destination locus of identity. S/he should identify important moments and the connection between them but stress that these connections exist/are to be made without recourse to a linear re-assemblage of movable parts. Hence, a reverse chronological order (like Nietzsche's reversal of the traditional cause-effect chronology). As Foucault states in "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History",

[g]enealogy does not oppose itself to history as the lofty and profound gaze of the philosopher might compare to the molelike perspective of the scholar; on the contrary, it rejects the metaphistorical deployment of ideal significations and indefinite teleologies. It opposes itself to the search for "origins." (1984, 77)

Jameson's point that history is inaccessible except through "pop images or simulacra" is echoed by Foucault's observations about origins. Foucault states that

the origin makes possible a field of knowledge whose function is to recover it, but always in a false recognition due to the excesses of its own speech. The origin lies at a place of inevitable loss, the point where the truth of things corresponded to a truthful discourse, the site of a fleeting articulation that discourse has obscured and finally lost. (1984, 79)
This passage, especially in its references to a "false recognition" and the "excesses of its own speech" also recalls the discussion on De Man and Nietzsche, whose theories Foucault extends. In the formulations of Jameson, De Man, Nietzsche and Foucault, there are the repeated themes of a lost centre/origin/history which is inaccessible, although this inaccessibility is masked by the excessive/metaphorical/rhetorical/redundant textuality through which the search for this lost dimension is conducted. In all cases, the sense of loss and metaphorical and textual excess is alluded to (and eluded) through the fugitive figure.
THE ELOQUENT UN-DEAD:

BEAUTIFUL AND TERRIBLE FUGITIVITY IN THE VAMPIRE CHRONICLES

we only come out at night, the days are much
 too bright we only come out at night
and once again, I'll pretend to know the way
 thru the empty space
 thru the secret places of the heart...
 I'm on my own...
 and once again, you'll pretend to know that
 there's an end, that there's an end to this begin
 it will help you sleep at night
 it will make it seem that right is always right
 alright?
 we only come out at night

"We only come out at Night" (The Smashing Pumpkins)

Anne Rice's *The Vampire Chronicles* emerged within popular culture and have subsequently been analysed by academic culture.¹ These texts invite critical pursuit through the fluidity expressed by their fugitive figures. They are useful to critics due to their treatment of desire. Fugitivity, fluidity and desire are not the same. However, desire makes the text and the figures within it fluid and fugitive. Furthermore, the text desires through its fluidity and fugitivity. There is no cause and effect, only two sides of a coin.

As Fuery (1995) argues, many of this century's seminal thinkers (Barthes, Lacan, Derrida, Foucault, Irigaray, Cixous and Kristeva) have formulated theories of desire in their respective (though in many cases overlapping) fields of enquiry. These theorists have emphasised the vital interconnection between desire, writing, subjectivity, discourse and representation. Rice expresses a preoccupation with desire and its figuration in her books helps explain their fascination for both popular and academic culture.
Making a Killing: Anne Rice and her Vampire Figures

Kill No. 1: Interview With The Vampire

And all that you hold sacred
Falls down and does not mend
Just remember that death is not the end...

When you're standing at the crossroads
That you cannot comprehend
Just remember that death is not the end...

Not the end, not the end
Just remember that death is not the end

- "Death Is Not The End" (Nick Cave and The Bad Seeds)

The Vampire Chronicles mark themselves as contemporary in numerous ways. They differ from the other texts to be examined because Rice allows the vampire to speak (more or less) directly to the reader. In the first novel of the chronicles, Louis is the "other" speaking. As the title Interview with the Vampire (1976) suggests, Rice aims for a sense of directness, of confronting the vampire and discoursing with it in a far more intimate way than ever before.

Although it is not until book two of the chronicles, The Vampire Lestat (1985), that one of the vampires directly (and ostentatiously) addresses the reader with enormous narratorial freedom, there is only the novelist, the frame of Daniel, the interviewer and his tape recorder intervening between the reader and Louis' story in Interview with the Vampire. The interviewer is a kind of sounding board for Louis' prodigious, precise memory. Certainly, a sympathy towards Louis is established by the interviewer with whom the reader presumably identifies. Interestingly, an opposition is evoked between the evanescent oral (Louis) and the technological
(interviewer), emphasising the contrast between them: the interviewer is contemporary while Louis remains, to a large degree, rooted in an older modernity.

The novel begins at the end of the 18th Century. Through the technique and scenario of the interview, it tells the story of Louis, son of a Louisiana plantation owner who dies, leaving the young man with the attendant responsibilities. The faithless and cynical Louis is approached by the vampire Lestat who persuades him to be transformed via the "Dark Gift" into a vampire. However, despite developing more acute sensibilities, Louis remains disillusioned as a vampire, especially as he sees his desired mentor Lestat as being so brutally self-centred.

In *Interview with the Vampire*, Lestat desires Louis' plantation at the very time Louis wants to die. This coincidence signals that the vampire emerges from one's own desires. The uncanny alloys the strange and familiar. This collusion of opposites mirrors the simultaneity of the beautiful and the terrible in the sublime. *The Vampire Chronicles* is replete with images of sublimity. These are articulately figured through the repeated idea of the inexpressible, that which cannot be articulated. For instance, when Daniel asks how he began to change on becoming a vampire, Louis explicitly compares the process to sexual intercourse: "I can't tell you exactly,' said the vampire. 'I can tell you about it, enclose it with words that will make the value of it to me evident to you. But I can't tell you exactly, any more than I could tell you exactly what is the experience of sex if you have never had it." (Rice 1976, 18)

Throughout the chronicles, the vampire is profoundly sexual. Furthermore, the act of sucking blood which sustains this figure is analogous to penetrative intercourse, fellatio and/or rape. Louis sees his vampirism as inexpressible. He acknowledges the inadequacy of the signifier to contain experience, thus alluding to textual fugitivity while equating vampirism via "intercourse" with sex. His metaphor exploits an ambiguity whose nexus is desire. The
satisfaction of this desire sustains both mortals and the immortal undead (in the rarefied form of blood) in Rice's novels.

Louis' conscious linking of vampirism and sexual intercourse introduces a homoerotic element into the text at a very early point since the experiences he is recalling involve his being penetrated by Lestat. Throughout this early part of the novel, Louis is fascinated by (or infatuated with) Lestat. This is evident in his description of the beating of the overseer of his plantation. The links between vampirism, (homo)sexuality and desire in general appear in this passage:

As we beat the body, bruising the face and the shoulders, I became more and more aroused. Of course, you must realize that all this time the vampire Lestat was extraordinary. He was no more human to me than a biblical angel. But under this pressure, my enchantment with him was strained. I had seen my becoming a vampire in two lights: The first light was simply enchantment; Lestat had overwhelmed me on my deathbed. But the other light was my wish for self-destruction. My desire to be thoroughly damned. This was the open door through which Lestat had come on both the first and second occasion. (Rice 1976, 20)

As Stoker does in a crucial scene to be discussed in Dracula, Rice presents an episode which is latently (blatantly) homoerotic made manifest in a conspiratorial violence on another body. In this passage, Louis employs images of salvation and damnation. Lestat is a "biblical angel" who has "enchanted" him, yet is an agent of destruction who has capitalised on Louis' desire to die. This apparent emotional confusion highlights the sublimity of Louis' becoming a vampire. It is an intensely desired and yet strongly detested state. Lestat embodies angelic and diabolical qualities all at once. Louis cannot resolve his feelings about the change Lestat has wrought in him because they are fundamentally irresolvable - positive and negative emotions swirl in the bittersweet contradiction characterising the Un-dead.
Louis becomes aroused when near death ("as we beat the body", "overwhelmed me on my deathbed"). Despite his reservations about Lestat, he participates willingly in the overseer's brutal murder. The intensity of the scene corresponds to sexual excitement. The thrill Louis experiences is sadistic and necrophilic. Even more apparently, it is profoundly homoerotic, descriptions of the murder juxtaposed with direct and intimate comments about the beauty of Lestat. The unabashed homoeroticism of this scene is tempered though by its violence, both in the killing of the overseer and Lestat's assault on Louis. This is the first moment that Louis realises that the intensely erotic actions of the vampire are underpinned by a rampant destructive solipsism. Lestat is the embodiment of this beautiful eros and savage thanatos (and vice versa).

At a general level, the evident undercurrent of homoeroticism relates not only to how the vampire assumes an androgynous form relevant to discussions of sexual or gender blurring. The fluid metaphorical figure of the vampire also inescapably reflects the products of an indefinite play of signifiers which is the vampiric text. The vampire and the way in which this figure is signified (the "figured" figure) both incorporates and reflects the textual fugitivity that is indicative of this continuous play of signifiers. The homoerotic nature of the vampire is an integral aspect of this play of signification.

Throughout The Vampire Chronicles, there are "queer" manifestations of implicit and overt homoeroticism. These instances highlight that the vampire is a figure of sexual/textual blurring. Louis describes the crucial act in which Lestat provides him with the "Dark Gift" accordingly:

"Now listen to me, Louis," he said, and he lay down beside me now on the steps, his movement so graceful and so personal that at once it made me think of a lover. I recoiled. But he put his right arm around me and pulled me close to his chest. Never had
I been this close to him before, and in the dim light I could see the magnificent radiance of his eye and the unnatural mask of his skin. (Rice 1976, 22)

Louis compares Lestat to a "lover" and refers to "the magnificent radiance of his eye". However, even at this early point, the homoeroticism is tinged with negative feelings. Louis recoils immediately after conceptualising Lestat as a lover and sees his skin as an "unnatural mask" after noting his eye's brilliance. This mixture of desire and fear is symptomatic of the sublime. The villain's artifice is foregrounded. Louis juxtaposes beauty and the repulsive, but also employs the mask image to indicate that Lestat has many secrets. Indeed, his origins in this first book remain a mystery. This reinforces that he is a fugitive figure.

Slightly later, Louis claims that when "Lestat whispered to me, his lips moving against my neck... I remember that the movement of his lips raised the hair all over my body, sent a shock of sensation through my body that was not unlike the pleasure of passion" (Rice 1976, 23). Louis describes his experience of becoming a vampire in the following manner:

He pressed his bleeding wrist to my mouth, said firmly, a little impatiently, "Louis, drink." And I did. "Steady, Louis," and "Hurry," he whispered to me a number of times. I drank, sucking the blood out of the holes, experiencing for the first time since infancy the special pleasure of sucking nourishment, the body focused with the mind upon one vital source. (Rice 1976, 23)

Importantly, Rice's description of Louis receiving the "Dark Gift" foregrounds orality. Orality and infantile regression are as important in Rice's texts as in those to be discussed and more will be said of this particular issue and its connection to fugitivity at a later point. Louis does not really offer any resistance to the vampire. He feels afraid but his desire for the vampiric experience compels his acceptance of Lestat's penetration. After he recounts this incident to Daniel, he states, "[h]ow pathetic it is to describe these things which can't truly be described" (Rice 1976, 23). This reinforces that the experience of being a vampire is inexpressible.
While Louis is preoccupied with his newly acquired vampirism and the profound intensity it bestows on experience, Lestat propagates an image of his subjectivity through wealth, indulging his tastes and whims in extravagant materialistic splurges. The first evidence of this occurs just after he has made Louis into a vampire and the latter is experiencing the final throes of the transformation:

All my human fluids were being forced out of me. I was dying as a human, yet completely alive as a vampire; and with my awakened senses, I had to preside over the death of my body with a certain discomfort and then, finally, fear. I ran back up the steps to the parlor, where Lestat was already at work on the plantation papers, going over the expenses and profits for the last year. "You're a rich man," he said to me when I came in. "Something's happening to me," I shouted.

"You're dying, that's all; don't be a fool. Don't you have any oil lamps? All this money and you can't afford whale oil except for that lantern. Bring me that lantern."

"Dying!" I shouted. "Dying!" (Rice 1976, 25)

Lestat's complete insensitivity to Louis' predicament is largely attributable to his absorption in the healthy financial situation of the plantation. He also desires the propagation of his own image. This idea is intensified through the etymological ambiguity of "plantation". Lestat is interested in the physical plantation, but also in the abstract underlying drive of implanting himself firmly in the Louisiana soil so that he can accumulate wealth and propagate his image (and the vampire race, through his "children"; Louis and, ultimately, Claudia). Lestat also has extremely aristocratic tastes and takes great pleasure in adorning his dwellings with the most exquisite and expensive artefacts, tokens of his "breeding" and refinement. Lestat is conceited, egotistical and self-absorbed, just as Louis was as a mortal.

Louis continually evokes the inexpressible in response to Daniel's curiosity about his vampirism. For instance, when trying to explain the enormous impact changing into a vampire
had on his perceptions, he states that "I can't really make this clear to you for the obvious reason that you are now as I was before my body died. You cannot understand" (Rice 1976, 29).

In the chronicles, the vampires appear and disappear suddenly, drifting in and out of scenes. They have supernatural qualities and incredible speed of movement. For instance, Louis frightens Daniel by appearing to stretch his arm out toward the boy a phenomenal distance when the truth of the matter, as Louis explains, is just that "I moved forward much too fast for you to see. It was an illusion" (Rice 1976, 30). This recalls Louis' own amazement when he encounters Lestat (21). The significance of the speed of movement and sudden (dis)appearance in these texts is that it produces in the witness to these fugitive acts an experience of the sublime.

The very title of the novel *Interview with the Vampire* and the situation it implies indicates a meeting of the sublime and the ordinary everyday. In the novel, Louis and Lestat embody the sublime because they are beyond all possibility, preternatural beings in the here-now. There are numerous points at which this embodiment of sublimity is keenly recognised either by the protagonists, the interviewer or the author herself. An example is when Louis and Lestat are observing some slaves on Louis' plantation after Lestat has fed on one of them and "[i]t was as if we were black insects utterly camouflaged in the night, watching the slaves move, oblivious to us, discover the wounded man, drag him back, fan out in the foliage searching for the attacker" (Rice 1976, 33).

The reference to "black insects" is doubly apt. It conveys the image of camouflage which is important to the vampires' aura of sublimity. Louis and Lestat achieve a metamorphic transcendence through apparently (or figuratively) taking another form. They are capable of transforming themselves totally as, in the passage, they are "utterly camouflaged" which signals the complete and fantastic change they have wrought on themselves. However, the reference also
connotes the abject or repulsive as the reader imagines enormous, monstrous insects preying on living men. This is the double-edge of sublimity, as Louis and Lestat figuratively embody that which is wonderful, magnificent or fantastic, yet terrifying, alien and hideously monstrous.

Lestat is a disappointing father-figure to Louis. Louis is continually critical of his maker.

When Lestat takes Louis out for his first "kill", this is a deeply unsatisfying experience for Louis:

There were many things, as I mention, which Lestat might have said and done. He might have made the experience rich in so many ways. But he did not... He rushed headlong through the encounter as if it were something to put behind us as quickly as possible, like so many yards of the road. (Rice 1976, 33-34)

Also, not long afterwards, while Louis is watching Lestat play solitaire:

I was altered permanently; I knew it. And what I felt, most profoundly, for everything, even the sound of the playing cards being laid down one by one upon the shining rows of the solitaire, was respect. Lestat felt the opposite. Or he felt nothing. He was the sow's ear out of which nothing fine could be made. As boring as a mortal, as trivial and unhappy as a mortal, he chattered over the game, belittling my experience, utterly locked against the possibility of any experience of his own. By morning, I realized that I was his complete superior and I had been sadly cheated in having him for a teacher. He must guide me through the necessary lessons, if there were any more real lessons, and I must tolerate in him a frame of mind which was blasphemous to life itself. I felt cold towards him. I had no contempt in superiority. Only a hunger for new experience, for that which was beautiful and as devastating as my kill. And I saw that if I were to maximize every experience available to me, I must exert my own powers over my learning. Lestat was of no use. (Rice 1976, 36)

Lestat's solitaire-playing is metonymic of his egocentrism, his indifference to others. Some key differences between he and Louis are indicated in this passage. Principally, it contrasts the

metaphysical Louis with the ironic, materialistic Lestat. This is important to Lestat becoming

Rice's main character throughout The Vampire Chronicles: he embodies the postmodern while

Louis does not. Thus he is the more successful vampire figure - both in the existence he is
imagined to have and as a character who represents Rice's varied concerns. Basically, he is more naturally supernatural (or preternatural). His ease at being predatory contrasts with Louis' malaise and suits the fierce individualism of capitalism into which their world is moving. Louis notes another example of his materialism:

He had impeccable taste, though my library to him was a "pile of dust," and he seemed more than once to be infuriated by the sight of my reading a book or writing some observations in a journal. "That's mortal nonsense," he would say to me, while at the same time spending so much of my money to splendidly furnish Pointe du Lac, that even I, who cared nothing for the money, was forced to wince. (Rice 1976, 41)

Indeed, Louis finds it difficult to adjust to being a killer. The irony is that before he became a vampire, he was coldly dispassionate towards others, yet after the change he is disarmingly empathetic towards mortal beings. He subtly evokes the paradox of being a vampire when he addresses his dead brother: "'Paul,' I said softly, addressing my brother, 'for the first time in my life I feel nothing for you, nothing for your death; and for the first time I feel everything for you, feel the sorrow of your loss as if I never before knew feeling"' (Rice 1976, 40). This emphasises a paradox fundamental to the vampire: the senses are more acute and each experience is more profound and intense; yet Louis, through his new powers and predatory nature, is not capable of really empathising with mortals. This relates to the vampire being a fugitive figure, both existing beyond and yet somehow within the everyday, a kind of fertile/barren nether-world of excessive/unfulfilling signification.

While Lestat is disgustedly self-indulgent, Louis continues to experience a desire for community with the family he disdained as a mortal being. This desire is expressed so strongly as to suggest an erotic incestuous thread in his emotions. Indeed, Louis experiences a strange and overpowering love for his sister after he has become a vampire, as is evidenced in the following:
It was only now as a vampire that I did come to know my sister... [who] laughed at the transformation in me when we would meet at night and I would take her from our flat out the narrow wooden streets to walk along the tree-lined levee in the moonlight, savoring the orange blossoms and the caressing warmth, talking for hours of her most secret thoughts and dreams, those little fantasies she dared tell no one and would even whisper to me when we sat in the dim-lit parlor entirely alone. And I would see her sweet and palpable before me, a shimmering, precious creature soon to grow old, soon to die, soon to lose these moments that in their intangibility promised to us, wrongly... wrongly, an immortality. As if it were our very birthright, which we could not come to grasp the meaning of until this time of middle life when we looked on only as many years ahead as already lay behind us. When every moment, every moment must be first known and then savored. (Rice 1976, 43-44)

Here, Louis embodies the incestuous nature of the vampire, as it will be explored by Rice throughout the chronicles. Because he is now different to his mortal family and cannot ultimately interact with them as a peer - and of course because they will all eventually die - Louis is forced to seek intimate familial connection with others of his kind. The vampires form close attachments to the families they create in the novels and these attachments have a strongly erotic dimension as witnessed in the relationships between Louis and Lestat, Louis and Claudia, Claudia and Madeleine, Lestat and Gabrielle for instance. Of interest in this evocative passage is not only the incestuous thread which runs through it but also the generation of a feeling of fugitivity through the consideration of mortality, the idea of a "shimmering, precious creature" and the "intangibility" of being. These images emphasise the fragility of human existence in contrast to the peculiar enduring vitality of the vampire.

While Louis, with his heightened vampire senses, is busy experiencing a whole new range of emotions and sensations, he accumulates further evidence of the materialism of Lestat: "If he were not picking the pocket of a dead man in an alley, he was at the greatest gambling tables in the richest salons of the city, using his vampire keenness to suck gold and dollars and
deeds of property from young planters' sons who found him deceptive in his friendship and alluring in his charm" (Rice 1976, 44).

Lestat and Louis run the plantation through exploitation of the superstitious, obedient and hard-working slaves until such time as these slaves rally against them, knowing them for the murderous fiends that they are. They flee to New Orleans where Louis fully experiences the anguish and restlessness of his new existence. He experiences "one of those arresting moments" after he has fed on and killed a prostitute to end Lestat's torture of her:

There were supper parties in the hotels, and the planter families were lodged in town in great numbers and we passed through them like a nightmare. My agony was unbearable. Never since I was a human being had I felt such mental pain. It was because all of Lestat's words had made sense to me. I knew peace only when I killed, only for that minute; and there was no question in my mind that the killing of anything less than a human being brought nothing but a vague longing, the discontent which had brought me close to humans, to watch their lives through glass. I was no vampire. And in my pain, I asked irrationally, like a child, Could I not return? Could I not be human again? Even as the blood of that girl was warm in me and I felt that physical thrill and strength, I asked that question. The faces of humans passed me like candle flames in the night dancing on dark waves. I was sinking into the darkness. I was weary of longing. I was turning around and around in the street, looking at the stars and thinking, Yes, it's true. I know what he is saying is true, that when I kill there is no longing; and I can't bear this truth, I can't bear it. (Rice 1976, 97)

Louis realises that when he kills, weariness and longing dissipate. He wanders in the streets, his restless physical movement a sign of confusion and regret. Physical fugitivity and constant movement functions to indicate, on a metaphorical level, the restlessness of the signifier. In other words, the figure of the vampire when it roams in this troubled state is meaningful on narrative and textual levels simultaneously. It signals the impossibility of arresting the signifier into a finally meaningful coherence just as it suggests the existential aloneness and psychic complexity of the protagonists themselves.
Louis eventually stops and finds that


[the pain for the moment was gone; the confusion was gone. I closed my eyes and heard the wind and the sound of water flowing softly, swiftly in the river. It was enough, for one moment. And I knew that it would not endure, that it would fly away from me like something torn out of my arms, and I would fly after it, more desperately lonely than any creature under God, to get it back. (Rice 1976, 97-98)

Louis’ description of this moment as "arresting" is significant as it indicates that he has momentarily satisfied his desire. The moment is an epiphanic one in that it brings with it a kind of huge realisation, an intimate glimpsing of something undeniable. The chaotic flow of images preceding the arresting moment is temporarily displaced by this certainty as is the confusion which accompanied these images (like "the faces of humans [that] passed me like candle flames in the night dancing on dark waves" [97]).

The end to the confusion that Louis feels is an arresting moment in that it causes a significant perceptual change, explaining why he has physically stopped his tormented wanderings. Yet the underlying significance of this being physically, perceptually arrested is that it corresponds to the state of death. In a passage as saturated with the language of desire as this one is, it can be said that the narrative scenario painted by Rice has a textual implication and it is that Louis is experiencing the strong pull of thanatos. Yet this passage also indicates the paradoxical interaction of the instincts being as infused with eros as they are with thanatos. This is especially apparent in the words "It was enough, for one moment", which indicate the extreme temporality of the experience (its being momentary as well as momentous). Furthermore, Louis states, "And I knew that it would not endure, that it would fly away from me like something torn out of my arms, and I would fly after it, more desperately lonely than any creature under God, to get it back." No sooner has his confusion been arrested and a precious moment of sense
established itself within his perception than he desires to return to rapid movement and pursuit once again. Indeed, the desire to "fly after it" and "get it back", is no less (and so much more) than the fixation on the objet petit a. This is pursued vigorously, but ultimately as Lacan suggests, with futility: "Understanding is evoked only as an ideal relation. As soon as one tries to get close to it, it becomes, properly speaking, ungraspable." (1993, 7)

The image Louis presents to the reader of having meaning "torn out of my arms" recalls the image of the mother-child (or lover-lover, because in the vampiric world the distinction between the two becomes blurred and insignificant). In other words, the metaphor Louis is drawing upon in order to describe his feeling of desolation and aloneness is that of the separation of the mother and child (or lover and lover). Of course, as Lacan observed, this separation is characterised by the infant's accession to the symbolic order, to signification. It is this order which leads to futile pursuit and the desire to retrieve something intangible. Therefore, the air of fugitive evanescence which permeates these passages is metaphorically related to the very fugitivity of signification.

In this passage cited from the novel, Louis and Lestat are fugitive figures both in the narrative sense and in the textual, in that they represent the convoluted movement of signifiers and the subversive effect this has on the "phallogocentric Symbolic". This double-sense of the narrative and the textual and the interaction between the two is reflected in the semantic nuances of steal/fly (voler) observed by Cixous (1976) and the application of these signifiers to different levels of fugitivity at the same time.

It is also important to note that even in "satisfaction" desire does not disappear, as Louis observes. His moment of satisfaction is extremely brief and associated with death (literally as well as metaphysically because the satisfaction of his desire is achieved through killing) as
attested to by the images of evanescence surrounding it and his evocation of a lifelong image of pursuit. Desire, like textuality, is insatiable, and the fugitive figure is encoded to reflect and contribute to this unending insatiable desire of and for textuality.

Louis imagines an unending pursuit of meaning without satisfaction which foresees exactly what is to transpire in the novel as, later, he and Claudia travel from country to country seeking some kind of origin to explain their hideous existence. Pursuit is driven by desire, but ultimately, desire cannot be satisfied. This is further indicated in another evocative passage in which Louis is chasing Lestat through the streets, the latter carrying Claudia in a blanket: "as I ran after him it seemed sometimes as if the blanket flew through the night with no one holding it, a shifting shape travelling on the wind like a leaf stood upright and sent scurrying along a passage, trying to gain the wind all the while and truly take flight" (Rice 1976, 99-100).

Claudia, like Louis, drinks from Lestat's wrist to become a vampire:

I realized what he was doing, that he had cut his wrist and given it to her and she was drinking. "That's it, dear; more," he was saying to her. "You must drink it to get well."... He was trying now to push her off, and she wouldn't let go. With her fingers locked around his fingers and arm she held the wrist to her mouth, a growl coming out of her. "Stop, stop!" he said to her. He was clearly in pain. He pulled back from her and held her shoulders with both hands. She tried desperately to reach his wrist with her teeth, but she couldn't; and then she looked at him with the most innocent astonishment. (Rice 1976, 102)

Lestat and Louis corrupt the supreme conventional figure of innocence - a female child. Lestat tempts Louis into making Claudia into a vampire and it could be argued that through this enforced transformation of Claudia, Louis has "attained" her; that he has, in other words, captured an objet petit a.

The importance of signing, forgery, the idea of having an identity through entering into the illusion of symbolic inscription, is indicated by the relationship Louis and Lestat possess.
Louis is Lestat's "real" man anchored to law, property, money - i.e. "real" estate - and so occupies a position of greater power than it appears because, as he insists on reminding the reader, "I was careful never to sign any property over to him, which maddened him" (Rice 1976, 106).

The early part of Interview with the Vampire is set in a time of plague and disease. This adds to the sense of deep social crisis that the monsters figure. At the heart of this crisis is the problem of identity: how to insert oneself into the symbolic order without allowing unconscious desires (monsters) to erupt and gain mastery over the ego. As vampires, Louis and Lestat are symbolic embodiments of the twentieth century's liberation and demystification of desire. As such, they are out of place in the repressive world in which they live. They figure as outsiders with a deadly (preternatural) knowledge which is simultaneously and sublimely carnal and spiritual.

Throughout the novel, Louis is represented as an object of desire. Aside from his wealth, knowledge of financial matters and disillusioned readiness to face his own death, it is because of his compelling beauty that Lestat makes him into a vampire. Later, afraid that he will lose the disenchanted Louis, Lestat makes Claudia whose love for and dependence on Louis is strongly illustrated by her angry reaction to Louis' later connection with Armand. The ancient vampire is drawn to Louis because he desires a companion who can help him adjust to the massive changes undergone by the modernising world. Louis, it seems, is desirable to and desired by everybody else. This continual objectification of Louis and the passivity of his demeanour serve to feminise him. He is an androgynous figure who embodies traditionally masculine and feminine characteristics and is attractive to both males and females. While he can kill and is adept with money, he is a passive, introspective, static character who is often subject to the desiring gaze of others. His "beauty" is classically feminine, vulnerable and awaiting possession.
Through acting as a conduit for the requirements of others, Louis' own needs are effaced and he becomes a kind of male mother figure. Indeed, it is Louis who finds Claudia, orphaned by the ravages of the plague. He and Lestat adopt her in a queer parody of the traditional family, with Lestat adopting the paternal role and Louis the maternal (Gelder 1994, 113). His acquiescence to the desires of others allows Lestat, Claudia and himself to live together for sixty-five years in New Orleans. While Lestat provides Claudia with all her material needs (including the strategies and means of quenching her savage hunger/thirst), Louis provides her with the emotional sustenance she needs.

Lestat explains to Claudia how they will never know death (the cessation of desire) and that they will constantly desire:

The plague raged in the city then, as I've indicated, and he took her to the stinking cemeteries where the yellow fever and plague victims lay in heaps while the sounds of shovels never ceased all through the day and night. "This is death," he told her, pointing to the decaying corpse of a woman, "which we cannot suffer. Our bodies will stay always as they are, fresh and alive; but we must never hesitate to bring death, because it is how we live." And Claudia gazed on this with inscrutable liquid eyes. (Rice 1976, 108)

Much to Lestat's annoyance, Claudia becomes careless in her choice of mortals to prey on, eventually drawing unwanted attention to their household by killing two servants. Yet this scene has symbolic significance because the two are mother and daughter and, as Rice describes them, they might have been consumed by the plague:

There they lay on the bricks, mother and daughter together, the arm of the mother fastened around the waist of the daughter, the daughter's head bent against the mother's breast, both foul with feces and swarming with insects. A great cloud of gnats rose as the shutter fell back, and I waved them away from me in a convulsive disgust. Ants crawled undisturbed over the eyelids, the mouths of the dead pair, and in the moonlight I could see the endless map of silvery paths of snails. (Rice 1976, 117-118)
Here Claudia is emphatically leaving behind what might have been her fate. However, this scene also acts as an abject foreshadowing of Claudia's inability to ever rekindle a lasting daughter-mother relationship of her own. This passage also contains numerous evocations of fugitivity. Firstly, there is the perversion of the traditional image of mother and child, especially in its archetypal form of Mary and Christ. Also, it signals the triumph of nature, death, chaos. The specular is foregrounded, as is the prominence of the moon once again. Finally, the hideous "endless" movement of creatures symbolises physical and textual fugitivity - "paths" and an "endless map".

Claudia begins to grow restless, unable to understand how she is what she is, why she cannot become an adult and how she does not have a mother. The following passage, in which she challenges the taciturn Lestat, exemplifies her ongoing search for origin and meaning in the text and the paradoxical findings of this quest: "'You made us what we are, didn't you?' she accused him... She was studying him again, as if he were a puppet on strings. 'Did you do it to me? And how?' she asked, her eyes narrowing. 'How did you do it?'" (Rice 1976, 120-21). Claudia is persistent and when interrogating Lestat proves unproductive, she turns to Louis:

"'You'll tell me, won't you? How it was done...' And tell me all that you know. What are we? Why are we not like them?' She looked down into the street.

"'I don't know the answers to your questions,' I said to her. Her face contorted suddenly, as if she were straining to hear me over a sudden noise. And then she shook her head. But I went on. 'I wonder the same things you wonder. I do not know. How I was made, I'll tell you that... that Lestat did it to me. But the real "how" of it, I don't know!... He can't give us the answers. And I have none.'" (Rice 1976, 123)

Eventually, she despairs, hurling her suspicions and accusations at the languid, uncaring Lestat:

"'You know nothing,' she said to him gravely, her voice so low that the slightest noise from the street interrupted it, might carry her words away, so that I found myself straining to hear her against myself as I lay with my head back against the chair. 'And
suppose the vampire who made you knew nothing, and the vampire who made that vampire knew nothing, and so it goes, back and back, nothing proceeding from nothing, until there is nothing! And we must live with the knowledge that there is no knowledge." (Rice 1976, 133)

This extreme frustration leads to Claudia desiring to kill Lestat. Her discussion with Louis regarding this possibility (135) recalls the primal Freudian scene of the desire to kill the father. This is symbolically emphasised further in the following:

I felt her shift in my arm, move down as if she could accomplish being free of me without the awkward aid of my hands... She was at a distance from me now, small shoulders straight and determined, her pace rapid, like a little girl who, walking out on Sundays with her parents, wants to walk ahead and pretend she is all alone. (Rice 1976, 135-136)

Here, Claudia is becoming an adult, wanting to "disown" her parents, assert her own identity and independence. The paradox though is that since she was made into a vampire as a child, she must physically remain so forever even if mentally and emotionally she is more fully developed.

In the fugitive search for origins, for meaning, movement is the key. Language, like the vampire, is never in stasis; it is dynamic, pursuing a resting-point, zero-signification, or else death itself. As Claudia states, "I kill humans every night. I seduce them, draw them close to me, with an insatiable hunger, a constant never-ending search for something... something, I don't know what it is..." (Rice 1976, 137).

The "insatiable hunger" Claudia refers to works as a metaphor for the signifier. The vampire kills people to satisfy its hunger, but this satisfaction is only ever temporary - the hunger will re-emerge all too soon. In language, signifiers are deployed in order to make thoughts, ideas (and desires) signified. However, these signifiers only partially satisfy this need to order reality, allowing an illusory sense of fulfillment. Two things seriously temper this illusion however. The first is the fleeting nature of the utterance - the moment the signifier acts upon the "signified"
(merely another signifier), attempting to pin it down, the very moment itself has passed. Secondly, while at first glance the signifier appears to have captured and contained the "signified" in a transparent unity, it becomes apparent that there are an indefinite number of semantic possiblities disseminating from the act of signification. In other words, the imagined definite and coherent "meaning" generated in the utterance collapses into indeterminacy, signification moving in all different directions. The "hunger" of the signifier enjoys only temporary and transient fulfillment; it needs to pursue the "signified" it desires across the literary landscape to achieve this small but still incomplete satisfaction. The "grand A" is chased, but only the petits objets a are savoured.

Meanwhile, Lestat plays the role of the authoritarian Oedipal father: "Just stop asking me questions. Stop following me. Stop searching in every alleyway for other vampires. There are no other vampires! And this is where you live and this is where you stay!" He looked confused for the moment, as if raising his own voice had confused him. 'I take care of you. You don't need anything'" (Rice 1976, 146).

Claudia's poisoning of Lestat by lacing two young boys' blood with absinthe leads to a fascinating situation. Lestat hovers over Claudia's "present" and Rice/Louis juxtaposes opposites in a sublime figuration: "I heard him let out a long, conscious moan, a perfect mingling of hunger and lust... He let out a sigh which had again that longing, that sweet, painful anticipation" (Rice 1976, 147). This mingling of the sweet with the painful anticipates the discussion in Dracula of Jonathan Harker's seduction by Dracula's "daughters".

Claudia continually demands to know the meaning of her existence and tries to extract the knowledge of her true origin from her evasive creator. This is especially evident after Lestat's poisoning when she searches through all his possessions trying to find something meaningful to
indicate his vampiric provenance. In a sense, because she cannot extract the "truth" from Lestat himself, she analyses the signifiers which cluster around him but cannot find anything which transcends the trivia of everyday paraphernalia. As Louis observes:

When I awoke, she was going through his things. It was a tirade, silent, controlled, but filled with a fierce anger. She pulled the contents from cabinets, emptied drawers onto the carpets, pulled one jacket after another from his amours, turning the pockets inside out, throwing the coins and theater tickets and bits and pieces of paper away. I stood in the door of his room, astonished, watching her. His coffin lay there, heaped with scarves and pieces of tapestry. I had the compulsion to open it. I had the wish to see him there. "Nothing!" she finally said in disgust. She wadded the clothes into the grate. "Not a hint of where he came from, who made him!" she said. "Not a scrap." (Rice 1976, 153-54)

Louis' going to the church and confessional is another (frustrated) search for the Origin:

The procession stopped. The mourners moved out, filling the dusty pews without a sound, and Claudia, turning with her book, opened it and lifted the veil back from her face, her eyes fixed on me as her finger touched the page. "And now art thou cursed from the earth," she whispered, her whisper rising in echo in the ruins. "And now art thou cursed from the earth, which hath opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand. When thou tillest the ground, it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength. A fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth... (Rice 1976, 159-60)

His vision of Claudia saying, "A fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be" (160) aptly describes the predicament faced by all of Rice's vampires, the damned Un-dead. Not even the priest (162) can provide the answer Louis is looking for. Louis implores him to explain how God can allow a fiend to exist, but in his vice-like grip the priest is helpless and pathetic.

"Then there is no mercy!" I said to him and suddenly clamping my hands on his shoulders, I held him in a preternatural lock from which he couldn't hope to move and held him close beneath my face. His mouth fell open in horror. "Do you see what I am? Why, if God exists, does He suffer me to exist!" I said to him. "You talk of sacrilege!" He dug his nails into my hands, trying to free himself, his missal dropping to the floor, his rosary clattering in the folds of his cassock. He might as well have fought the animated statues of the saints. I drew my lips back and showed him my virulent teeth. "Why does He suffer me to live!" I said. His face infuriated me, his fear, his contempt,
his rage. I saw in it all the hatred I'd seen in Babette, and he hissed at me, "Let me go! Devil!" in sheer mortal panic. (Rice 1976, 162)

After dumping Lestat's body in a swamp, Claudia and Louis believe themselves to be safe until he returns in a manner befitting the "repressed". Louis hurl a lamp at Lestat, setting him on fire and then flees from America with Claudia.

The swamps to which the narrative continually returns are symbolic of the unconscious, giving supplementary meaning to Claudia's choice to bury Lestat in the swamp after poisoning him. This indicates a civilised desire to keep the insatiable (id) desire submerged (and Lestat's perverse resurrection suggests the futility of such a motivation). This act serves to position Lestat as the most powerful figure of and for the unconscious in the novel. The fact that even this burial/drowning (and later his hideous burning) cannot put paid to him once and for all reinforces this impression. In a sense, his (inevitable) return from (a particularly severe) repression mirrors the irrepressible resurfacings of the id. The fact that the vampires are often submerged and cannot see the sun means that they function as figures for the unconscious. This is reinforced by the habit of staying in the ground for years at a time as Lestat does on several occasions during the chronicles.

Louis experiences the paradoxical fugitivity of being a vampire when he flees from New Orleans with Claudia and sails for Central Europe:

nothing turned me from our quest and nothing could turn me, but over and over, committed as I was, I pondered the great risk of our questions, the risk of any question that is truthfully asked; for the answer must carry an incalculable price, a tragic danger. Who knew that better than I, who had presided over the death of my own body, seeing all I had called human wither and die only to form an unbreakable chain which held me fast to this world yet made me forever its exile, a specter with a beating heart? (Rice 1976, 182)
Louis refers to "an unbreakable chain which held me fast to this world yet made me forever its exile". Rice's use of this image provides a bridge between narrative and textual fugitivity. Most obviously, Louis is talking about being "Un-dead", having characteristics of the living and dead at the same time and thus being a paradoxical non-being as the image of the spectre with the beating heart reinforces. Yet the unbreakable chain to which Louis refers can be taken metaphorically to refer, at the textual level, to signification and its limits. Louis' unbreakable chain is also the intermeshing of signifiers in the act of writing. The interaction of these signifiers forms a symbolic order tenuously held together by the connections between each signifier. Indeed, it is more of a symbolic (dis)order with multiple ideas (dis)seminating from each signifier. Within this symbolic order, all acts of signification take place. That is why Louis is "held fast" to the chain - for being is constituted through signification. Yet his being an exile alludes to the impossibility of ever "breaking the chain" - every signifier is irreducibly linked to other signifiers and there can be no transcendental signifier (the "meaning" of vampirism) or being to break the chain. While it enables being, the chain of signification denies a final sense of meaning or origin. This is the fugitivity of being (a vampire) in the textual and narrative senses. This denial of an all-explaining origin is also felt most keenly by Claudia when she puzzles over the existence of revenants, unthinking, blundering beasts risen from the grave:

But what had fathered them, how had they begun? That was what she couldn't explain and what gave her hope of discovery when I, from sheer exhaustion, had none. "They spawn their own kind, it's obvious, but where does it begin?" she asked. And then, somewhere near the outskirts of Vienna, she put the question to me which had never before passed her lips. Why could I not do what Lestat had done with both of us? Why could I not make another vampire? I don't know why at first I didn't even understand her, except that in loathing what I was with every impulse in me I had a particular fear of that question, which was almost worse than any other. (Rice 1976, 214)
Its implications also extend beyond the feeling of alienation and existential aloneness which characterise not being aware of how one originated. For as Claudia mocks Louis, "Are you sure you haven't fathered a league of monsters who, from time to time, struggled vainly and instinctively to follow in your footsteps? What was their lifespan, these orphans you left behind you - a day there, a week here, before the sun burnt them to ashes or some mortal victim cut them down?" (Rice 1976, 215).

After arriving in Paris, they are observed by vampires who operate a theatre, inhabiting a hidden underground city beneath it. This subterranean dwelling is a symbol of corruption and stealth but also, again, of the unconscious itself. The vampires' fear and avoidance of the strong light of day is not only a sign of weakness or inhumanity, but also points to the fact that the unconscious which they figure works better in the dark. As King argues in Danse Macabre (1981), referring to the peculiar fascination people have for horror stories: "It's a dance. And sometimes they turn off the lights in this ballroom. But we'll dance anyway, you and I. Even in the dark. Especially in the dark. May I have the pleasure?" (1981, 29).

It is also significant that Louis and Claudia arrive in Paris at this time as the city represents the pinnacle of modernity, the "capital of the 19th Century" as Benjamin referred to it. When the mysterious Armand presents himself to them for the first time, he evokes in Louis a sense of the sublime once again articulated through the trope of the inexpressible. In his metaphor of the sea, Louis likens Armand to a kind of calm, absorbing maternal force obliterating the capacity for speech:

He would have startled me, except for his stillness, the remote dreamy quality of his expression. It seemed he'd been standing against that wall for the longest time, and betrayed no sign of change as we looked at him, then came towards him..."We've been searching for you a very long time," I said to him, my heart growing calmer, as if his
calm were drawing off my trepidation, my care, like the sea drawing something into itself from the land. I cannot exaggerate this quality in him. Yet I can't describe it and couldn't then; and the fact that my mind sought to describe it even to myself unsettled me. He gave me the very feeling that he knew what I was doing, and his still posture and his deep, brown eyes seemed to say there was no use in what I was thinking, or particularly the words I was struggling to form now. Claudia said nothing. (Rice 1976, 244-45)

Not long afterwards, Armand invokes a similar reaction from Louis, remaining inexpressibly remote: "It seemed he possessed an aura and even though his face was very young, which I knew meant nothing, he appeared infinitely old, wise. I could not define it, because I could not explain how the youthful lines of his face, how his eyes expressed innocence and this age and experience at the same time" (Rice 1976, 256).

Soon, this deference to the inexpressible is all Louis can express:

all of them had dyed their hair black, but for Armand; and it was that, along with the black clothes, that added to the disturbing impression that we were statues from the same chisel and paint brush. I cannot emphasize too much how disturbed I was by that impression. It seemed to stir something in me deep inside, something I couldn't fully grasp. (Rice 1976, 264-65)

As well as Louis' feeling that Armand's presence is inexpressible, this passage is also important for its observation "that we were statues from the same chisel and paint brush". This evokes a sense of artifice and an image of mirroring that indicates the "paraxial" role of the vampires and their status as fugitive figures. This mirroring also suggests the role played by vampires as doubles or doppelgangers. Here, Rice is using an image which resonates with allusions to Frankenstein, with (as we shall see) its heavy emphasis on the spectacle of self-reflection.

Louis loses Claudia forever when Armand's vindictive coven imprison her and Madeleine, her surrogate mother, and they are turned to ashes in the heat of the Parisian day. Even before this, the deterioration of their relationship with the intrusion of Armand represented
the way in which nothing endures interminably. Claudia sees Armand as disrupting her ideal union with Louis. This fragmentation corresponds to the symbolic differentiation between the infant and the mother and the ultimate severance of the maternal cord: death. Claudia's brutal death is sanctioned by the jealous Armand. His incitement of the coven to kill her marks the intercession of Freud's terrible "father" envious of the mother-child relationship established by Louis and Claudia. In Lestat, Claudia has already "eliminated" one rival to her affections for Louis, but a more ruthless adversary emerges in the form of Armand.

Louis and Armand converse near the end of the novel in a passage evocatively foregrounding the desolation of the vampire in regard to its paradoxical (non)being. It indicates that the desire driving the vampire - the desire for death - is also paradoxical. As Louis states:

"I wanted love and goodness in this which is living death," I said. "It was impossible from the beginning, because you cannot have love and goodness when you do what you know to be evil, what you know to be wrong. You can only have the desperate confusion and longing and the chasing of phantom goodness in its human form. I knew the real answer to my quest before I ever reached Paris. I knew it when I first took a human life to feed my craving. It was my death. And yet I would not accept it, could not accept it, because like all creatures I don't wish to die! And so I sought for other vampires, for God, for the devil, for a hundred things under a hundred names. And it was all the same, all evil. And all wrong... And you see now simply a mirror of yourself." (Rice 1976, 362)

At the textual level, this statement indicates that there are no transcendental signifiers, only *objets petit a*, mortality as the only end to the irresolvable dialectic of pursuit. One fugitive figure becomes another fugitive figure. Armand represents the object of Louis' narrative quest, but in his pursuit of him Louis has metaphorically effaced the difference between them. Armand does not hold the key to Louis' origin at all; he only provides another playful, tantalising *surface* image that Louis skates upon. Vampires, the living dead, are ideal figurative embodiments of the paradoxical desire for death.
While Louis is primarily pessimistic about being a vampire, there are many moments throughout the novel when both he and, indirectly, Lestat, explicitly articulate the positive, attractive qualities of being a vampire. These qualities are intimately connected with the desire exuded and expressed by the vampire figure; the desire that permeates and is the irreducible motivation for an otherwise meaningless existence. The desire for this desire is never better expressed than by Daniel when Louis has finished his story. The young interviewer completely misapprehends Louis' motives in telling the story. He perceives it not as a warning of the disastrous consequences of the unlimited eruption and satisfaction of desire, but as a vindication of this ecstatic liberation:

"Don't you see how you made it sound? It was an adventure like I'll never know in my whole life! You talk about passion, you talk about longing! You talk about things that millions of us won't ever taste or come to understand. And then you tell me it ends like that. I tell you..." And he stood over the vampire now, his hands outstretched before him. "If you were to give me that power! The power to see and feel and live forever!..."

"Give it to me!" said the boy, his right hand tightening in a fist, the fist pounding his chest. "Make me a vampire now!.. You don't know what human life is like!" he said, on the edge of breaking into tears. "You've forgotten. You don't even understand the meaning of your own story, what it means to a human being like me." (Rice 1976, 365)

Louis clings desperately to the modernist ideal of recovering a sense of unity or truth to establish a sense of coherent identity. He recalls leaving Paris and eventually returning to New Orleans to find Lestat living in sordid, shabby squalor. Louis thus ends his narrative revealing a deep-seated disillusionment with his existence. However, Daniel cannot see the futility of being a vampire. He is a child of the contemporary age of glorified self-gratification and desires what Louis has. Not surprisingly, since Louis is unwilling to see his desire for transcendent "meaning" as an unattainable illusion, his usefulness in the remainder of Rice's chronicles is extremely limited. He is an interesting character who sheds light on the profound ambivalence of being a
vampire but, unlike the sensuous and selfish Lestat, he cannot transport the reader into new experiences.

**Kill No. 2: The Vampire Lestat**

*The only way to get rid of a temptation is to yield to it.*

- Oscar Wilde (1962, 35)

*The Vampire Lestat* is set in the 1980s and has the title character as first person narrator speaking directly to the reader. This is appropriate for a text emphasising late twentieth century postmodernism. Lestat tells the epic - and self-aggrandising - tale of how he became a vampire and of his wide-ranging search for the origin and "meaning" of vampirism.

Throughout *The Vampire Lestat*, there is the same public exhibition of vampirism that occurs in *Interview with the Vampire*. This is evident in the detailed description provided by Lestat of how the "Théâtre des Vampires" came into existence, thus continuing the emphasis on the exhibitionism of the French vampires in the first of the chronicles. Lestat's desire to draw attention to his status as a vampire and to make an artistic parody of himself by becoming a rock star is evident in the opening pages of the book. He simultaneously hides and parades himself through art just as the vampires of Armand's Parisian coven display similar acts of self-conscious performance and image projection. Here are three examples from quite early in the book which serve to indicate this point:

I am also the author of an autobiography which was published last week (Rice 1985, 10)
I was overcome with excitement and love just looking at them, Alex and Larry and the succulent little Tough Cookie.

And in an eerie moment in which the world seemed to stand still beneath me, I told them what I was. (18)

And it didn't matter that they didn't believe it. It didn't matter that they thought it was art. The fact was that, after two centuries of concealment, I was visible to mortals! I spoke my name aloud. I told my nature. I was there! (24)

In these examples, it appears that Lestat is a postmodern protagonist as he parodies himself and problematises identity through his emphasis on the image. He is a figure for excessive signification. He indulges in the surface play of the irresolvable proliferation of identities with which he invests himself and his art. It can be said that he has consciously recognised the way in which identity is a construction rather than an essential given. His vampiric "identity" gives him the freedom to explore ways of being which cluster around this fact/image.

An important aspect of the discussion of The Vampire Chronicles in this chapter has been the way in which the vampires violate absolutes through being Un-dead, simultaneously dead and alive. In this way, the deconstructive blurring of traditionally binary concepts is explored, as it will be throughout the thesis. Yet another aspect of this exploration which can be seen to have narrative and textual implications, is the consciousness of mortality best exemplified in the early exchanges between Lestat and Nicolas before either becomes a vampire. A memorable example of this fear of dying is manifested in the following:

"But that's just it," I said, "we don't make any discovery at that moment! We merely stop! We pass into nonexistence without ever knowing a thing." I saw the
universe, a vision of the sun, the planets, the stars, black night going on forever. And I began to laugh.

But I had stopped laughing. I stood still and I understood perfectly what I was saying!... No, I didn't understand it at this moment. I saw it! And I began to make the single sound: "Oh!" I said it again "Oh!" and then I said it louder and louder... my mouth opened in that perfect circle that I had described to my mother and I kept saying, "Oh, oh, oh!"

I said it like a great hiccupsing that I couldn't stop. (Rice 1985, 65-6, emphases in original)

Lestat's horrified outburst demonstrates a fear of death that realises all the frightening aspects of mortality. However, Lestat's "malady of mortality" as Nicolas likes to call it, has textual implications as well. In textual terms, Lestat, in his awareness that life just stops without any metaphysical intervention, is articulating the idea that there is no transcendental signifier with which to make sense of the meaninglessness of significations. By the end of the outburst, Lestat is reduced to the infantile monosyllable of "Oh!" which indicates his being dumbfounded before a vision of sublimity. The infantile nature of his response is further indicated by reference to his mother both in the beginning and at the end of the passage. Additionally, "Oh" can represent the wordless and witless submission to the abyss of meaninglessness revealed by Lestat's deep contemplation of existence.

This "malady of mortality" is as much about textuality as it is about the physical fear of death. Lestat's verbosity comes to a shuddering end with his catatonic lapsing into the juvenile nonsense of "Oh!" He is ultimately wordless. His realisation that people are mortal causes him to run out of words. The textual analogue to this realisation is that signifiers are bereft of the power to fully and finally illuminate everything - in a sense, the text, like the universe, is "black night going on forever". He has a "malady of mortality" because he is incapacitated both physically and linguistically by the realisation of his own mortality and of those whom he loves. His ability to speak at this moment dies at the same time as his belief in a final, transcendent meaning - there
is no light to expel the darkness of being, no signifier to sufficiently elucidate this darkness. As Weber stated, "under the very conditions of 'culture,' senseless death has seemed only to put the decisive stamp upon the senselessness of life itself" (1948, 356). Lestat's "Oh!" is simultaneously and unconsciously "0", indicating not only the bewildered and juvenile roundness of the mouth and infinity of the universe of meaninglessness, but also the degree zero towards which, as Barthes (1967) argues, all signification, as if invested with its own textual thanatos, tends.

Shortly after his hysterical swooning, evocative imagery suggests the extent to which vampires transgress the laws of nature:

A catacomb I saw, a rank place. And a white vampire creature waking in a shallow grave. Bound in heavy chains he was, the vampire; and over him bent this monster who had abducted me, and I knew that his name was Magnus, and that he was mortal still in this dream, a great and powerful alchemist. And he had unearthed and bound this slumbering vampire right before the crucial hour of dusk.

And now as the light died out of the heavens, Magnus drank from his helpless immortal prisoner the magical and accursed blood that would make him one of the living dead.

Treachery it was, the thief of immortality. A dark Prometheus stealing a luminescent fire. Laughter in the darkness. Laughter echoing in the catacomb. Echoing as if down the centuries. (Rice 1985, 99-100)

The uncanny otherness of the vampire figure is represented in this image of coexisting eros and thanatos. The unnatural means by which the vampire is created is indicated by the reference to the dark, "rank" place where this occurs. Typically, the vampire is figured in its origins as a thief; this recalls the popular connotation of "fugitive", evoking the "criminal". Ironically (and irresolvably), the vampire figure is simultaneously a base thief and possessor of the lofty "status" of immortality. This passage echoes not only the ancient myth of Prometheus stealing fire from the gods, but also Frankenstein, whom Mary Shelley self-consciously regarded as a "modern Prometheus". In particular, the senses of claustrophobia, obsession, derangement and depravity
evoked by Rice in the passage above, are all registered in Shelley's atmospheric scene of the creature's awakening, as shall be clear when *Frankenstein* is the primary object of analysis.

Passages like these juxtapose images of the vampire which are positive and negative. Correspondingly, the subtitle to this chapter is "Beautiful and Terrible Fugitivity in *The Vampire Chronicles*". It is meant to suggest the paradoxical simultaneity of such positive and negative qualities as they inhere within the vampire figure (both narrative and textual). Vampires are presented as deeply paradoxical beings because they are the living dead. This is reflected in numerous narrative examples in which the beautiful and terrible are agonisingly (and ecstatically) juxtaposed. The overall impression of irresolvable sublimity which results from such narrative descriptions serves to permit an expression of the irresolvable sublimity of textuality at the same time. This allows the vampires to function as (fugitive) "figures" in both the narrative and textual senses of the term. Thus, an experience of beauty and terror is simultaneously meaningful to an understanding of vampires and the textuality which they metonymically figure. An example occurs just after Lestat has been made into a vampire by Magnus and he begins to realise that his "life" (or, more correctly, his existence) will never be the same again:

This was the sprawling metropolis.

And as I narrowed my eyes, I saw a million windows like so many projections of beams of light, and then as if this were not enough, in the very depths I saw the unmistakable movement of people. Tiny mortals on tiny streets, heads and hands touching in the shadows, a lone man, no more than a speck ascending a windblown belfry. A million souls on the tessellated surface of the night, and coming soft on the air a dim mingling of countless human voices. Cries, songs, the faintest wisps of music, the muted throb of bells...

The city dimmed. I let it go, its swarming millions lost again in the vast and wondrous play of lilac shadow and fading light.

"Oh, what have you done, what is this that you've given to me!" I whispered.
And it seemed my words did not stop one after another, rather they ran together until all of my crying was one immense and coherent sound that perfectly amplified my horror and my joy. (Rice 1985, 102-3)

Lestat's overwhelming feelings which erupt in his "immense and coherent" crying, are those of horror and exhilaration. That these two antithetical feelings emerge together suggests the ambiguity of the vampire and its experiences. In terms of the sublime, horror is evident in Lestat's terrible realisation and the concomitant sensory overload as he discovers what it means to perceive as a vampire perceives. Meanwhile, there is exhilaration in the dense potency of these extraordinary faculties of perception.

Lestat experiences such an antithetical combination of feelings because these feelings proceed from witnessing sublime things. The sublime is terrible-and-beautiful partly because of its awesome immensity, and one of the words which Lestat repeats to describe the city below him is "millions". He says that he saw "a million windows", a "million souls" who are "swarming". Lestat feels overwhelmed by the profusion of amazing images below him and with his new vampire senses he perceives each image in startling, fascinating detail. The result of this profusion is the production of evanescence - everything seems to flit away and become meaningless because of its fragmentary nature being part of a whole too large to be comprehended as words like "sprawling" and "swarming" indicate. This evanescence, the fugitivity of existence and vulnerability to the sublime, unknowable forces of the immense universe, is best reflected in the passage which describes "[a] million souls on the tessellated surface of the night, and coming soft on the air a dim mingling of countless human voices. Cries, songs, the faintest wisps of music, the muted throb of bells".

To this extent, Lestat can be seen - at this point at least - to express ideas of a modernist nature, especially as articulated in the poetry of Baudelaire and the writings of Benjamin. In
particular, his bewilderment before the chaotic immensity of life as witnessed with his new vampire senses recalls Benjamin's observations about the importance of "shock" in Baudelaire's perceptions of the Parisian crowd:

Moving through this traffic involves the individual in a series of shocks and collisions. At dangerous intersections, nervous impulses flow through him in rapid succession, like the energy from a battery. Baudelaire speaks of a man who plunges into the crowd as into a reservoir of electric energy. Circumscribing the experience of the shock, he calls this man "a kaleidoscope equipped with consciousness." (Benjamin 1973, 177, emphasis in original)

A full picture, a final meaning cannot be drawn from Lestat's observations because there is so much, **too** much to absorb and comprehend. Within this immensity, everything is simultaneously vivid and yet dim, faint or "muted": once again, a paradox with far-reaching implications. These implications can be understood by observing Lestat's reactions to his witnessing of the sublime in all its magnificent yet minute glory. "I moaned... The city dimmed... 'Oh, what have you done, what is this that you've given to me!' I whispered... And it seemed my words did not stop one after another, they ran together until all of my crying was one immense and coherent sound that perfectly amplified my horror and my joy".

Lestat is blinded by the city and his verbal reactions become more and more irrational, culminating in the incredible crying reminiscent of his hysterical unravelling while talking about chaos and meaning with Nicolas in Auvergne. Importantly, Lestat proceeds from talking about what he sees in minute and intimate detail to becoming verbally incoherent. Yet his cry is described as "immense and coherent" because ultimately, words are not adequate to express such witnessing of the sublime and their symbolic encoding is consumed by an undeniable wave of "semiotic" moaning and crying, to use a category first announced by Kristeva (1974). Lestat
perceives all that is sprawled before him in vivid detail, yet this vividness is, as he comes to (hysterically) realise, simultaneously "dim", "faint" and "muted". The dramatic narrative description of Lestat observing the sublime, feeling the joy of it and, very quickly afterwards, the horror, has an important textual analogue. Lestat "narrows" his eyes and discusses what he saw. He uses language to symbolically encode what "occurred" below him. Yet he articulates a sense of the profusion, immensity and evanescence of it all. Lestat can seemingly express the richness of the things observed; yet he can do so only for a fleeting moment, as the words he uses, like the things themselves, are too rich, too orgasmic, too invested with "supplementarity" or *jouissance*. In other words, just as Lestat "experiences" sublimity and this is recorded in the narrative description of the experience, he also realises a textual sublimity that is finally expressed in a pre-conscious moan.

Lestat's words, like what he sees, become too vivid so that the intense light and sound of the experience becomes dimmed and muted. When he releases the city, he releases himself from the symbolic realm because his body's "hysterical" reactions assume control - he has returned to the pre-differentiated semiotic characterised by "a dim mingling of countless human voices, Cries, songs, the faintest wisps of music, the muted throb of bells".

In this evocative passage, Rice's writing suggests the paradoxical signifying process itself. This paradox is embodied by Lestat's physical and verbal reactions to the city and by his narratorial description of these reactions to the implied reader. As stated above, the words, or signifiers attached to the things, or signifieds, seem adequate at first, meeting richness with richness. Yet the more Lestat uses signifiers, the more the overall "meaning" escapes him, because with each signifier the "richness" (or polysemic potential of the signification) increases dramatically. This results in the wild and overwhelming proliferation of meanings which
corresponds to the "swarming" profusion of the city sights and sounds themselves. Lestat articulates this sense of being swamped textually as well as visually and physically when he states that "it seemed my words did not stop one after another, rather they ran together".

This running together (which is a figure sufficiently dynamic to correspond to the double-sense in which the term "fugitive" is used) explains how the "elemental richness" of Lestat's signifiers dim, fade or become faint, their acoustic texture muted. For when there is too much signification, there is no signification at all - meaning spins ever faster towards the vortex of chaos (the abyss) Lestat was so afraid of at the inn. This indeterminacy leaves Lestat reeling as much as the things observed/experienced in the narrative. The immensity of the world below in all its colourful detail is, metaphorically speaking, the rich immensity of textuality, a tapestry of virtually innumerable possibilities.

As already argued, Lestat's sublime experience is registered through a regressive movement from the symbolic realm to the infantile semiotic. In this context, his repetition of crying and moaning noises, both in this incident as well as in Auvergne, are symptoms of an hysterical realisation of the irreducible immensity of textuality as it is manifest in the experience of sublimity. This hysteria is in itself not unimportant to the arguments being developed here. Taken as a set of symptoms which recur in given situations, it can be seen as a vital clue to the unconscious goings-on both within the narrative "mind" of Lestat and within the desire-driven text (in which the implicit textual function operates as the unconscious of the text itself).

Because vampires are all but indestructible and yet may find immortality an unbearable burden, some set themselves alight to end their existence. Indeed, Magnus does this after turning Lestat into a vampire. In The Vampire Lestat, a preoccupation with fire is evident. It begins with the boy Lestat's fearful imaginings of the witch burnings that take place in his village and then
continues with the self-immolation of Magnus. Yet, throughout *The Vampire Chronicles*, through innumerable trials and tribulations - including being hideously burned in the New Orleans residence shared with Louis and Claudia - Lestat resists the fires of self-destruction. While the monster is sacrificed in earlier Gothic texts, in the Rice novels Lestat is allowed to continually renew himself, and by extension continue to speak to us, through his avoidance of this fire while perpetuating Promethean desire. This is evident after he sees Magnus destroy himself:

> He sent me stumbling away from him. And he leapt so high and so far into the very middle of the flames he appeared to be flying.
> I saw him descend. I saw the fire catch his garments.
> It seemed his mouth became a torch, and then all of a sudden his eyes grew wide, and his mouth became a great black cavern in the radiance of the flames and his laughter rose in such piercing volume, I covered my ears.
> He appeared to jump up and down on all fours in the flames, and suddenly I realized that my cries had drowned out his laughter. (Rice 1985, 108-09)

His maker's sudden and spectacular self-destruction leaves the abandoned Lestat to his own devices. Significantly, this suicide leaves Lestat no "originary" being to explain the provenance of vampires. Lestat has no one to answer the myriad questions he has to ask (probably explaining why he refuses to answer Louis' questions in the first book, the bitterness of his own immediate bastardisation still galling him). Magnus then is metaphorical for the absence of the father who can offer a transcendental signifier. Left alone, Lestat is forced to fend for himself and find his own answers. Rice eradicates Magnus primarily to explain Lestat's vampiric independence. He exemplifies the process of self-assertion or *forging* an identity from his raw interaction with the world and not from any a priori givens. This in fact happens virtually immediately as Lestat responds to his maker's death by becoming narcissistically introspective.
The monster arises from within men of leisure, or at least from within middle-class, aristocratic men. This could be seen as a comment on the wealthy and their parasitic dependence on the poor, the enslaved, workers, lower classes etc. Interestingly, The Vampire Lestat is set around the time of the French Revolution, just as Frankenstein is. As we shall see, Moretti is aware of the implications of this setting in relation to Frankenstein and to a certain extent, similar things can be said about Rice's texts when they touch on this time and place.

The vampires are almost artist-figures in the book and, to a certain extent, may be seen as metaphors for the artist. They embody characteristics of an artistic community. They have a parasitic relationship to the wider community, are both feared and desired, have special powers, but ultimately, co-exist with the living. They reclusively inhabit their own decadent community, live a hidden life, produce lives and take them, are constantly mobile, are their own gods, violate traditional boundaries, are outsider figures. In this, there is an element of symbiosis that is metaphorical for the relationship between the capitalist and the bohemian artist.¹

Once again, this recalls Baudelaire and Benjamin and the flâneur figure who occupied a similarly ambivalent place (or placelessness) in 19th Century Paris. According to Mazlish,

Now enters the dispassionate flâneur, merely observing the life of the metropolis from an ironic perspective, as a spectacle... [W]ith Baudelaire the flâneur introduces us to modernity. For the flâneur, in fact, is more than a journalist, though that is how he earns his living. He is a poet, who observes daily, urban capitalist life - and writes up his observations in prose. He is the "dandy", protesting with his sometimes feigned idleness the bourgeois work ethic and clinging to the remnants of an aristocratic aura, but now forced to go on the market. He is the genius whose spirit has been capitalized. (1994, 46-47)
 Appropriately, the vampire in Rice's novels is often positioned on the cusp of modernity. He is caught between the worlds of the crumbling pre-industrial and the period of frightening/exciting industrial and societal progress.

Very much in the manner of the dandy, the Wildean aesthete or Baudelairean flâneur - all heroes of modernity - Lestat sees and portrays himself as a work of art, an artifice. As such, he embodies the fugitive figure because it is this figure (both physically and textually) which problematises any notion of whole, coherent identity through its dissolution into a play of signifiers which are overdetermined and excessive. This relates to the dandy and flâneur, who are similarly evasive and unreadable, enigmatic figures. He is the embodiment of otherness, the uncanny other constituting the very being of the "self". As an artifice, he resembles Hyde and Frankenstein's monster, but he has more autonomy than this manufactured pair after the suicide of Magnus, whose fate as a transgressive alchemist is as serious as Jekyll's and Victor Frankenstein's. (Interestingly, the name of Lestat's maker echoes one of the alchemists Frankenstein reads in his early obsession with them, Albertus Magnus).

Wandering around Magnus' deserted abode, Lestat stumbles on some stashed treasure. As well as the generation of symbolic specular relationships with other characters, the monsters in *The Vampire Chronicles* are positioned by the narrator/author in front of reflecting surfaces, with intriguing results as the following suggests:

I lifted from the treasure an exquisite pearhandled mirror.

I looked into it almost unconsciously as one often glances in mirrors. And there I saw myself as a man might expect, except that my skin was very white, as the old fiend's had been white, and my eyes had been transformed from their usual blue to a mingling of violet and cobalt that was softly iridescent. My hair had a high luminous sheen, and when I ran my fingers back through it I felt a new and strange vitality there.
In fact, this was not Lestat in the mirror at all, but some replica of him made of other substances! And the few lines time had given me by the age of twenty years were gone or greatly simplified and just a little deeper than they had been.

I stared at my reflection. I became frantic to discover myself in it. I rubbed my face, even rubbed the mirror and pressed my lips together to keep from crying.

Finally I closed my eyes and opened them again, and I smiled very gently at the creature. He smiled back. That was Lestat, all right. (Rice 1985, 115-116, emphasis in original)

This passage evokes some striking images. There is Lestat's realisation that "this was not Lestat in the mirror at all, but some replica of him made of other substances!" The idea of the reflection as a replica suggests that the monsters in Gothic texts are somehow "duplicates" or forgeries of their ego (id)entities. Not only is the reflection Lestat sees a bogus, but it is also "made of other substances" as if it is a totally different being reflected, a very unconvincing and "impossible" plagiarism of the self.

At the textual level, the reader understands what Lestat realises at the narrative level - that the self is not recognised in the mirror (of story, writing, textuality, signification), but is perceived as other (the paradoxical intrusion of the uncanny). Lestat at first thinks that this is some kind of trick or illusion as the word "replica" suggests, but he soon realises that the "other" ("He smiled back") is the "self" ("That was Lestat, all right"). This is the moment that he self-consciously assumes the physical characteristics of the fugitive figure. He literally is the outsider looking in, "I" is "he" is "I", the figure on the other side of the mirror, the paraxial.

Yet this physical or narrative assumption of fugitive characteristics extends to the textual because, through the mirror of language, the self recognises not an essential being but its own otherness. To enter the symbolic order is to be continually fragmented or deferred so that there are innumerable coincidental I's. There are so many that I becomes he or she at the moment that the eye perceives the reflected I/he/she in the mirror (of signification). This then is ontological
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fugitivity made textual and is evidenced in this passage in the second of the striking images referred to ("striking" is used in its most physical sense because these moments are literally akin to slaps in the face for Lestat as all shocks or [mis]recognitions are).

Lestat declares that "I stared at my reflection. I became frantic to discover myself in it." Here he is literally treating the reflected image as another, an impostor. He clings to the illusion of an essential self which this image has somehow usurped. The tenuousness of this illusion is indicated by the use of italics. These italics are his last precarious defence but they betray him to reveal the uncanny otherness of the self. Lestat sees only the shimmering illusion of cohered identity and its dependence on all the replicated images around him which are simultaneously him and not-him (recalling Jameson's "flesh-coloured simulacra"). The infantile rubbing of the face and mirror immediately after his statement of denial simulates the final act of this infantile stage. His readiness to enter the paraxial region of non-signification/hyper-signification is evident in the next passage when he speaks of himself as "he" and "I" in the same breath. As he accepts his fugitivity, and the very textuality of it, the primal nature of this scene assails the reader.

It is readily apparent that this scene is reminiscent of Lacan's famous "mirror-stage". However, in terms of a discussion of textual fugitivity, it also recalls Derrida's ideas about the blurring inside and outside of representation:

One already suspects that if writing is "image" and exterior "figuration", then "representation" is not innocent. The outside bears with the inside a relationship that is not simple, anything but simple exteriority. The meaning of the outside was always present within the inside, imprisoned outside the inside, and vice versa... There is no longer any simple origin. For what is reflected is split in itself and not only as an addition to itself of its image. The reflection, the image, the double, splits what it doubles. The origin of the speculation becomes a difference. What can look at itself is not one; and the law
the addition of the origin to its representation, of the thing to its image, is that one plus one makes at least three. (Derrida 1976, 36, emphasis in original)

The key statement in this passage is "the origin of the speculation becomes a difference". For Rice dramatically re-enacts this in the incident outlined above. The moment Lestat is aware of becoming a vampire, he loses a sense of anchorage, self-coherence and unified identity. In this scene, the double-edged spur of "fugitive figure" is very evident. At the narrative level, Lestat's feeling of alienation from himself reflects the archetypal splitting of identity in the mirror-stage. At the textual level he is a fugitive figure because, as a vampire, everything he sees and does becomes excessive, surplus, supplementary - "the origin of the speculation becomes a difference".

Lestat's acceptance of the fugitivity of identity is confirmed in his desire to pursue objets petits a in compensation for what has been lost. After he accepts the reality of his situation, that he has seen not a ghost or spirit, but himself-as-other, he imagines this frantic pursuit for the wholeness he has just lost. Just before the final symbolic touch of putting down the mirror (with the implication that he no longer needs to look into it, realising now that he is other without needing its cruel images to leave this fact undeniable), his mind races to all that he can do (in pursuit of that lost wholeness of "self"):

A lust to know all things about what I was came over me. A lust to know how I should walk among mortal men. I wanted to be in the streets of Paris, seeing with my new eyes all the miracles of life that I'd ever glimpsed. I wanted to see the faces of the people, to see the flowers in bloom, and the butterflies. To see Nicki, to hear Nicki play his music - no.

Forswear that. But there were a thousand forms of music, weren't there? And as I closed my eyes I could almost hear the orchestra of the Opera, the arias rising in my ears. So sharp the recollection, so clear.
But nothing would be ordinary now. Not joy or pain, or the simplest memory. All would possess this magnificent lustre, even grief for things that were forever lost. (Rice 1985, 116)

Lestat's insatiable desire for experience signals his embodiment of fugitivity at this point as well as the sublimity which accompanies these imagined experiences with all their "magnificent lustre" and dramatic paradoxical manifestation.

The signification of vampires as fugitive figures on both narrative and textual levels is achieved through an evocation of evanescence simulating the paradoxical play of presence and absence within the chain of signification itself. A powerful example of this evocation of evanescence occurs in Lestat and Gabrielle's repeated experience of a "vague and maddeningly elusive presence" (140) which we later discover is Armand's coven. This is another version of the appearance and disappearance of the narrative and textual fugitive figure, its concealment and revelation. This is something which Lestat both fears and desires at the same time, something sublimely beyond yet (remotely) present in the here-now. It offers the promise of revealing a fundamental truth or origin, yet also the threat of annihilation and merciless rebuke: the utopic/dystopic simultaneity of the abyss-bound signifier.

_The Vampire Lestat_ explores and plays with the idea of the incest taboo and its violation. This is most evident in the relationship between Lestat and his mother, both as mortal and immortal beings, as well that between Lestat and Akasha, the "Mother" in _The Vampire Lestat_ and _The Queen of the Damned_. In the former text, Lestat is not prepared to accept the impending death of his sick mother, so he uses his vampiric powers to make her into one of his kind. As observed in relation to his similar seduction of Louis in _Interview with the Vampire_, this process is intensely erotic, paralleling sexual intercourse, especially through the exchange of vital bodily fluids. Importantly, the narratorial voice of Lestat denies any conscious, pre-meditated plan to
complete this process. He characterises the birth of the idea in his mind as a kind of silent, unspoken, unspeakable amorphous thing:

I don't think I stood still more than a moment, but something changed inside of me. An awesome shift took place. In one instant I saw a vast and terrifying possibility, and in that same instant, without question, I made up my mind.

It had no words to it or scheme or plan. And I would have denied it had anyone questioned me at that moment... I understood something absolute... If I had thoughts at that moment, I don't know what they were. (Rice 1985, 171-72)

Part of the strange unspoken shapelessness of Lestat's cognition here is his vampire body's intuitive, instinctive awareness of its capacity to give birth to or rejuvenate something. He has a dim, distant realisation of his capacity to nurture and nourish what would otherwise die. This scene is replete with a range of deeper symbolic significances. Lestat is aware - but unable to articulate - that there is a role reversal about to take place between him and his mother. He is going to nourish her to sustain her. However, the profoundly intimate nature of this nourishing process signifies a sexual liaison between mother and son and only monsters can be born of such illicit procreation. Lestat as mother signifies an inversion or perversion which also extends to a parodic image of a Christ-like figure restoring life to the otherwise helpless (Lestat's role as a saviour is extended when he brings the ancient Egyptian Akasha back to life in *The Queen of the Damned*). These resonances make the scene irresolvably desirable and fearful, beautiful and monstrous, sublime beyond words, as testified to by Lestat's inability to mould his thoughts into words at this point.

Rice continues to explore the mute following of the imperatives of desire in this part of the novel. The sheer fluidity of the images flooding the act's consummation lucidly symbolises
the explicit sexuality of what is happening ("lucidly" seems most apt here as it evokes Stoker's Lucy and her sexual significance in *Dracula*):

And jetting up into the current came the thirst, not obliterating but heating every concept of her, until she was flesh and blood and mother and lover and all things beneath the cruel pressure of my fingers and lips, everything I had ever desired. I drove my teeth into her, feeling her stiffen and gasp, and I felt my mouth grow wide to catch the hot flood when it came.

Her heart and soul split open. There was no age to her, no single moment. My knowledge dimmed and flickered and there was no mother anymore, no petty need and petty terror; she was simply who she was. She was Gabrielle. (Rice 1985, 174)

Here, the images of penetration are accompanied by the fluid "jetting up", "current", "thirst", "hot flood". The emphasis on the fluid in this scene serves to lubricate the intensely erotic experience but also registers that the dominant factor in this experience is not the participants (Lestat-Gabrielle, author-reader), but desire itself. This links directly with Deleuze and Guattari's ideas of the machinic flow of desire and its "prepersonal flow" (1984). In other words, desire is fluid and unlocatable; it flows over its subjects in an impersonal manner. It undermines and, in the moment of consummation, obliterates the symbolic roles structuring society. This is why Lestat says "there was no mother anymore". This implies that there is no son either. Crudely speaking, these symbolic identities are effaced by their intercourse. Lestat's feeling is that, lost in the imperatives of desire, his mother was not his mother anymore, but "she was simply who she was. She was Gabrielle". While this statement may appear to be essentialist and thus contradictory to the poststructuralist claims of Deleuze and Guattari, what it signifies more strongly than any sense of a transcendent essential communion is the refusal of desire to be adequately contained and delimited. Lestat is accepting his inability to articulate the ferocious bodily magnitude of this experience and resorts to the platitudinous and empty words evoking
essentialist clichés. The key point is that desire is nameless, fugitive and flows over the subject, effacing it and denying the individual integrity of the "self".

It is not long before Lestat ceases to conceptualise his once-mother as Gabrielle. At first, it satisfies him to know her by her name rather than by the role she once embodied. Yet this is soon patently inadequate: "And though I said her name over and over, to make it natural, she wasn't really Gabrielle yet to me. She was simply she, the one I had needed all my life with all of my being. The only woman I had ever loved" (Rice 1985, 186, emphasis in original).

By this stage, only a very loose and indefinite pronoun is an acceptable signifier for the uncontainable. Lestat characterises the woman in classical Freudian terms of lack and fulfilment. Yet his consummation of Gabrielle is not without its social consequences. A coven of Parisian vampires (we discover later), telepathically signal their displeasure with this transgressed taboo:

Far away, from the direction of les Innocents, I heard the presence as strongly as ever before... Outlaw, outlaw, outlaw. I felt a wave of light-headedness, something of a dream remembered. Fragment of a dream. But I couldn't think. I'd been damaged by doing it to her. I had to drink.

"It called us outlaws," she said. "Didn't you hear it?" And she listened again, but it was gone and neither of us heard it, and I couldn't be certain that I had received that clear pulse, outlaw, but it seemed I had! (Rice 1985, 184, emphases in original)

Very early in Gabrielle's vampiric existence then, she and Lestat are reminded of the social taboo they have broken. The word "outlaw" denotes someone acting outside strictly prescribed social limits and simultaneously connotes the unspoken psychic correlatives making these social limits imperative. In other words, Lestat and Gabrielle have transgressed the symbolic "Law of the Father" and re-entered the forbidden semiotic unity of mother-son fluid exchange. Significantly, they are alerted to an awareness of this transgression through psychic means: the very unspoken structures which their consummation violates are brought to their attention through the medium
of telepathy, not spoken words. Once again, "the presence" from which this censure originates, is suitably fugitive, italicised, sensed and, like desire itself, menacingly omnipresent. Yet it is fragmented, emerging from the unconscious realm of dreams and nowhere to be seen. In this passage, the status of Lestat and Gabrielle as fugitive figures is subtly yet powerfully evoked by other as yet unseen fugitive figures.

When Lestat returns to the Theatre of Vampires, he finds a very cynical Nicolas and a place much changed. Yet Nicolas embodies the cold and merciless insouciance Louis finds in Lestat in Interview with the Vampire. As Nicolas tells Lestat,

Well, we will take the little theatre that you painted in gold, and hung with velvet... and it will serve the forces of the devil more splendidly than he was ever served by the old coven... We will make a mockery of all things sacred. We will lead them to ever greater vulgarity and profanity. We will astonish. We will beguile. But above all, we will thrive on their gold as well as their blood and in their midst we will grow strong. (Rice 1985, 290)

Numerous important images spring up from this impassioned speech. A sense of the infesting parasitic permeates, a hideous upsurge "in their midst". Meanwhile the ostentatious nature of the theatre is accompanied by a sense of the desire to drain the unwitting public of gold as well as blood. (This feeds into the panic generated by last century's infiltration into Europe of "inferior" immigrants, particularly the Jews, who are caricatured by figures like Dracula, as will be seen in the next chapter.)

Rice makes numerous literary and mythological allusions during the course of the chronicles. One of the most important of these in relation to a discussion of Gothic fugitivity is the continued reference to Prometheus. These references self-consciously connect her novels to Mary Shelley's text because they emphasise how the human identity is forged in close alliance
with the monstrous and how that desire may take powerful but hideous forms. Rice likens the very act of producing a vampire to the myth of Prometheus stealing fire from the gods. A good example of this is in Armand's story of how he came to become a vampire. His "Master" Marius tells him: "This is the only sun that you will ever see again. But a millennium of nights will be yours to see light as no mortal has ever seen it, to snatch from the distant stars as if you were Prometheus, an endless illumination by which to understand all things" (Rice 1985, 321). It becomes increasingly clear that the sublime is registered in the moment of the vampiric kill. The paradox of the kill is that it makes the flesh "sacred" rather than the spirit (in a sense, the flesh becomes the spirit). The kill unites the spiritual and the carnal. Armand succinctly articulates this paradox in the following passage:

It seemed to him in the best of these moments that his way was profoundly spiritual, uncontaminated by the appetites and confusions that made up the world, despite the carnal rapture of the kill.

In that act the spiritual and the carnal came together, and it was the spiritual, he was convinced, that survived. Holy Communion it seemed to him, the Blood of the Children of Christ serving only to bring the essence of life itself into his understanding for the split second in which death occurred. Only the great saints of God were his equals in this spirituality, this confrontation with mystery, this existence of meditation and denial. (Rice 1985, 331)

Yet the kill by itself is not enough for Lestat. Despite its sublime intensity, he seeks the underlying "Reason" for his existence as a vampire. Marius becomes a kind of absent mythological father figure to Lestat, someone who can help him make sense of the apparent senselessness of his vampirism. He becomes Lestat's pursued and in keeping with this, Lestat whispers and writes messages to him in a parody of blind faith. With Gabrielle's ruthless independence and constant movement, Marius is the only link to the vampiric community he has:

"And then she was gone without explanation, and I walked the streets alone, whispering aloud to
Marius and writing to him the long, long messages that took the whole night sometimes to complete" (Rice 1985, 369). His wandering in search of a deeper "meaning" leads him to eschew the consolations of a communal existence.

The vampires form covens or families with rules, taboos, moral upholders and "fire-stealers". These groups and their laws are grotesque images of mortal life and, ironically for Lestat, he as an immortal desires to be mortal again. He has the chance to do this in The Tale of the Body Thief, but for now he can only fantasise:

By the time we left Italy I was playing dangerous little games with mortals. I'd see a man, or a woman - a human being who looked perfect to me spiritually - and I would follow the human about. Maybe for a week I'd do this, then a month, sometimes even longer than that. I'd fall in love with the being. I'd imagine friendship, conversation, intimacy that we could never have. In some magical and imaginary moment I would say: "But you see what I am," and this human being, in supreme spiritual understanding, would say: "Yes, I see. I understand."

Nonsense, really. Very like the fairy tale where the princess gives her selfless love to the prince who is enchanted and he is himself again and the monster no more. Only in this dark fairy tale I would pass right into my mortal lover. We would become one being, and I would be flesh and blood again. (Rice 1985, 369)

In expressing the desire to escape the conditions of his existence, Lestat wants to enter the "nonsensical". His desire for dissolution is a travesty of romantic love and is only possible through death, the ultimate dissolution of identity.

It is significant that the narrative, through Marius, makes its way to Egypt because this is a place traditionally symbolising mystery and hidden origin. Ultimately, Marius makes Lestat realise that the notion of an origin is nothing other than "a great gleaming morass of symbols" (Rice 1985, 140). This is an evocative phrase which suggests the myriad entanglements of signification itself as it is figured in these novels by the vampire. Marius tells Lestat what he most fears, that there is no way to untangle this symbolic morass to find an underlying "Reason":
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"What can I say finally that will not confirm your worst fears? I have lived over eighteen hundred years, and I tell you life does not need us. I have never had a true purpose. We have no place" (Rice 1985, 507). Marius realises that Lestat is finding it difficult to accept his status as a fugitive figure: "As a vampire, you have been a roamer, an outsider haunting houses and other lives as you drifted from place to place" (510).

Lestat leaves Marius after hearing his story and returns to New Orleans. He feels at home in this "lawless" place (538) - an appropriate term to use given his position outside the symbolic order. He evokes a sense of the fugitivity of his existence in the last few paragraphs of his related quest for an underlying "truth":

Whatever I suffered should be lessened in this lawless place, whatever I craved should give me more pleasure once I had it in my grasp. And there were moments on that first night in this fetid little paradise when I prayed that in spite of all my secret power, I was somehow kin to every mortal man. Maybe I was not the exotic outcast that I imagined, but merely the dim magnification of every human soul.

Old truths and ancient magic, revolution and invention, all conspire to distract us from the passion that in one way or another defeats us all.

And weary finally of this complexity, we dream of that long-ago time when we sat upon our mother's knee and each kiss was the perfect consummation of desire. What can we do but reach for the embrace that must now contain both heaven and hell: our doom again and again and again. (538)

Here, Lestat feels his attainment of life's a will be fulfilling. Yet once again, he finds himself desiring the impossible communion with a mortal which to him symbolises the deeper dissolution of the mother's embrace. Ultimately, every kill only temporarily satisfies a larger desire: for Lestat, there is no consummate significant act, only partial satisfaction as he strives for the unattainable dissolution to which he refers.
The Vampire Lestat ends by returning to San Francisco in the 1980s where Lestat is about to perform with his band, "Satan's Night Out" in a rock concert. However, he has unleashed a force of unknowable dimensions by stimulating the previously dormant Akasha to awaken. As people are set alight and mayhem rules in the vicinity, Lestat considers that "I had made another serious miscalculation. I'd realized it for the first time when the Porsche exploded with Louis still inside it. This little war of mine would put all those I loved in danger. What a fool I'd been to think I could draw the venom to myself" (596). Victor Frankenstein will be forced to make a similar realisation on his wedding-night.

In The Vampire Lestat, Rice interweaves the stories of the different vampires encountered. There is a sense of there being an infinite possibility of stories within stories. Lestat details his search for an all-explaining origin but his related quest is anything but a simple linear unfolding. Instead, the "origin" is bound up in the connections in the vampire world. It is and is not Lestat's story alone, but a multifocal assemblage of perspectives. This, as shall be discussed later, mirrors the way in which Stoker, Stevenson and Shelley's texts are constructed. Similarly, with its panoramic sweep across many different countries and time periods, The Vampire Lestat exhibits some of the characteristics of a travel narrative. In this it also owes an allegiance to the works of the earlier authors of the marvellous and strange.

Kill No. 3: The Queen of the Damned

The degree to which Lestat self-consciously expresses himself and his situation is indicated by his use of imagery of the fugitive figure early in The Queen of the Damned in which he states
But it's just so painful to shrink back into the shadows - Lestat, the sleek and nameless gangster ghoulie again creeping up on helpless mortals who know nothing of things like me. So hurtful to again be the outsider, forever on the fringes, struggling with good and evil in the age-old private hell of body and soul. (Rice 1988, 5)

The death of Enkil is registered by Lestat in the following way: "He stared at the figure lying on the floor, watching it lose the very last trace of opacity" (34). Rice's choice of words here is significant. They indicate that Enkil is not merely a dying character in the narrative sense, but in the textual sense as well. He is a "figure" losing all "trace" of "opacity". Symbolically, Enkil represents the masculine, patriarchal, phallogocentric which has been killed by a maternal crusading force embodied by Akasha. In terms of the textual fugitive figure, this fatal assault on the masculine by the feminine represents the postmodern chaos of dissemination as it usurps traditionally "objective" masculine gazes and approaches. The word "dissemination" itself hints at this chaotic dethronement of the male by meaning to "scatter about, to spread (ideas etc.) widely" (Godfrey-Smith et al. 1991, 220). The etymology of the word is Latin, the prefix "dis" preceding *semen* (seed), an obvious metonymy of male power and propagation of this power. When signification disseminates, it spreads chaos, opening up language to the feminine and killing the masculine. There is no unified transparent meaning, but a complex multiplicity of potential significations. Rice's figure of Akasha is not only a symbol of contemporary feminism but also may be seen through poststructuralist perspectives on the signifying process itself. Significantly, it is the androgynous Lestat who witnesses the death of the masculine figure. As a figure who embodies traits of both genders, he is a site of "complex multiplicity" and irreducible density. This is what makes him a "fugitive figure".

Akasha is unleashed in contemporary America and her devastating maternal presence is signified in the terms of the inexpressible sublime Rice has deployed throughout the chronicles.
She embarks on a pyrokinetic killing spree and some of her first victims belong to a motorcycle group ironically named the "Fang Gang". For instance, the supernatural murder of the young Harley-Davidson rider, Baby Jenks is registered in these terms:

The light was shining again, the magnificent light she'd glimpsed when she'd almost died that first time around. She moved towards it, into it. And this was truly beautiful. Never had she seen such colors, such radiance, never had she heard the pure music that she was hearing now. There were no words to describe this; it was beyond any language she'd ever known. And this time nobody would bring her back!

Because the one coming towards her, to take her and to help her - it was her mother! And her mother wouldn't let her go. (66)

Rice makes a contrast between the ancient vampires and the modern world in which they exist. One of the ancient vampires she focuses on is named Pandora. This "goddess" flies high in the Himalayas. Rice foregrounds Pandora's observations of the vast multitude of sounds assailing her too-attuned senses:

But the recorded voice of Lestat was gone now, swallowed by other faint electric voices, vibrations rising from cities and villages, and the ever audible cry of mortal souls. As so often happened, her powerful ears could separate no one signal. The rising tide had overwhelmed her - shapeless, horrific - so that she had closed herself off. Only the wind again.

Ah, what must the collective voices of the earth be to the Mother and Father [Akasha and Enkil] whose powers had grown, inevitably, from the dawn of recorded time? Had they the power, as she had still, to shut off the flow, or to select from time to time the voices they might hear? Perhaps they were as passive in this regard as in any other, and it was the unstoppable din that kept them fixed, unable to reason, as they heard the endless cries, mortal and immortal, of the entire world. (70)

This passage suggests the anachronism of the vampire by showing how it struggles to cope with the overwhelming sensory assault of modernity. This scene is reminiscent of Lestat's feeling
utterly bewildered by the intensity of his senses shortly after becoming a vampire in *The Vampire Lestat*.

This volume also follows the fortunes of Daniel, Louis' interviewer in the first volume of the chronicles. He becomes a mortal "minion" for Armand and embodies the restlessness of the fugitive figure:

Now he was a ruined thing, walking too fast under the lowering night sky of Chicago in October. Last Sunday he had been in Paris, and the Friday before that in Edinburgh. Before Edinburgh, he had been in Stockholm and before that he couldn't recall...

Everything would go all right for months as Daniel felt compelled to move from city to city, walking the pavements of New York or Chicago or New Orleans. Then the sudden disintegration. He'd realize he had not moved from his chair in five hours. Or he'd wake suddenly in a stale and unchanged bed, frightened, unable to remember the name of the city where he was, or where he'd been for days before...

[H]e would track to the ends of the earth these pale and deadly beings whose existence he had only glimpsed. (84-96)

Here, Daniel is exhibiting not only the ephemeral and restless characteristics of the fugitive figure, but also what Gelder refers to as the "global exotic' - where the vampire functions as a kind of internationalised, cosmopolitan tourist, mobile (and leisured) enough to make that world 'my own' - and channelling that world through...‘panoramic perception’" (1994, 123). Clearly, the physical tendency to cross geographical borders is metaphorical for the vampire's fundamental practice of transgressing all kinds of boundaries as a violator/violation of symbolically encoded limits.

In *The Queen of the Damned*, the familiar sense of the vampires being forgeries of human beings is evoked by Daniel who refers to "ghastly imitations of the living. And this one, the gleaming manikin of a young boy!" (Rice 1988, 99). At a later point, the Queen herself is
described as "not the flower now but the replica of the flower made of pure white wax" (468). Rice highlights the development of Armand and his adaptation to the times. In this novel, he is characterised in a markedly different manner to his position as an early modern figure when first encountered by Louis in Paris. Indeed, in *The Queen of the Damned*, Armand becomes an insatiable consumer of the postmodern world in which he lives. He responds to the desire to experience everything and embodies the excess of his world. He takes Daniel with him:

Into the very midst of life they plunged...
In New York they went tearing to museum openings, cafés, bars, adopted a young dancer, paying all his bills through school. They sat on the stoops in SoHo and Greenwich Village whiling the hours away with anybody who would stop to join them. They went to night classes in literature, philosophy, art history and politics. They studied biology, bought microscopes, collected specimens. They studied books on astronomy and mounted giant telescopes on the roofs of the buildings in which they lived for a few days or a month at most. They went to boxing matches, rock concerts, Broadway shows. (107-9)

It becomes apparent that the vampire figures not just the "global exotic" but also a kind of "local erotic" in which any particular social phenomenon is engaged with, played with and then exhausted before the fugitive figure moves restlessly onto the next item for consumption. Armand becomes a decadent materialist, much like Lestat in *Interview with the Vampire*. To truly embody the postmodern *zeitgeist*, it is necessary for him to not only want everything, but also to possess it, conspicuously so:

Then had come the night when Armand said he was ready to enter this century in earnest, he understood enough about it now. He wanted "incalculable" wealth. He wanted a vast dwelling full of all those things he'd come to value. And yachts, planes, cars - millions of dollars. He wanted to buy Daniel everything that Daniel might ever desire. (112)
Just as Lestat is a self-conscious character, Rice's writing is sometimes directly (and ironically) intertextual. For instance, Jesse, who is at the time unaware of her vampiric lineage, "had been living in an old house in Chelsea, not far from where Oscar Wilde had once lived. James McNeill Whistler had once shared the neighborhood and so had Bram Stoker, the author of Dracula. It was a place that Jesse loved. But unbeknownst to her, the house in which she'd leased her rooms had been haunted for many years" (Rice 1988, 188).

Jesse is employed by the Talamasca to do some research in New Orleans to find if there is any validity to events in Interview with the Vampire (a nice re-incorporation of a "real" text back into the world of fiction by Rice, thus "vampirically" blurring the boundary). After meeting with David Talbot, the Talamasca leader, "Jesse was on a plane for New Orleans. She was to annotate and document the novel, in every way possible, searching property titles, transfers, old newspapers, journals - anything she could find to support the theory that the characters and events were real" (207). Clearly, Rice's earlier reference to Dracula is not merely gratuitous. Moreover, it signals that the relationship being developed between the mysterious and meticulous David Talbot and Jesse is analogous to that shared by Stoker's Dr Abraham Van Helsing and Mina Harker.

Ultimately, the Talamasca's research leads them to Lestat's concert. This is the scene for Rice to fully "flesh out" all the earlier metaphorical references made to Christ. It is also the site which has drawn a host of monsters, friends and foes of Lestat. Therefore, the auditorium resembles the chilling place of Christ's crucifixion, a kind of Golgotha. While Lestat embodies the power of Christ to attract people to him and believe in him, his monstrosity ensures that he is only ever a grotesque parody of the messiah. Rice plays on parodic images to the full, quite explicitly making the link between the two (and again uniting the spiritual with the sensual):
And Lestat was Christ on the cathedral cross. How to describe his overwhelming and irrational authority?..  
His soaring tenor seemed to leave his body utterly as he recounted his defeats, his resurrections, the thirst inside him which no measure of blood could ever quench...
It seemed to Daniel at the highest moments as though it were an omen that he should find immortality on the eve of this great Mass. The Vampire Lestat was God; or the nearest thing he had ever known to it. The giant on the video screen gave his benediction to all that Daniel had ever desired...

Lestat was unkillable. He devoured the suffering forced upon him and emerged all the stronger. To join with him was to live forever:
This is my Body. This is my Blood.
Yet the hate boiled among the vampire brothers and sisters...
Kill the god. Tear him limb from limb. Let the mortal worshipers do as they have always done - mourn for him who was meant to die. (268-9)

Rice emphasises the vampire's parodic inversion of Christ shortly after this evocative passage. She does so through the exchange of blood signifying not a holy communion, but a vampiric one. Indeed, Maharet makes a vampire of Jesse in an intensely homoerotic scene. When Maharet projects the message "You are mine, you are utterly and completely mine" (282, italics in original), vampiric desire is granted a consummation which is simultaneously sexual and textual. You/me blur in ecstatic dissolution.

Lestat's likeness to Christ is also self-consciously realised by Akasha. When Lestat questions her as to why she does not simply kill him, Akasha responds in the following manner:

"There has been a design to all of it - your coming, my waking. For now the hopes of the millennia can be realized at last. Look on the little town below, and on this ruined castle. This could be Bethlehem, my prince, my savior. And together we shall realize all the world's most enduring dreams"...

"Ah, you are so strong, princeling," she said. "But you were destined for me, surely. Nothing defeats you. You fear and you don't fear. For a century I watched you suffer, watched you grow weak and finally go down in the earth to sleep, and I then saw you rise, the very image of my own resurrection." (301)
When Marius encounters Maharet, he observes "the fine symmetry of her masklike face" (310), describing it as "a mask with the light behind it, glowing in a frame of red hair." (311). This repetition, as well as the reference to her eyes being "not really her eyes" (310), illustrates the monstrous artifice she embodies. In textual terms, the mask (as surface or signifier) is "all there is"; no "signified" lies underneath. Of course, the mask also represents secrecy and mystery, but the sense of forgery which is once again evoked is dominant here.

Marius then meets the child he turned into a vampire so many centuries ago in Venice, Armand (Amadeo as he was then known) and the scene resonates with paedophilic, incestuous and homoerotic overtones. However, the most outstanding aspect of this scene though is the way in which Rice blurs art and life through Marius' reference to his paintings of the boy in Venice:

Centuries ago in a palazzo in Venice, he had tried to capture in imperishable pigment the quality of his love. What had been its lesson? That in all the world no two souls contain the same secret, the same gift of devotion or abandon; that in a common child, a wounded child, he had found a blending of sadness and simple grace that would forever break his heart? This one had understood him! This one had loved him as no other had... He looked at the slim white hand he held in his own. Every detail he had sought to preserve forever on canvas; every detail he had certainly preserved in death. (319)

This passage echoes Wilde's The Picture of Dorian Gray, most evidently in the fugitive images of "capture in imperishable pigment" and "sought to preserve forever on canvas". A parallel might therefore be seen between Marius and Armand and their counterparts in Wilde's text, Basil Hallward and Dorian. As Halberstam notes, "[w]hile his painting takes on the appearance of depth, Dorian remains a perfect surface, a canvas stretched across a soul" (1995, 54). In terms of the art/life distinction, Marius' observations remind the reader that the vampire is an artifice. It emerges from the crevice between art and life just as it exists in between life and death in a realm
that is simultaneously both and neither. Near the end of The Queen of the Damned, Lestat returns to New Orleans, meeting Louis and going with him to the cemetery. Lestat thinks of the time "when he and I had roamed the swamps together, the swamps that threatened to swallow everything, and I had fed on the blood of roustabouts and cutthroat thieves" (1988, 561). The juxtaposed images of swallowing and feeding on blood anchor Lestat and Louis in the primal oral desire of the unconscious: the swamps are as insatiable as they and metaphorically embody their unspeakable monstrosity. Indeed, this image of insatiable oral monstrosity recalls Conrad's image of the crazy Kurtz and his rampant mad desire in Heart of Darkness.

Kill No. 4: The Tale of the Body Thief

The Tale of the Body Thief does not have the panoramic scope of volumes two and three of the chronicles. Also, it does not trace the development, nor follow the fortunes of a large number of vampires. Instead it concerns itself with the desire Lestat has expressed at different moments up to this point to become human again. He has the opportunity to fulfil this desire when he encounters Raglan James, a mystical confidence trickster with the ability to "swap bodies". In a narrative that enters into a mode Gelder describes as "dirty realism" (1994, 122), Rice details Lestat's difficulty in becoming human again and his quest to recover his own body from the exploitative James.

In The Tale of the Body Thief, Rice once again plays with the idea of forgery. In a sense, Raglan James, the "body thief" is a sham, a charlatan, a forgery. He is nothing more than a greedy capitalist, a plagiarist/m. However, he acts as a kind of mirror image of Lestat. Indeed, this is something he is aware of in the text, accusing Lestat of being a thief (1992, 181). All these
ideas of replication and inauthenticity yet again recall the discussion in the introduction to this thesis of Jameson's too real skin-coloured simulacra.

The homoeroticism Rice evokes in the chronicles is most intensely explored in *The Tale of the Body Thief*. In this book, Lestat's relationship with David Talbot, the English gentleman scholar, resonates with homoerotic tension which is consummated near the end of the book when Lestat makes him a vampire. As the title of the book suggests, Lestat exchanges his immortal body for a mortal's, the deceitful Raglan James. As will be observed in relation to Stevenson's *Jekyll and Hyde*, this too allows a homoerotic subtext to develop. This is a point that Gelder raises (1994, 122). Ultimately, Lestat goes further than Bram Stoker's Dracula did - he does not just desire males, but is seen to drain them and share his own fluids with them. The homoerotic androgyny of the vampire is powerfully embodied by Rice's main character.

**Kill No. 5: Memnoch the Devil**

The fifth of the chronicles, *Memnoch the Devil*, continues to focus virtually exclusively on the vampire Lestat (and, to a lesser extent, the newly made vampire, David Talbot). This novel assumes epic proportions as it details Lestat's meeting with the Devil who takes him to Heaven and Hell ("Sheol") and shows him the creation of the world. In this volume, Rice's engagement with themes of spirituality is most extensively developed. She continues exploring the idea that the pursuer is always already the pursued. Early in the novel, Lestat is quite conscious of this fact. He speaks to David about pursuing a victim and being stalked by a sensed presence himself (1995, 14). Lestat develops an obsession about his chosen victim, Roger, a wealthy drug baron, but is also forced into a paranoid fixation on the unannounced presence. The "Thing", as Lestat
refers to it (thus reinvoking the by now familiar trope of the inexpressible), reveals itself only in a tantalising, fugitive set of fragmentary clues. As he explains to David:

the Thing is stalking me, and now and then it lets me see something in the blink of an eye. I hear it mostly. I hear it sometimes talking in a normal conversational voice to another, or I hear its steps behind me on the street, and I spin around. It's true. I'm terrified of it. And then when it shows itself, well, I usually end up so disoriented, I'm sprawled in the gutter like a common drunk. A week will pass. Nothing. Then I'll catch that fragment of conversation again. (Rice 1995, 17)

Lestat continues to encounter this "Thing" and states to David after seeing it that "I don't have any words for this" (Rice 1995, 22). He believes he has beheld the ultimate fugitive figure - the Devil himself. Importantly, this figure signifies his fugitivity by appearing as a mysterious and inexplicable rip in the fabric of everyday reality. As Lestat realises, this rip is characterised by its sudden appearance and correspondingly sudden disappearance. It leaves behind it the ordinary reality momentarily displaced and thus suggests itself as strange and overpowering illusion: "And then I woke up, as I always do, in some familiar place, where I started actually, and everything's just the way it was. Nobody has a hair out of place" (Rice 1995, 23).

Lestat makes David arrange his accommodation and this allows Rice the opportunity to make an ironic reference to one of her precursor texts, Bram Stoker's Dracula. The significance of her reference will be more apparent later but Lestat says: "This was humiliating. Rather like making a servant of him. Perhaps he'd change his mind and put our new lodgings under the name of Renfield." (Rice 1995, 27)

The cloying atmosphere Rice establishes in the opening pages of the novel is continued. The pursuer is the pursued, the watcher the watched. Lestat secretes himself in Roger's flat amid his cluttered collection of religious artefacts including "a great marble statue of an angel" (30).
When Roger arrives, Lestat hides in a corner. Roger thinks that he is alone. He is startled by the sight of the statue and Lestat intuits that "[h]e didn't know what it was or how it had gotten here" (33). When Roger switches on a light, Lestat sees the statue is of the Devil. It reminds him of his "Stalker". A tantalising sense of infinite regression, of mirrors, chinese boxes, voyeurism and fugitive pursuit is encapsulated in Lestat's observation of Roger:

I held very still. Now take your time, I thought. Figure this out. You've got your Victim and this statue is just a coincidental detail that further enriches the entire scenario. He turned another halogen beam on the thing. It was almost erotic the way he studied it. I smiled. Erotic the way I was studying him - this forty-seven-year-old man with a youth's health and a criminal's poise. (Rice 1995, 35)

We return to the idea of the fugitive figure as an artifice when Rice focuses attention of the statue. As it becomes animate, the distinction between art and life is blurred. We are witnessing something familiar as we have seen it before in The Picture of Dorian Gray and throughout The Vampire Chronicles, but these simulacra still have an estranging force: "The black thing wasn't a statue at all. It was alive. And it was studying me. It was living and breathing and watching me under its furious shining black scowl, looking down at me" (Rice 1995, 39).

Even after killing Roger, Lestat is plagued by the ghost of his victim from whom he finds out much. He learns of Roger's obsession with Old Captain, whose books by Wynken de Wilde are so unique as to make a fugitive figure out of De Wilde. The playful absence of De Wilde is perhaps meant to conjure an image of Oscar Wilde. In any case, Roger generates an air of mystery around De Wilde: "I saw all types of medieval books! And I came to know that Wynken's were unlike any others. Wynken's were blasphemous and profane. And nobody,
nobody at any of these libraries had a book by Wynken De Wilde, but the name was known!" (Rice 1995, 62).

Eventually, Lestat's stalker comes to take the ghost of Roger away in a scene which ripples with the sublime inexpressible:

I saw the wings rise up over me, over him. I saw the immense obliterating darkness shoot up as if from a volcanic rip in the very earth and the light rise behind it. Blinding, beautiful light.

I know I cried out. "Roger!"
The noise was deafening, the voices, the singing, the figure growing larger and larger.

"Don't take him. It's my fault." I rose up against It in fury; I would tear It to pieces if I had to, to make It let him go! But I couldn't see him clearly. I didn't know where I was. And It came rolling, like smoke again, thick and powerful and absolutely unstoppable, and in the midst of all this, looming above him as he faded, and towards me, the face, the face of the granite statue for one second, the only thing visible, his eyes. (Rice 1995, 92, emphasis in original)

The indefinite "It" of the inexpressible here is embodied in the shapeless shape of death. While Lestat has been able to cheat death - both his own and the people he loves - throughout the chronicles, this time he is powerless to intervene. It is worth noting in this context Rice's use of imagery as she attempts to articulate that which cannot be articulated. She emphasises the stoniness of the statue - the figure emerges from a "volcanic rip in the very earth" and is granite. The obdurate presence of stone is meant to provide a contrast to the extremely brief and tenuous shimmer of human life here "embodied" by Roger's ghost. Also important is the rolling smoke, the light and heat emerging from the volcanic rip. Just as stone draws attention to the fugitivity of existence through its own solid endurance, so too is fire a symbol of that very fugitivity. Of course, fire is used in this powerfully symbolic manner by Rice throughout the chronicles. In mythological terms, it evokes the transgressive Prometheus, but also suggests the Greek
philosopher Heraclitus who saw the world as being in a process of constant change. For Heraclitus, fire typified this process.

These sublime appearances by Memnoch the Devil are strong foretastes of the articulation of the inexpressible which is to follow. Memnoch takes Lestat on a mind-boggling journey to Heaven and Hell. The reader is not surprised to find that when the two arrive in Heaven, the language of the text is saturated by excessive self-effacement. Memnoch warns Lestat about the probability of sensory overload:

When we get inside, you must be strong. You must realize you are in your earthbound body, unusual as it is, and your senses will be overwhelmed! You will not be able to endure what you see as you would if you were dead or an angel or my lieutenant, which is what I want you to become...

What I saw, however, overwhelmed me as much as the sound.

This was very simply the densest, the most intense, the busiest, and the most profoundly magnificent place I'd ever beheld. Our language needs endless synonyms for beautiful; the eyes could see what the tongue cannot possibly describe. (Rice 1995, 164)

Here, Lestat succumbs to speechlessness, much as he did in those key scenes in The Vampire Lestat. However, in this instance, the sublime experience is not tinged with anxiety or terror; it is a truly transcendent feeling for him. In a sense, his experience is the intoxicatory fullness of the kill multiplied to an unimaginable degree. He satisfies his senses in a way he cannot on earth, even as a vampire.
Fugitive Conclusions

In this decade, there has been a revival of interest in Gothic texts within the mainstream movie industry. *Interview with the Vampire*, like *Dracula* and *Frankenstein*, has been made into a recent "blockbuster" film. This reveals the capacity of the monstrous figures within the texts to be transmuted into different forms according to the psychical, social, cultural and political anxieties of the time.

The vampire's monstrous "fluidity" (i.e. its capacity to represent different specific monstrosities at different times) is a function of the fugitivity of these figures as well in that their fugitivity is their indeterminacy, their potential for irresolvable differentiation. In other words, because these figures possess this apparently insatiable capacity for differentiation (or *différance*), they are recycled and redeployed in reworked versions of the myths which they inhabit to meet another social and historical situation's demands.

The monstrous figures in these novels are fluid in the sense that they can be redeployed in later works (texts) in different situations. Yet it is also true that they are fluid between different media. In other words, the issues which these figures foreground can be addressed by forms of media other than the literary text. This is another reason for the interest shown in these texts by the film industry and why there are contemporary versions of these myths to accompany the proliferation of film versions already in existence. In fact, the number of films "about" Dracula and Frankenstein's monster is in the hundreds in both cases. According to Gelder, "[a]round 3,000 vampire or vampire-related films have been made so far" (1994, 86).

In particular, the myths and figures of monstrosity originated by the novels are adaptable to cinema through the correspondence between the fluidity of the monstrous in the sense outlined
above and the fluidity of the visual medium. The film image embodies the very fugitivity or fluidity of these figures even better than the written word in that the images are truly momentary. The cinema captures this flickering effect, (which in textual terms is the flickering, indeterminate presence-absence of différance) even more successfully (and dramatically) than the literary text through its reliance on quick movement and transience, properties inherent to the medium itself.

A pattern is established in Interview with the Vampire which is continued throughout The Vampire Chronicles. The pattern is one of a sustained search for origins. In Interview with the Vampire, this search is conducted by Louis and Claudia and their metaphorical searching corresponds to their literal movement to Central and Western Europe in pursuit of an underlying truth or fundamental basis to their existence as members of the Un-dead. In their seeking out of a kind of vampire-father, someone who can explain to them the secrets of their existence, its origins and meaning, they can be said to be searching for a transcendental signifier.

The key point is that the search for origins occurring in each text is important for reasons which are not only narrative. These searches highlight the "textuality" of texts. This means that these texts enact - whether consciously or unconsciously - a search for origins at two levels: that at the narrative level, but also at the textual. Here, the search for origins is nothing less than the search for "Meaning" itself. In other words, the textual search for origins is a pursuit through the fugitive play of signifiers in an attempt to resolve their polysemic play of différance.

However, as Louis and Claudia find, the promise of revelation is always an illusory one as the act of final, momentous revelation is endlessly deferred. New, rich experiences are added to those already undergone. New rich associations or significations interact with familiar ones to make the existence or text itself infinitely "richer" but, ultimately, less knowable. Lestat discovers the same thing in The Vampire Lestat. His insatiable curiosity does not lead to
radiating light, but only a deeper awareness of the darkness of the universe. He sees only the "abyss" of meaning such a luminous proliferation of signifying possibilities paradoxically entails. Ultimately, despite its ostentatious promises of revelation, the fugitive figure enmeshed in the text, makes the text itself irrevocably fugitive.
FLUID METAMORPHOSES:

STOKER'S FUGITIVE FIGURE(S)

Roll back the tombstone
Let the saints appear
Roll back the tombstone
Until the lone ranger rides again
rides again in your mind.
Ride across the open plain,
All the way and back again
Back again...

Roll back the tombstone
And make a new man out of me, out of me...

- "Tombstone" (Crowded House).

Bram Stoker's Dracula (1897) exemplifies an incipient awareness of the instability of the self/other dichotomy. It is a text that generates ambivalences through its problematic representations of subjectivity and the relations between perception, language and reality. These ambivalences may be investigated through seeing the novel as being pervaded by "fugitivity" in the senses previously discussed.

Even a cursory review of the critical material on Stoker's text reveals that it explores the issue of otherness and its implications. Jonathan Harker remarks upon the Count's strange physical otherness early in the novel:

His face was a strong - a very strong - aquiline, with high bridge of the thin nose and peculiarly arched nostrils; with lofty domed forehead, and hair growing scantily round the temples, but profusely elsewhere. His eyebrows were very massive, almost meeting over the nose, and with bushy hair that seemed to curl in its own profusion. The mouth, so far as I could see it under the heavy moustache, was fixed and rather cruel-looking, with peculiarly sharp white teeth; these protruded over the lips, whose remarkable ruddiness showed astonishing vitality in a man of his years. For the rest, his ears were pale and at the tops extremely pointed; the chin was broad and strong, and the cheeks firm though thin. The general effect was one of extraordinary pallor.
Hitherto I had noticed the backs of his hands as they lay on his knees in the firelight, and they had seemed rather white and fine; but seeing them now close to me, I could not but notice that they were rather coarse - broad, with squat fingers. Strange to say, there were hairs in the centre of the palm. (Stoker 1993, 28)

As well as the heavily emphasised physical otherness of Dracula, he is an archetypal "outsider" - in the most allusive sense of the term - and has been read as a metaphorical figure for numerous unspeakable things. For instance, he has been perceived as the narrative embodiment of Jewishness (Zanger 1991), repressed/returning (homo)sexuality (Craft 1984), moral decay (Glover 1992) and "Eastern European bloodlust" (Wasson 1988, 22). The Count has also been read to figure incest taboo violation, sexual deviance, ruthless capitalism and satanism among many other significations.

Dracula/Dracula then embodies metaphorical representations of otherness. The aim of this chapter is not to unify these metaphors within the notion of fugitivity, but to supplement poststructuralist and psychoanalytical perspectives which argue that this "otherness" is intimately (and indissolubly) tied to issues of subject construction.

The sub-title of this chapter is "Stoker's Fugitive Figure(s)", referring not only to the fugitivity of figures like Dracula and indeed Stoker himself, but also to how fugitivity is figured in the novel. In other words, it refers to the blurring and metamorphosing of apparently discrete and distinct categories of being. This blurring is inscribed at the threshold of "meaning" itself and causes the text to be(come) irrevocably multiple, transient, effusive, evanescent and, in a word, fugitive. As Gelder observes, playing, like Stoker's text, with the traditionally polarised ideas of consumption and production:
To enable its canonisation... *Dracula* has become a highly productive piece of writing; or rather, it has become productive *through its consumption*. To read this novel is to consume the object itself, *Dracula*, and, at the same time, to produce new knowledges, interpretations, different *Draculas*. (1994, 65, emphasis in original)

*Dracula* (both the text and the eponymous protagonist) is riddled with fugitivity. "Riddled" simultaneously suggests his/its enigmatic fugitive pervasion/perversion. As described in earlier chapters, fugitivity marks and is marked by desire which is its motivating force and its symptomatic manifestation. *Dracula/Dracula* thrusts the issue of desire into the foreground. For in terms of the rhetorical effects of *Dracula/Dracula* and the way in which desire permeates and endlessly displaces them beyond the reader's/researcher's reach, they blur in a vampire's kiss from which neither can be extricated. This vampire's kiss serves to also bring the figures of Jonathan Harker and Dracula together, although the reader does not witness such an embrace: it is only hinted at by Stoker. The intriguing mirroring and pursuit which takes place between them provides a ripe site for textual desire to flourish.

---

**Countless Others: Dracula and The Fear of/Desire for the Shattered Self**

**or**

**Jonathan's Significant Other: Double and Nothing**

*my reflection,*
*dirty mirror*
*there's no connection*
*to myself I'm your lover,*
*i'm your zero*
*i'm the face in your dreams of glass*
*so save your prayers*
*for when we're really gonna need 'em*
*throw out your cares and fly...*
*wanna go for a ride?..*
*i never let on, that i was on a sinking ship...*
*you blame yourself for what you can't ignore*
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you blame yourself for wanting more
she's the one for me...
she's my one and only

- "Zero" (The Smashing Pumpkins)

We went thoroughly into the business of the purchase of the estate at Purfleet. When I had told him the facts and got his signature to the necessary papers, and had written a letter with them ready to post to Mr Hawkins, he began to ask me how I had come across so suitable a place. (Stoker 1993, 34)

Jonathan's letter enables Dracula to enter England and legitimately take possession of properties in which he can place his coffins and execute his "evil" plans. From this moment the figures of Jonathan and the Count become indissolubly intertwined. Jonathan is ambitious and his plan of making a successful career in law is supplemented by his desire to marry Mina Murray. His signing of documents entitling the passing of property into the Count's hands allows Dracula to invade England with the law's blessing as it were.

The Count is an id figure, resembling (or dissembling) a selfish undifferentiated pre-oedipal "child". Therefore, we can see his interaction with the law via Jonathan as an emergence into the symbolic order, into language and Oedipal conflicts and differentiation, a process complete upon his entry into England. As such, the completion of these formalities, while ostensibly no more than a part of the narrative development showing how Jonathan becomes trapped in the Transylvanian castle, in fact operates on quite a powerfully metaphorical level as well, signifying not only the Count's interaction with the law but also his negotiation of the Law of the Father.

Jonathan's signing of the papers granting power to Dracula are also important with regard to the issue of signification (as the very word "signature" suggests). Dracula problematises the
notion of identity through violating rational understandings of what constitutes being. He is an uncanny, supernatural creature whose origins are strange and who is capable of what is traditionally assumed to be impossible. However, as we shall see, he does not possess an identity in his own right. He is also a "figure" (or "figment"), the symbolically motivated embodiment of Jonathan's desires.

This means that Dracula can exist only if he is called into being, even if through the paradoxical return from repression. Therefore, the signing of the Count's name onto legal documents calls him into being in a "different" way. He is being inscribed into a body of textuality. He comes to exist through being written into law/Law. In other words, as suggested above, this scene functions as a metaphor for the process of negotiating the transition from undifferentiated infant to being in and constituted by the symbolic order. However, the Count is doomed to remain pre-symbolic until his eventual inevitable expulsion. While he gains access to modern England, his dream of being at one with the crowds of London is forcibly disrupted by the Crew of Light's elucidation of his infernal otherness and their pointed pursuit of him. Yet this letter scene forcefully inscribes the Count into the novel itself.

Stoker begins the doubling process with the two signatures of Jonathan and the Count. It is immediately clear that writing is integral to the doubling that occurs between them. Yet this idea is implicit from the outset in Jonathan's keeping of a journal, continuing even after he has arrived at Dracula's castle. This indicates that it is not just a travel journal. In this first part of the novel, Jonathan is forced to face his own potential monstrosity. This occurs through a doubling with his host. He keeps the same nocturnal hours and is preoccupied with the Count's affairs. Just as he starts to become increasingly obsessed with the Count, he tries to hold onto his collapsing sense of self-coherence. The diary provides an excellent vehicle for both Jonathan and Stoker in
this regard. It is a direct insight into the desperate battle Jonathan wages to maintain his sanity (Gelder 1994, 74) and individuality. It also shows the self-deception and inherent duplicity of this manoeuvre and of writing itself. Jonathan's desperate recourse to the "I" genre of the journal signals that his inescapable doubling with the Count runs in a parallel line to the duplicity of written expression.

In psychobiographical terms, Jonathan's struggle to maintain a sense of psychic integrity and independence mirrors Stoker's. The novel's author was an ardent admirer of the theatrical talents of (Sir) Henry Irving (who, among other memorable characters, played Faust). Stoker was absorbed into the magnetic charisma of this mephistophelean figure. The extent to which Stoker self-effacingly worked to augment Irving's career and reputation has been well documented, most notably by Belford in her biography of Stoker (1996). As she notes, rather than writing an autobiography of an interesting and successful life, Stoker typically directed even more attention away from himself and towards the famous actor by writing two volumes of *Personal Reminiscences of Henry Irving* (307).

When he finds himself imprisoned in the Count's castle, Jonathan expresses a fear of his language "running riot" and this has important implications as I will later explain. Jonathan prepares to "make his entry" - interestingly sexual, as Gelder (1994, 74) notes - into the journal by saying,

8 May. - I began to fear as I wrote in this book that I was getting too diffuse; but now I am glad that I went into detail from the first, for there is something so strange about this place and all in it that I cannot but feel uneasy. I wish I were safe out of it, or that I had never come. It may be that this strange night-existence is telling on me; but would that were all! If there were any one to talk to I could bear it, but there is no one. I have only the Count to speak with, and he! - I fear I am myself the only living soul within the place. Let me be prosaic so far as facts can be; it will help me to bear up, and
imagination may not run riot with me. If it does I am lost. Let me say at once how I stand - or seem to. (Stoker 1993, 37)

This is seeing language in the same way as Shelley does, through the metaphor of Frankenstein's monster, the aberrant signifier. Jonathan is afraid of being "lost" and insists on the "objective" - "facts" as opposed to "imagination" - but he undermines his own determination (and simultaneously signifies his indeterminacy) in "or seem to" which suggests that he does not really see himself standing anywhere: he is not fixed, static, objective, but fragmented and contingent, "lost".

The journal is traditionally a genre of self-reflection presuming a detached, objective "I"/eye. As Chambers argues, in

an autobiography, it is the hero's experiences that have made him, in the course of time, a narrator (one who knows) capable of evaluating them judiciously; so there is, as well as continuity, a measurable distance between the narration and the greater part of what is being narrated, the gap gradually closing as the story develops. Since there is no hint of "unreliability" on the part of the narrator, nothing to suggest that the text itself does not espouse the mature perspective of its narration, the reader is led to assume that the narrator's act of narration is identifiable with the text's own narrative stance and so espouses in turn this perspective of "maturity." (1984, 97-98)

Jonathan/Stoker ambivalently subverts this genre. Jonathan's determination-and-doubt can be seen as a narrative analogue to Stoker's problem of representation. In other words, his use of the journal and his thoughts preparatory to writing information in it, correspond to the problem faced by Stoker of writing the narrative of Dracula. Stoker, like Jonathan, clings to the illusion of control and the desire for order and "facts". Yet he ambivalently signals the opposing idea, that order is swamped by the irrational and that "imagination" does run riot, losing the "I" in the process and immersing itself in fugitive textuality. In this context, the Crew of Light embodies Stoker's desire for rational control. Meanwhile, the Count is the subversive irrational force he is trying to exorcise. Dracula is the most compelling figure in the text but the point of Stoker's narrative is the wilful disavowal of the selfish dissolution Dracula represents. Stoker needs the
Count as a powerful embodied warning of the dangers of succumbing to unrestrained desire. In this sense, Dracula is analogous to the Devil in Christian mythology. However, Stoker finds it difficult to resist the power of the Count himself because it is so powerful and seductive. To do so, he employs numerous narrative devices such as the journal, an archetypal form of self-assertion. Also, because each of the characters alone is vulnerable to the machinations of the Count, Stoker continually shifts perspectives so that the illusion of rational control does not sink with each individual. He recognises that the only way Dracula can be defeated is through the "safety of numbers" - a group with a collective mind conservatively walling out the other.

This ambivalence helps to provide the novel with the suspenseful titillation for which its later film and stage progeny are famous. It is generated through a hesitation (which Jonathan repeatedly embodies in the novel) between the fear of and desire for the other. This hesitation characterises Jonathan's confused writing at this point.

*Dracula* signals a preoccupation with dualism through being a textual site of sublimity. In other words, the text consists of numerous moments in which the characteristic reaction to sublimity of simultaneous fear and desire is enacted. This simultaneous expression inscribes a fundamentally irreconcilable dualism. The doubling between Jonathan and the Count reaches a climactic point in the following incident:

I only slept a few hours when I went to bed, and feeling that I could not sleep any more, got up. I had hung my shaving glass by the window, and was just beginning to shave. Suddenly I felt a hand on my shoulder, and heard the Count's voice saying to me, "Good morning." I started, for it amazed me that I had not seen him, since the reflection of the glass covered the whole room behind me. In starting I had cut myself slightly, but did not notice it at the moment. Having answered the Count's salutation, I turned to the glass again to see how I had been mistaken. This time there could be no error, for the man was close to me, and I could see him over my shoulder. But there was no reflection of him in the mirror! The whole room behind me was displayed; but there was no sign of a man in it, except myself... at the instant I saw that the cut had bled a little, and the
blood was trickling over my chin...When the Count saw my face, his eyes blazed with a sort of demoniac fury..."Take care," he said, "take care how you cut yourself. It is more dangerous than you think in this country." Then seizing the shaving glass, he went on: "And this is the wretched thing that has done the mischief. It is a foul bauble of man's vanity. Away with it!" and opening the heavy window with one wrench of his terrible hand, he flung out the glass, which was shattered into a thousand pieces on the stones of the courtyard far below. Then he withdrew without a word. (Stoker 1993, 38-39)

The crucial mirror scene revealing that Dracula has no reflection is important, as suggested above, because it serves to blur the self/other distinction between the Count and Jonathan. It also implies that the vampire does not come from the outside but from within and this indicates a repression/eruption dynamic. In other words, the quiet and reserved Jonathan, who intends to be successful as a lawyer and to marry Mina, must repress strong anti-social desires, especially as there is a prohibition on sex before marriage in Victorian England.

If, at one level, we consider Jonathan and Dracula to be a schizoid "entity" then, the former represents repression while the latter embodies the erupting. In the mirror scene, Jonathan feels the presence of the Count, but is not able to see his reflection in the mirror. This indicates that the site of this repression and eruption is the same body. Significantly, Dracula "appears" after Jonathan has cut himself. "Cut" here should be regarded in its full disseminating capacity where it may refer to not merely the superficial nick of his skin but to other more tantalising possibilities. These include "to penetrate or wound with a sharp-edged instrument", "to divide or detach... shape, make", "to absent oneself from" (Godfrey-Smith et al. 1991, 192). These "definitions" suggest the polyvalence of "cut" and reveal that if Jonathan's shaving produces, at the narrative level, a superficial skin nick, at the textual it creates a sense of a radical diffusion of identity figured in the text by the penetration-threatening Count.

Freud argues that the "double" is an important incarnation of the uncanny. In his discussion of E.T.A. Hoffman's "The Sand-Man", he argues that "[i]n the story of Nathaniel's
childhood, the figures of his father and Coppélius represent the two opposites into which the father-imago is split by his ambivalence; whereas the one threatens to blind him - that is, to castrate him - the other, the 'good' father, intercedes for his sight" (1955, 232). These ideas could be applied to Dracula, in which the blindingly bad and illuminatingly good fathers are the Count and eccentric Dutch polymath Dr Abraham Van Helsing respectively. When Jonathan returns to England after his Transylvanian nightmare, his association with the Crew of Light allows the other characters in this group to become uncannily opposed to Dracula. Indeed, Bentley (1988) argues that the Count is Van Helsing's double because he functions as the "bad" father to Van Helsing's "good" father. On a general level, through representing the return of the repressed irrational desires of the id, Dracula is the double of all the morally upright and socially bound characters in the group which forms to kill him. "Double" here is being used primarily because of its uncanny associations. Freud's theories, while profoundly relevant to (readings of) the text, do preserve dichotomies which the fugitive figure blurs. For instance, the fugitive figure emerges in the space (which is no space) between the "ego" and the "id". The two (as Henry Jekyll finds) are ultimately inseparable. Freud provides the theoretical platform from which Lacan, Derrida and Deleuze and Guattari perform readings which collapse the privileged and subordinated poles of such dichotomies. The result is a multiplicity which Dracula, in his perverse polymorphic form, sublimely and surreally embodies. He is the textual figure of surplus. To state that he is Jonathan's "double" is to draw attention to his uncanny "appearance" in the scene outlined above; it is not to limit his capacity for multiplication. In a way, the Count is Jonathan's "double", "triple" and "quadruple" etc., up to signifiers of permutation not yet coined. Yet, paradoxically, he is also "nothing": he clearly is not there in a real sense because he does not reflect. He is "Un-dead", paraxial, the "degree zero" of "being".
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The scene also includes Dracula throwing Jonathan's mirror out the window and it shattering "into a thousand pieces on the stones of the courtyard far below." This is significant as it reinforces the irreconcilable blurring between the two and the impossibility of a unified coherent self being identified (for either of them). After the Count completes this violently symbolic action, "he withdrew without a word" (38-9), which might be taken to mean that he emerges from the pre-symbolic, fragmented morass of Harker's unconscious. He is outside the social, made fugitive by not being a symbolically unified self.

As Lacan (1977) observed, a crucial moment in the symbolic differentiation of self and other is the "mirror-stage", the moment in which the infant perceives for the first time its own apparent unity and can distinguish between the in-here (for) of the inside and the out-there (da) of the outside. Yet Lacan shows that the infant's identification of an "Ideal-I" occurs "before it is objectified in the dialectic of identification with the other, and before language restores to it, in the universal, its function as subject" (2). In other words, the infant's recognition of its "unity" leads to its insertion in the symbolic order, its recognition of self comes at the price of the fragmentation of that self. Philosophical dualisms have been an integral part of Western thinking for several centuries and the most fundamental of these may be traced to formative moments in our psychological growth. If our constitution as subjects in the symbolic order carries with it a social imperative to maintain such binary oppositions, then the upsurge of modernist and postmodernist literary texts in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries which fundamentally challenge, deconstruct and undermine such assumptions came alongside the critical advances made by thinkers like Lacan and Freud before him.

*Dracula* was written around the same time that Freud was formulating many of his ideas on the unconscious. Indeed, as Gelder observes, "The novel was in fact published two years after
Freud and Breuer's *Studies in Hysteria* (1895) and one year after the term 'psychoanalysis' was actually introduced" (1994, 66). Literary ideas foreshadowing psychoanalysis can be traced to the Gothic and Romantic texts of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. A key connection between these texts and Stoker's is the mobilisation of an image of the pursuer being simultaneously the pursued through the overthrow of reason by desire. This is evident in numerous texts, such as Godwin's *Caleb Williams* and his daughter Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*. In *Dracula*, the Count is the pursuer who is eventually chased back to his Transylvanian lair and vanquished. In many Romantic poems, this same ambivalence is registered. Consider the following famous passage from Wordsworth's *The Prelude* (1850) for instance:

```
Sometimes it befell
In these night wanderings, that a strong desire
O'erpowered my better reason, and the bird
which was the captive of another's toil
Became my prey; and when the deed was done
I heard among the solitary hills
Low breathings coming after me, and sounds
of indistinguishable motion, steps
Almost as silent as the turf they trod. (1973, 193)
```

As well as incorporating ideas inherited from Romantic sources, Stoker's text embodies experiences which Freud would theorise, and implicitly anticipates some of Lacan's ideas, especially as mirrors play such an important role.

The appearances of Dracula are uncanny because, metaphorically speaking, they arise from the unconscious and are a paradoxical combination of the strange and the familiar. Freud, in his essay on the uncanny, "*Das Unheimliche*", cites the succinct definition provided by
Schelling: "Unheimliche' is the name for everything that ought to have remained... secret and hidden but has come to light" (1955, 224). Freud himself states that among its different shades of meaning the word "heimlich" exhibits one which is identical with its opposite, "unheimlich". What is heimlich thus comes to be unheimlich... In general we are reminded that the word "heimlich" is not unambiguous, but belongs to two sets of ideas, which, without being contradictory, are yet very different: on the one hand it means what is familiar and agreeable, and on the other, what is concealed and kept out of sight. (224-25)

This definition applies to the figure of Dracula, an Oriental Transylvanian terror whose evil machinations in England make him known to the band of men intent on stamping out such evil. The Count is strange through his eastern European otherness but is also already familiar to the Crew of Light because he embodies urges they recognise all too well, even if they try to repress these desires. According to Coe,

what is evil about the vampire is that he wishes to reverse the "rational order," to establish the rule of emotion over reason, impulse over will. Van Helsing and the other men have emotions, even "base" emotions like lust. Of his encounter with the vampire women, Jonathan writes, "I felt in my heart a wicked, burning desire that they would kiss me with those red lips" (46). Van Helsing, facing the same women, is not immune either. (1986, 234)

The mirror scene is an instance of the uncanny, one of the many strange events which Stoker presents to emphasise the chilling nature of the Count. More than this though, Dracula is the paraxial Jonathan, the uncanny figure on the imagined "other side of the mirror". Glover (1992, 991) argues that "Count Dracula himself often seems to occupy a space that is almost beyond representation, an unmirrorable image, a force able to assume a multiplicity of forms." He is
lurking in the background but strangely intangible as the symbolic embodiment of familiar but repressed anti-social urges.

The idea of Dracula being virtually beyond representation, "unmirrorable", is consistent with his "status" as an archetypally fugitive figure. The Count embodies that which defies description, a border being whose transgression of the life/death and inside/outside dichotomies poses a threat to the apparently coherent autonomous self of the bourgeois imagination (Craft 1984, 117). The implications of his having no reflection are that he does not exist in the same way as the living do. In fact, Stoker portrays him as a figure who undermines the traditional separation of life and death through being "nosferatu", i.e. "Un-dead". As Jackson asserts,

He dissolves the life/death boundary, returning from an otherworld to prey upon the living. He occupies a paraxial realm, neither wholly dead nor wholly alive. He is a present absence, an unreal substance... He is beyond organic life... Dracula comes from an inorganic realm, before cultural formation... Dracula's victims share his un-dead quality. They become parasites, feeding off the real and living, condemned to an eternal interstitial existence, in between things. (1981, 118, emphasis in original)

Dracula's membership of the Un-dead, therefore, is possible only through a parasitic feeding on the blood of the living. The predatory attacks of the vampire on its victim hinge on both the fear and desire the self has for the strange other. A vampire, according to the mythology with which Stoker and Van Helsing were so well-acquainted, can only gain access to a building for the first time when invited to cross the threshold of one of its rooms. Through this symbolic crossing of the threshold, the priest of darkness is able to unite the dead and the living in a grotesque and violent parody of sexual union.

Dracula's capacity to adopt a range of incarnations is also important to an understanding of his "status" as a fugitive figure. Indeed, the Count's ability to appear as a man, a mist, rats, a
wolf or a bat is symbolic not only of his belonging in a kind of nether world, nor of his ability to evade his foes through metamorphosis. It also reveals his continual metonymic displacement as a set of endlessly shifting signifiers. Lacan's tantalising play with Descartes' "cogito" indicates this process of endless shifting:

This meaningful game between metonymy and metaphor up to and including the active edge which splits my desire between a refusal of meaning or a lack of being and links my fate to the question of my destiny, this game, in all its inexorable subtlety, is played until the match is called, there where I am not because I cannot locate myself there.

That is, what is needed is more than these words with which I disconcerted my audience: I think where I am not, therefore I am where I think not. Words which render sensible to an ear properly attuned with what weasling ambiguity the ring of meaning flees from our grasp along the verbal thread.

What one ought to say is: I am not, wherever I am the plaything of my thought; I think of what I am wherever I don't think I am thinking. (1988, 97)

Through his propensity to metamorphose or "assume a multiplicity of forms", Dracula, who cannot be seen in a mirror, reflects signification itself. Like the Count, the signifier is not fixed, stable or absolute. It is similarly capable of evading absolute categorisation through adopting multiple forms, whether denotative or connotative.

To describe Dracula as a fugitive figure automatically implies this duplicity (multiplicity) of meaning. At the narrative level, he is a fugitive because he is generally regarded as a criminal, reviled, pursued, and the desire for his expulsion takes on the form of an imperative. However, he is also a fugitive figure at the textual level. This means that Dracula, both the fictional figure and the text itself, consists of signifiers shifting in phases of inexhaustible tension and play. If the Count's reflection could not be seen by Jonathan, then his image flits tantalisingly between the lines of the pages of the text. "Meaning" in this (as in any other) text is contingent on slippery fugitive figures - like Dracula himself, its effects can be seen everywhere. The actions and words
of the novel's characters as well as the author's word choices, methods and elisions are all fluid signifiers which may be interpreted in numerous different ways. However, when it comes to unequivocally and categorically identifying and assessing these effects, they disappear from the scene as effortlessly and evanescently as the Count in an intangible green mist of absence/excess.

Dracula paradoxically embodies the lack/surplus of desire. Metaphorically speaking, he does not exist, only being summoned by the erupting expression of the desires of others. He has no "life" of his own, no coherent "I" - hence, unlike other major characters, he doesn't keep a diary - and "lives", like a true parasite, only through intercourse with others. An example of this is, as I will later explain, his appearance when Jonathan is about to succumb to the erotic attentions of the vampire-women in his castle (1993, 54). Yet the mist and the dust into which the Count crumbles at the end of the novel signify his absence. He is made real only through the expression of desire. Yet, when he is summoned, he signifies excess, the blissful "too much" of desire. He satisfies desire absolutely. This clearly applies to Lucy Westenra, yet is most striking in his compelling seduction of the paragon of chaste virtue in the novel, Mina. Therefore, Dracula is a figure of absence and excess all at once because he emerges in the crack between repressed and erupting desire. In other words, he appears suddenly and with striking force where he seems to be most subdued. In fact, it is the severe repression of desire which encourages rather than discourages his violent returns from repressions. This is a process we shall also see at work in Jekyll and Hyde.

The association of the fugitive's sudden appearance and disappearance with a manifestation of the sublime both within and somehow beyond the temporal, causes an intense interest to be generated in the fugitive figure. Just as the fugitive in the narrative sense of the term is keenly pursued so that order can be re-established, so too is the textual fugitive figure
pursued with similar vigour according to the idea that this figure holds the key to understanding what is fundamentally inexplicable - the sublime. The pursuit of the fugitive figure, involving the desire to explain why and whence it emerges, becomes metaphorically hypostatised into a more general search for origins. This occurs in the text itself but can be seen as a process which is mirrored in critical meta-texts as well. Much of the scholarship undertaken on Dracula tries to identify an historical figure on whom Stoker allegedly based the Count (see for instance Florescu and McNally [1990] and Frost [1989]). Thus, there is once again a search for origins in order to apprehend the fugitive and speak authoritatively (or make an "original" claim) about it.

Of course, it cannot be overlooked that Stoker's intrepid band of adventurers do eventually catch up with Dracula, having been shown to cleverly intuit most of his plans and moves. Extending the comparison between the narrative and textual levels of the book, this is not to suggest that ultimate "meaning" itself is finally apprehensible if it gives critics a few nasty scares and threatens eternal twists and turns in vampires' graves. No, it takes more than a few adept pen strokes or deft stabs with a bowie knife to exorcise the innumerable demons in language, and even Stoker's conservative dénouement itself resonates with ambivalences, as will be made apparent later.

Shortly after the strange mirror incident, Jonathan's awareness of his perilous situation is reflected by the degree to which his journal becomes increasingly self-conscious. The demons he fears are all about him infiltrate his own narrative to create a tension which is simultaneously narrative and textual. The status of the journal as artifice and thus as a "text" is evident in some quite self-referential moments. For instance, at one point, he notes, "Mem. this diary seems horribly like the beginning of the 'Arabian Nights,' for everything has to break off at cock-crow - or like the ghost of Hamlet's father" (Stoker 1993, 43-44). Or of course, like Dracula himself.
In other words, while for the most part, Jonathan adopts the naïve conventions of the diary writer, opting for "facts" in a very self-effacing manner, in moments such as these he self-consciously points to the artifice of what he is writing. His journal inscribes itself as a Barthesian "text" in which there are fugitive half-truths of "imagination" rather than a "work" with the rigid "facts" the "prosaic" craftsman would require (Barthes 1988).

Particularly conducive to the imagination is the sublime. The self/other problematic is observable through the notion of the sublime and the simultaneity of fear and desire registered in response to witnessing it. Burke outlined this idea in *A Philosophical Enquiry*. As Phillips argues,

The Sublime, which always includes something of the terrible, is an important category for Burke because it is such an odd mixture, revealing, as it can, the overlap between pain and pleasure... Beauty and sublimity turn out to be the outlaws of rational enquiry. Both are coercive, irresistible, and a species of seduction. (1990, xxii-xxiii)

The inexpressible sublime, experienced as it is through a paradoxical mixture of sensations, is the site of interaction between the self and the feared and desired other.

The whole text of *Dracula* is hinged on the titillating simultaneity of fear(desire, repression/expression. In particular, there are numerous moments in which fear and desire are held in a delicious agony of suspense. Probably the best example though (and one of the most cited passages from the text) is Jonathan’s seduction by Dracula’s three lovers/daughters early in the novel. These women could be either or both although it is not especially significant because the Count does not distinguish between these symbolic female roles. Here, there is a clear indication of Dracula's taboo-breaking behaviour and of the emergence of desire within Oedipal
familiar situations. Importantly, these women tempt Jonathan into succumbing to the desire to transgress the social imperatives of celibacy before marriage and fidelity to his fiancée:

All three had brilliant white teeth, that shone like pearls against the ruby of their voluptuous lips. There was something about them that made me uneasy, some longing and at the same time some deadly fear. I felt in my heart a wicked, burning desire that they would kiss me with those red lips. It is not good to note this down, lest some day it should meet Mina's eyes and cause her pain; but it is the truth. They whispered together, and then they all three laughed - such a silvery, musical laugh, but as hard as though the sound never could have come through the softness of human lips. It was like the intolerable, tingling sweetness of water-glasses when played on by a cunning hand...

I lay quiet, looking out under my eyelashes in an agony of delightful anticipation. The fair girl advanced and bent over me till I could feel the movement of her breath upon me. Sweet it was in one sense, honey-sweet, and sent the same tingling through the nerves as her voice, but with a bitter underlying the sweet, a bitter offensiveness, as one smells in blood. (Stoker 1993, 53-4)

This passage emphasises paradox through juxtaposing hard/musical laughter, honey/blood breath-scent, "an agony of delightful anticipation" and "thrilling and repulsive". These juxtapositions evoke the irresolvable tension between fear and desire that permeates the text. As Moretti argues, Dracula "liberates and exalts sexual desire. And this desire attracts but - at the same time - frightens... fear and desire incessantly overturn into one another. They are indivisible" (1983, 99-100, emphasis in original). These instincts of fear and desire both arise from the unconscious and their effect is to destabilise the individual and create an irretrievable schism of duality or multiplicity. This effect, as Jackson argues, is fundamental to the fantastic text: "What emerges as the basic trope of fantasy is the oxymoron, a figure of speech which holds together contradictions and sustains them in an impossible unity, without progressing towards synthesis" (1981, 21, emphasis in original).

Craft, in his article, "'Kiss Me with Those Red Lips': Gender and Inversion in Bram Stoker's Dracula" (1990), makes the point that Dracula does not penetrate another male.
However, his apparent preference for the blood of women appears arbitrary until we read his actions in terms of desire and sexuality. Part of the text's power is what it implies as much as what it graphically reveals. Close consideration of the Count's actions in the book shows that the reader never actually finds him in the act of bloodsucking. While evidence for such an activity having taken place is abundant in the cases of Mina and Lucy (and implied for Jonathan and Renfield), the act itself is not described.

So, although the text does not present Dracula sucking the blood of any male, he does desire Jonathan for himself. This explains his rage at the defiance of his lovers/daughters when he states, "Back I tell you all! This man belongs to me!" (Stoker 1993, 55). The symbolic importance of the Count's appearance at this point is that it indicates Jonathan's eruption of desire. If the female vampires consummated their intended penetration of Jonathan, or the scene were concluded in a tantalising implication of this consummation without Dracula appearing, it would present an altogether different picture. It would make Jonathan's submission more circumstantial, less unconscious. The Count's arrival on the scene though reminds the reader that his desire is expressed in fugitive figures. The Count (a title which misleadingly implies smooth incorporation into the symbolic, when it is clear that he really cannot be "counted" on in any sense of the term) is the most powerful evocation of Jonathan's fugitive figuration of desire. To Jonathan, he is the capital D of Desire, or the A to which the vampire-women in his command are the petit objets a.

As for the Count's intentions, it is not made clear whether he aims solely to pump Jonathan for legal information and matters concerning England (a form of bloodsucking itself) or for a more literal kind of bloodsucking. In one sense, it is irrelevant because Dracula's bloodsucking sexuality is as much about power as it is about anything else and he is clearly
shown to exercise power over Jonathan. Although his fangs are not seen to penetrate Jonathan's throat, there are numerous interchanges between the two indicating a mutual homoerotic interest. For instance, as we have already seen, Dracula surprises Jonathan while he is shaving and vulnerable (to penetration). Also, the latter often refers to the Count's physical features, especially his "aquiline" nose and strong hands. The continued mobilisation of fear and desire between Jonathan and Dracula inscribes these homoerotics. However, the exact kind and degree of this homoerotic interest is obscured from the reader - *undercoded*, to use Gelder's terminology (1994, 74).

One important use the Count makes of Jonathan is to disguise (or cloak) himself from nearby communities through the use of the latter's clothes which he wears into a peasant village in order to steal a child:

> I had been at my window somewhat less than half an hour, when I saw something coming out of the Count's window. I drew back and watched carefully, and saw the whole man emerge. It was a new shock to me to find that he had on the suit of clothes which I had worn whilst travelling here, and slung over his shoulder the terrible bag which I had seen the women take away. There could be no doubt as to his quest, and in my garb, too! This, then, is his new scheme of evil: that he will allow others to see me, as they think, so that he may both leave evidence that I have been seen in the towns or villages posting my own letters, and that any wickedness which he may do shall by the local people be attributed to me. (Stoker 1993, 62)

Jonathan waits by his window and is hypnotised. He awakes from a trance to hear loud wailing noises from the Count's room. He tries to escape his own room but finds the door locked, so he can do nothing. Then,

> [a]s I sat I heard a sound in the courtyard without - the agonized cry of a woman. I rushed to the window, and throwing it up, peered out between the bars. There, indeed, was a woman with dishevelled hair, holding her hands over her heart as one distressed.
with running. She was leaning against a corner of the gateway. When she saw my face at the window she threw herself forward, and shouted in a voice laden with menace:-
"Monster, give me my child!" (Stoker 1993, 63-64)

The importance of "clothing" in both its narrative and textual senses is evident here in that the blurring between the Count and Jonathan is manifested in the former wearing the latter's clothes as a signifier. The duplicity of form or representation emerges in that signification can be fugitive from language in the sense of it being a fraud, liar, trickster as well as evasive or villainous.

Shortly after this, in a profoundly homocrotic scene, while the Count sleeps, Jonathan searches Dracula's room and coffin for the key to his room's locked door:

I felt all over the body, but no sign could I find of the key. Then I stopped and looked at the Count. There was a mocking smile on the bloated face which seemed to drive me mad. This was the being I was helping to transfer to London, where, perhaps, for centuries to come he might, amongst its teeming millions, satiate his lust for blood, and create a new and ever-widening circle of semi-demons to batten on the helpless. The very thought drove me mad. A terrible desire came upon me to rid the world of such a monster. There was no lethal weapon at hand, but I seized a shovel which the workmen had been using to fill the cases, and lifting it high struck, with the edge downward, at the hateful face. But as I did so the head turned, and the eyes fell full upon me, with all their blaze of basilisk horror. The sight seemed to paralyse me, and the shovel turned in my hand and glanced from the face, merely making a deep gash above the forehead. (Stoker 1993, 71-72)

Maurice Hindle hints at the simultaneity of narrative and textual fugitivity when he argues that "Dracula represents not so much a spectral desire as a spectral power. This power haunting the novel's pages eludes the capacities of its men as surely as Harker's shovel is deflected by Dracula's paralysing glance, as persistently as Stoker's language is forced to evade that which he has guessed." (1993, xxvii, emphasis in original)
The fugitive figure functions to indicate the presence of the sublime but it simultaneously
denies the possibility of understanding this sublimity. This dynamic of simultaneous
revelation/concealment corresponds to the sudden appearances and disappearances of the fugitive
figure at both narrative and textual levels.

At the narrative level, Dracula embodies this evanescence and elusiveness. At the textual
level, the instances of appearance-and-disappearance may be seen as metaphors for signification
in which there is no singular "meaning". Instead, there is only a tantalising and contingent play of
signifiers between presence and absence. An example of this is in the Captain's log-book account
of Dracula's implied voyage on the Demeter. This passage is symbolic because the voyage brings
the fugitive figure to England where he wreaks havoc at the narrative level. The log-book is a
"factual", empirical record of the moment in the text in which the most profound signifier of
otherness infiltrates the apparently coherent body which fears and yet desires it:

On 17 July, yesterday, one of the men, Olgaren, came to my cabin, and in an
awestruck way confided to me that he thought there was a strange man aboard the ship.
He said that in his watch he had been sheltering behind the deckhouse, as there was a
rain-storm, when he saw a tall, thin man, who was not like any of the crew, come up the
companion way, and go along the deck forward, and disappear. He followed cautiously,
but when he got to bows found no one, and the hatchways were all closed. He was in a
panic of superstitious fear... There seems some doom over this ship. Already a hand
short, and entering on the Bay of Biscay with wild weather ahead, and yet last night
another man lost - disappeared. Like the first, he came off his watch and was not seen
again. Men all in a panic of fear; sent a round robin, asking to have double watch, as
they fear to be alone... At midnight I went to relieve the man at the wheel, but when I
got to it found no one there. The wind was steady, and as we ran before it there was no
yawing. I dared not leave it, so shouted for the mate. After a few seconds he rushed up
on deck in his flannels. He looked wild-eyed and haggard, and I greatly fear his reason
has given way. He came close to me and whispered hoarsely, with his mouth to my ear,
as though fearing the very air might hear: "It is here; I know it, now. On the watch last
night I saw it, like a man, tall and thin, and ghastly pale. It was in the bows, and looking
out. I crept behind It, and gave It my knife; but the knife went through It, empty as the
air." And as he spoke he took his knife and drove it savagely into space. Then he went
on: "But It is here, and I'll find It. It is in the hold, perhaps, in one of those boxes. I'll
unscrew them one by one and see. You work the helm." (Stoker 1993, 110-12, emphasis in original)

Here then, the figure implied to be Dracula, makes an unexpected appearance and, shortly afterwards, an inexplicable disappearance. He leaves no traces of where he has gone, but cannot logically be hiding anywhere. The Count's unexplained disappearances are mirrored by those of the ship's crew. That Dracula's presence-and-absence on the boat signifies a kind of sublime manifestation (or revelation-and-concealment) is supported by the ship's mate being unable to name the horror he witnesses on board - he repeatedly calls it "It".

Sublime Fugitivity:

The Insatiable Signifier of Sexuality/Textuality

It is not merely coincidental that shortly after Dracula's implied arrival in England, the narrative switches to Mina Murray's journal. When Mina refers to her and Lucy's "appetites", she is ostensibly talking about food. However, she is symbolically and unconsciously referring to sexuality and the need arises for a powerful figure like Dracula who can satisfy these "insatiable" urges:

We had a capital "severe tea" at Robin Hood's Bay in a sweet little old-fashioned inn, with a bow-window right over the seaweed-covered rocks of the strand. I believe we should have shocked the "New Woman" with our appetites. Men are more tolerant, bless them! Then we walked home with some, or rather many, stoppages to rest, and with our hearts full of a constant dread of wild bulls. (Stoker 1993, 118)

In retrospect, the reference to "a constant dread of wild bulls" alerts the reader to the impending full-blooded assault by the Count on the virtuous women of the text. Yet, this passage also points to Dracula's place in the imagination. Indeed, a "fantastic text tells of an indomitable desire, a
longing for that which does not yet exist, or which has not been allowed to exist, the unheard of, the unseen, the imaginary, as opposed to what already exists, and is permitted as 'really' visible" (Jackson 1981, 91).

Dracula's appearances in England are consistent with Jonathan's earlier encounters with vampires. Generally speaking, seeing the Count is synonymous with the sublime, as Mina's description of (him as) a massive bat flitting in the moonlight suggests. Here, Mina's fear for her friend's safety (and sanity) is overwhelmed by the excessive beauty of what she sees:

Again I awoke in the night, and found Lucy sitting up in bed, still asleep, pointing to the window. I got up quietly, and pulling aside the blind, looked out. It was brilliant moonlight, and the soft effect of the light over the sea and sky - merged together in one great, silent mystery - was beautiful beyond words. Between me and the moonlight flitted a great bat, coming in great, whirling circles. (Stoker 1993, 124)

After Dracula has fully fed upon Lucy, making her one of his own, Van Helsing tells her former suitors that it is necessary for her to be "purified". In Lucy's ritual staking and beheading, her fiancé, Arthur Holmwood, acts as if enchanted by her, even though all present are quite fearful about her acquired vampirism. Once again, the vampire elicits a sublime response of mingled fear and desire:

There was something diabolically sweet in her tones - something of the tingling of glass when struck - which rang through the brains even of us who heard the words addressed to another. As for Arthur, he seemed under a spell; moving his hands from his face, he opened wide his arms. She was leaping for them, when Van Helsing sprang forward and held between them his little golden crucifix. She recoiled from it, and, with a suddenly distorted face, full of rage, dashed past him as if to enter the tomb. (Stoker 1993, 272)

This passage recalls the earlier attempted seduction of Jonathan by Dracula's lovers/daughters, especially through the image of tingling struck glass like the voices of the female vampires previously encountered.
*Dracula* is the site of an intense engagement with the gender distinction in society. The text, through the Crew of Light, figures an intended phallogocentric silencing of Woman. This silencing functions in quite an explicit and graphic manner in the staking through the heart of Lucy. As argued by Cranny-Francis (1988, 68), this violent incident symbolises an aggressive penetration (rape) of the "wanton" woman. It is a reaction to the threatening nature of the perceived insatiable sexuality of women and represents the regressive male impulse to emphatically "put them in their place".

This perception of women as wanton and capable of corrupting honest men is rife in the late nineteenth century, both in society and aesthetics. Dijkstra, in his study of the representation of women in *fin de siècle* culture, *Idols of Perversity* (1986), analyses this idea in some depth. In the chapter "Metamorphoses of the Vampire: Dracula and his Daughters", he describes Mina's detested "New Woman" accordingly: "She was the bat-winged woman leading a massed, blinded humanity to the abyss of degeneration, as in a painting of 1897 by Henri Martin" (348). This of course is the much explored image of the *femme fatale*, a fugitive figure evoked especially in Decadent poetry, but recurring subsequently in different literary forms.

Yet not only does an attempt to exclude, marginalise and silence women take place. Another result of the almost pathological adherence to social roles in the text is a kind of repressed homoerotics as already noted in the discussion of the relationship between Jonathan and the Count. Without exception, the "heroic" men are all either wealthy and/or work in prestigious or respected professions. They are doctors, lawyers, lords and civilised men. Besides enabling a perception of themselves as protectors of women (and the saviours of society), the status of these men indicates that they occupy an unquestioned and automatically accepted place in the symbolic order. Superficially, they appear to be content, satisfied. Yet this surface
impression masks a deep underlying set of repressed desires. They are ostensibly on a noble, 
even divine quest to rid England of the forces of evil embodied by Dracula. However, on closer 
inspection, this apparently self-sacrificing, altruistic mission is punctuated by actions which 
imply profoundly violent and sexual urges for self-gratification. The staking of Lucy is simply 
the most explicit example of this. It is a feared hybridity that the Crew of Light strains to prevent: 
England and its (wo)men are the "pure", "untainted" self/ego/Western which needs to resist the 
permeation Dracula as a figure for the other/id/Oriental threatens. In *Dracula*, this invasion is 
seen both on the micro level of the individual threat posed by the vampire, and on the macro 
level of a strange Eastern European force infiltrating and contaminating England (there are 
several interesting articles on this macro or political fear of invasion, including Wasson's [1988] 
"The Politics of *Dracula*" and Arata's [1990] "The Occidental Tourist: *Dracula* and The Anxiety 
of Reverse Colonization").

Furthermore, as Craft suggests, the way in which the men form an alliance against 
Dracula is more important than might first appear. They initially exclude Mina from their 
activities, which is significant not only because it reflects a paternalistic attitude, but also because 
it indicates that a kind of ritualistic male exercise is taking place. At this point we could describe 
their interaction as homosocial. When it becomes more erotic (and more violent) is when the 
band "sanctify" Lucy:

Arthur took the stake and the hammer, and when once his mind was set on action 
his hands never trembled nor even quivered. Van Helsing opened his missal and began 
to read, and Quincey and I followed as well as we could. Arthur placed the point over 
the heart, and as I looked I could see its dint in the white flesh. Then he struck with all 
his might. 
The Thing in the coffin writhed; and a hideous, bloodcurdling screech came from 
the opened red lips. 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. But Arthur never faltered. He looked like a figure of Thor as his untremling arm rose and fell, driving deeper and deeper the mercy-bearing stake, whilst the blood from the pierced heart welled and spurted up around it. His face was set, and high duty seemed to shine through it; the sight of it gave us courage, so that our voices seemed to ring through the little vault.

And then the writhing and quivering of the body became less, and the teeth ceased to champ, and the face to quiver. Finally it lay still. The terrible task was over. (Stoker 1993, 277-78)

As Craft (1984, 122-24) notes, this passage is saturated with sexual imagery: the phallic stake being driven into Lucy's heart (the "vaginal" core or centre of her being) and Lucy's orgasmic screams. The union which occurs between the men is also evident in the blood transfusions which take place before this "point". Each man's blood (a fluid metaphor here analogous to semen) is pumped into Lucy's body. The blood transfusions she receives from each of the men before this point function, through mingling fluids, as metaphors for sexual intercourse. The sexuality of this is made evident in Van Helsing's injunction to the other men to keep this fact from Arthur, as it is in the former's joke in poor taste about all the men being "married" to Lucy: "this so sweet maid is a polyandrist" (227).

According to Craft (1984, 124), incidents like these are the only legitimate way for homosexuality to be expressed in the novel: all the men have shared erotic experiences, but their deeply sexual and violent desires have been sublimated towards apparently heterosexual experiences, as is of course the case with Dracula. They resolutely support each other in the ostensibly invidious but secretly fulfilling task of staking Lucy. This provides them with an opportunity for homoerotic gratification which is, in the circumstances, able to be socially vindicated.

With regard to the blurring of self and other in the text, this repressed homoerotics overspills in the killing of Lucy. It causes a kind of overlap to take place between the rational
conscious self and the irrational unconscious. That what is taking place occurs on two levels (the literal killing of a vampire and the figurative gang rape of a dead virgin by a group of homosexually aroused men) signifies this overlapping or blurring. Here the self is represented by the literal ego and the other by the figurative id. Because of the taboo nature of homosexuality, the homoerotics of the text emerge in a kind of "return of the repressed" which is once again pervaded by the irreconcilable mixture of fear and desire. The title of Craft's article ("Kiss Me with Those Red Lips"), taken from the novel itself, suggests the latent (homosexual) desire in the book, but more could be added to the title dealing with the fear residing within the very desire itself. Perhaps, "Kiss Me with Those Red Lips (But Don't Bite Me with Those Fangs)" might express this.

Another taboo foregrounded by Dracula is the violation of nature. The Count defies death itself by being Un-dead and imparting this "state" of (non-)being to others. The consequences of this are disastrous because it involves a promulgation of a species of mutations (both in the sense of aberrations and creatures characterised by change or metamorphosis). These "mutations" are insatiable, ceaselessly moving and thus without peace. Despite the homerotically charged atmosphere, none of the men in the book become vampires like Dracula. As well as the taboo on homosexuality, one reason for this might be to emphasise the sexuality of women, as the discussion of Dijkstra and the rigid gender dichotomy has already suggested. The importance of the image of the insatiable woman to an analysis of textual fugitivity is that such an image is a metaphor for a process of ceaseless signifying. The sexuality of women is seen to be like a set of rampant signifiers. These signifiers, in other words, are beyond apprehension, the things to which they appear to refer are inexpressible. This inexpressible nature explains the simultaneous fear of
and desire for the insatiable woman which is continually expressed in Dracula. In other words, Dracula is the vehicle through which the "insatiable" desire of women is figured.

This figuration of women as sexually insatiable connects with the endlessly restless movement of the signifier in what might be called the "textually insatiable". Characteristic of this textual insatiability is the elusive flight from any attempt to form a cohering body of sense. This sense of the text's ultimate senselessness (or the fugitive figure's refusal to arrest the nonsensical/too significant fugitive figure) is incorporated (in the narrative physical body and the imagined "body" of the text) by the figure of the schizophrenic. Deleuze and Guattari describe the way in which this figure eludes social codes of meaning and flits between these codes much as desire does. This indicates that there is some affinity between the schizophrenic and the fugitive figure, again at both narrative and textual levels. This affinity is evident in the following:

The code of delirium or of desire proves to have an extraordinary fluidity. It might be said that the schizophrenic passes from one code to the other, that he deliberately scrambles all the codes, by quickly shifting from one to another, according to the questions asked him, never giving the same explanation from one day to the next, never invoking the same genealogy, never recording the same event in the same way. (1984, 15, emphasis in original)

The madman ensures the opacity of the text. In Dracula, Renfield embodies characteristics of this schizophrenic figure. He is a possible avenue of truth/knowledge for Seward, Van Helsing and company, and, in his more lucid moments, seems to hint at this truth. However, he taunts the investigators/interrogators and refuses to yield to teleological questioning, preferring the fluid play of dialogue. For instance, he pleads with Seward to release him from the asylum and Van
Helsing suspects a strong motivation for this, asking Renfield to reveal his reasons, but the madman is evasive. Van Helsing says

"Can you not tell frankly your real reason for wishing to be free tonight?.. Be wise, and help us; and if we can we shall aid you to achieve your wish." He [Renfield] still shook his head as he said:-

"Dr Van Helsing, I have nothing to say. Your argument is complete, and if I were free to speak I should not hesitate a moment; but I am not my own master in the matter. I can only ask you to trust me. If I am refused, the responsibility does not rest with me." (1993, 315-6)

Importantly, he demonstrates himself to be a fugitive figure by enacting the dynamic of concealment/revelation referred to above, simultaneously telling/hiding the truth about the sublime presence-and-absence of his "master", the Count - someone to whom he does respond "according to the questions asked him".

Deleuze and Guattari's notion of the schizo can be applied not only to Renfield. As already argued, Jonathan and Dracula can be read as figures which potentially blur into each other as can Van Helsing and the Count. Ultimately, each figure in the text threatens to become multiple (or at least, realise its effaced multiplicity) as soon as Dracula is near. It is necessary to consider that Stoker produced a profoundly ambivalent text, at times reactively conservative while quite tantalisingly engaging in/with textual indeterminacies. This will be especially apparent when the text's "closure" is discussed. There is no critical agreement as to the conservatism/liberalism of the text, especially in relation to matters sexual. Is Stoker presenting Dracula as a villain to be expelled at all costs, or does he secretly identify with the vampire? For that matter, it is not clear whether the reader should identify with the Count, the Crew of Light, Mina, Lucy or some other character (Gelder addresses this issue of open-ended identification in some detail).
In a sense, these questions about Stoker’s "intentions" are moot if we are to accept the Barthesian idea of the "death of the author". Furthermore, if, as Gelder suggests, author and reader blur in the collapsed distinction between production and consumption (1994, 65), then the schizo figure will inevitably run rampant in the text. This is even more the case because Dracula can be seen, through the figure of the Count, to engage with these irresolvable issues of production/consumption. The metaphoric figures in the texts evoke an irresolvable tension between threat and desire within all other "figures" involved in the reading/writing of the text. Here, "figures" designates the characters in the text, the way in which these characters are inscribed, the signification of/by the text itself and the authors-readers of the text.

To return to Deleuze and Guattari who provide the idea of the schizo,

The schizo carries along the decoded flows, makes them traverse the desert of the body without organs, where he installs his desiring-machines and produces a perpetual outflow of acting forces. He has crossed over the limit, the schiz, which maintained the production of desire always at the margins of social production, tangential and always repelled. (1984, 131)

The passage above describes the fugitive movement of the schizo figure in a manner which graphically evokes the flow of desire. In the context of a discussion on the production of desire in Dracula, the "body without organs" may be read as the dismembered text itself. "Dismembered" indicates the way in which fugitive figures have made a nonsense of the search for a true and final "Crew of Light" sense. The text refuses the sterility of a single (homogeneous) signification. It is a site of fertility and heterogeneity. The text shares characteristics with the Egyptian mythological figure of Osiris who represented fertility and was brutally dismembered by his brother Seth. Like Osiris himself, the text may be subject to the most violent of assaults - to
"dismember" might be to divide up (disseminate), "to remove the limbs from" (Godfrey-Smith et al. 1991, 219). Yet, the Seth-figure of Dracula realises - with his excellent command of English - that his forcefully embodied threat is of castration itself, dismembering the "rational" male from the symbolic order. This is evidenced in the Count's warning to Jonathan after the solicitor has cut himself shaving, especially in the ambiguous words, "take care how you cut yourself. It is more dangerous than you think in this country" (Stoker 1993, 38). Metaphorically at least, the "cutting yourself" refers to castration. Meanwhile, the fact that this cut is self-inflicted does not contradict this argument. Moreover, it simply serves to reinforce that, in metaphorical terms, the Count arises from Jonathan's psyche as an unconscious projection; hence he does not reflect in the mirror. When Jonathan's journal ends with his thought that throwing himself off the cliff is preferable to being at the mercy of "these monsters", it is logical to assume that the monsters to whom he refers are the vampire-women alluded to slightly earlier. However, the use of "these" is ambiguous. Jonathan fears these women, but when he states that "the precipice is steep and high. At its foot a man may sleep - as a man" (Stoker 1993, 73), the ostensible reference to the castrating powers of the women masks what Jonathan fears/desires most: his penetration/castration by the Count. After all, he could hardly fail to remember that when one of the women was about to pierce his throat, the Count intervened and furiously proclaimed that "[t]his man belongs to me" (Stoker 1993, 55). This undercoding conceals/reveals Jonathan's deepest fear of and desire for Dracula and is continued in relation to the other members of the Crew of light later in the novel. Indeed, what Craft says about the homoerotic dimension to the scene of Lucy's staking applies to the incidents I refer to above. According to Craft,
this scene signals not the end of the story but the continuation of it, since Dracula will now repeat his assault on another woman. Such displacement of the scene of expulsion requires explanation. Obviously this displacement subserves the text's anxiety about the direct representation of eroticism between males: Stoker simply could not represent so explicitly a violent phallic interchange between the Crew of Light and Dracula. In a by now familiar heterosexual mediation, Lucy receives the phallic correction that Dracula deserves. (1994, 124)

As Skal observes in more general terms, "this may be what is really at stake in Dracula - not the rescue of a woman by a man but the rescue of an embattled male's deepest sense of himself as a male" (1990, 28). In Stoker's text, Seth's "long pointed snout" (Godfrey-Smith et al. 1991, 712) is displaced by other bodily elongations - the Count's ears, his nails and most especially his teeth. These are the tools with which Dracula (threatens to) dismember(s) both in the narrative and textual sense, as Pope's aptly titled article "Writing and Biting in Dracula" (1990) testifies. Dracula, being Un-dead, is the "body without organs" puncturing, producing Dracula as a textual "body without organs". Here, organs are both signs of vital integrity and symbolic masculinity; the body without them the androgynous impostor whose sublime appearance deflates the symbolic phallus. This assault on the symbolically organised phallocentric by a "body without organs" is registered in the "body without organs" which is the text.

Another important blurring which takes place in the novel is that between child and adult. The id can be seen to master - or at least, in crucial moments, overwhelm - the ego in the text. As it does, a form of infantile regression to a time and being before the constitution of the self in the symbolic order takes place. The most striking image exemplifying this infantile regression is in the following:
The moonlight was so bright that through the thick yellow blind the room was light enough to see. On the bed beside the window lay Jonathan Harker, his face flushed and breathing heavily as though in a stupor. Kneeling on the near edge of the bed facing outwards was the white-clad figure of his wife. By her side stood a tall, thin man, clad in black. His face was turned from us, but the instant we saw we all recognised the Count - in every way, even to the scar on his forehead. With his left hand he held both Mrs Harker's hands, keeping them away with her arms at full tension; his right hand gripped her by the back of the neck, forcing her face down on his bosom. Her white nightdress was smeared with blood, and a thin stream trickled down the man's bare breast which was shown by his torn-open dress. The attitude of the two had a terrible resemblance to a child forcing a kitten's nose into a saucer of milk to compel it to drink. (Stoker 1993, 362-363)

This image is replete with connotations of the nursed infant. There is of course the inversion (or perversion) of traditional motherhood as well with Dracula not only providing the text's archetypal mother figure with the blood/milk of life but, like the child with the kitten, forcing her to drink it.6

As Bentley suggests, this "baptism of blood" is metaphorical for an act of enforced fellatio (1988, 29). The primal orality of the Count is also evident in his quest for eternal life, conducted through bloodsucking, for the "blood is the life". Stoker's attempt to exorcise these particularly violent and persistent demons is approximately contemporaneous with Freud's ideas on oral sexuality. As Freud argues in his lecture on "The Sexual Life of Human Beings",

infants perform actions which have no purpose other than obtaining pleasure. It is our belief that they first experience this pleasure in connection with taking nourishment but that they soon learn to separate it from that accompanying condition. We can only refer this pleasure to an excitation of the areas of the mouth and lips; we call those parts of the body "erotogenic zones" and describe the pleasure derived from sucking as a sexual one. (1953, 313-14)

The "baptism of blood" occurs because of the prejudices and blind-spots of Mina's "protectors". The attempt to silence women referred to earlier is evident not only in the Count's pressing of Mina's mouth to his chest. In general, the band of men hunting out Dracula are a kind of fictional
embodiment of the primal horde of brothers desiring the death of the father (as MacGillivray argues in his article, "Dracula: Bram Stoker's Spoiled Masterpiece" [1972]). Men are presented as being active, the doers, the fixers, the problem-solvers. They leave Mina alone, claiming that it is the safest and best thing to do. On the contrary, it is the best way of allowing Dracula to seduce Mina. Consequently, the men eventually incorporate her into their activities, although only under the strongly paternalistic gaze of Van Helsing.

During the course of the novel, a transition occurs in which the young Jonathan assumes an aged, frail appearance with white hair, while the ancient Dracula becomes increasingly youthful and vigorous. The Count fulfils the urges Jonathan tries to repress. For instance, there are no signs of any sexually intimate moments between Mina and Jonathan; their relationship is presented as virtually platonic; desire is expressed (in) between them only when there are vampires present. This repression/eruption of desire in Jonathan/Dracula once again serves to show how the latter can be seen as a "double" for the former. The "baptism of blood" scene is not only powerfully sexual, but also takes place in the now married Harkers' bedroom and while the stupefied Jonathan is present, thus indicating his metaphorical impotence.

In his essay on the uncanny, Freud discusses Hoffman's Sand-Man figure, with whom Dracula shares some important affinities. He argues that the Sand-Man is a "disturber of love" whose habitual punishment of throwing sand in the eyes of children is a displacement of the castration complex. These fears, according to Freud, "become intelligible as soon as we replace the Sand-Man by the dreaded father at whose hands castration is expected" (231-2). Dracula is a "disturber of love" through inserting himself between Arthur and Lucy (and indeed between Lucy's other suitors who profess to love her). He also comes between Jonathan and Mina, causing her to vow, after her physical "engagement" with the Count, that she cannot be too
intimate with Jonathan for fear of betraying him to her seducer: "Unclean, unclean! I must touch him or kiss him no more. Oh, that it should be that it is I who am now his worst enemy, and whom he may have most cause to fear" (366).

Mina feels trepidation upon Dracula’s entrance into her room and yet has no compulsion to resist him: "I was bewildered, and, strangely enough, I did not want to hinder him. I suppose it is a part of the horrible curse that such is, when his touch is on his victim" (370). These strong yet diametrically opposed emotions, as well as the vampiric consummations of Mina and Lucy, produce a shattering of the self into disparate and fragmented selves in which the other has manifestly infiltrated. Such direct and intimate contact with the vampire leads to a torpid disintegration. This is why Jonathan remains ineffectual for most of the novel and Mina is used as a pawn in both sides’ hypnotic methods of investigation.?

Another important aspect about the image in Dracula referred to above is its inversion of child/adult. Dracula is known as the one with the child-brain. As Van Helsing states,

He had a mighty brain, a learning beyond compare and a heart that knew no fear and no remorse... Well, in him the brain powers survived the physical death; though it would seem that memory was not all complete. In some faculties of mind he has been, and is, only a child; but he is growing, and some things that were childish at the first are now of man's stature... He has all along, since his coming, been trying his power, slowly but surely; that big child-brain of his is working. Well for us, it is, as yet, a child-brain; for had he dared, at the first, to attempt certain things he would long ago have been beyond our power. (Stoker 1993, 389)

Despite his age and apparent immortality, the Count represents the irrational, unruly child. Mina is the adult who has entered the symbolic order. Earlier, Mina's reference to the "New Woman" (118) entertains ideas of independence and, as Gelder notes, she is "embedded in modern technological forms" (1994, 81). However, like most of the figures in the book, she is ambiguously coded by Stoker. Indeed, despite these empowerments, she can still be seen to have
recognised and accepted her designated place in the symbolic order, unlike Lucy, by representing for the men in the novel a traditional and desirable image of domestic femininity. She is the model wife to Jonathan, and secretary and mother figure to the male group, which despise and fear the "New Woman" as attested to by their staking of Lucy. Dracula undermines this order by forcing her to return to a pre-existing place of dependency. Nourishing Mina with his blood signifies an inversion which causes the pre-symbolic and the symbolic order to be blurred. This is simultaneous with the blurring of adult (mother)/child and self/other as well. Dracula is positioned in the text as an aberrant child, a pernicious, ins(id)ious other who emerges from within. This image is reinforced by Van Helsing's reference to Dracula's "child-brain".

Like the Sand-Man, Dracula appears, disappears and reappears with the eerie uncertainty of the uncanny. When he does appear, he exudes the threat of castration, particularly as it is metaphorically displaced as the fear of losing the "eye"(I). This embodied menace is evident in his capacity to awaken desire in women and cuckold men. As Weissman notes, "He is the man whom all other men fear, the man who can, without any loss of freedom or power himself, seduce other men's women and make them sexually insatiable with a sexual performance that the others cannot match" (1988, 76).

Yet Dracula's capacity to castrate extends beyond this. His fangs symbolise the threat of the feared and desired homosexual penetration which is never witnessed in the text. He is the irrational other who threatens to pierce the rational eye/I and his fangs are, metaphorically speaking, long and sharp enough to perform such a feat. This threatened penetration extends to "queering" the otherwise neat gender categories of the text.

Nevertheless, castration is associated with Freud's "dreaded father". This means that Dracula, through being extremely capable of and, indeed, constantly threatening the (symbolic)
castration of the men in the novel, is also a father figure. This initially seems to contradict the way in which he is positioned in the text because he is also represented - particularly by Van Helsing - as a primitive being with a "child-brain". However, while Dracula does assume these positions, a large degree of ambivalence is involved. He desires 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 makes it what it is" (Stoker 1993, 31). He has already made several women - i.e. Lucy and his three lovers/daughters - submissive to this statement's implied quest for proliferation. He attempts to inculcate Mina as well with the perverted "baptism of blood" and his forcing of her head to his breast to drink his blood acts not only as a hideous inversion of images of traditional motherhood, but also as an affirmation of his supreme penetrative masculinity. When the men burst in to witness this scene, it recalls Freud's archetypal father making an emphatic display of power before his rebellious sons. Dracula's spreading sexuality spills over to threaten the men of the text in an intriguing scene in which the Crew of Light ambushes the Count at his Piccadilly house and he sneers:

You think to baffle me, you - with your pale faces, all in a row, like sheep in a butcher's. You shall be sorry yet, each one of you! My revenge is just begun! I spread it over centuries, and time is on my side. Your girls that you all love are mine already; and through them you and others shall yet be mine - my creatures, to do my bidding and to be my jackals when I want to feed. Bah!® (Stoker 1993, 394)

This quote embodies Dracula's perception of himself as a father figure: a dreaded father with a child-brain. As Craft shows, Stoker juxtaposes the Count's penetrations of Lucy with Van Helsing's (medical) penetrations: "But it is all penetrative energy, whether re-fanged or refined, and it is all libidinal; the two strategies of penetration are but different articulations of the same
primitive force. Dracula certainly problematizes, if it does not quite erase, the line of separation
signifying a meaningful difference between Van Helsing and the Count" (1984, 127).

It is important that the "line of separation" in this text is "problematised". Another way to
state this is that a blurring takes place between the key figures in this text. The implications of
this blurring include that the neat Victorian categories of gender and sexuality are erased in a
threatening and exhilarating way. There is also the suggestion that language, used to impose
order on the world, is similarly out of control, responding to the intangible forces of desire which
cannot be effaced.

... And they all lived happily after?

or

Dead and Buried?... Don't Count on it

let's take the boat out
wait until darkness comes...
pulling out the papers from drawers that slide smooth
tugging at the darkness, word upon word
confessing all the secret things in the warm velvet box
to the priest - he's the doctor
he can handle the shocks...
dreaming of mercy street
wear your inside out...
dreaming of mercy street
swear they moved that sign
looking for mercy
in your daddy's arms.

- "Mercy Street" (Peter Gabriel)

Realising that escape is his only chance of surviving the dogged attentions of Van Helsing's
Crew of Light, the Count flees back to his homeland. There is some proleptic irony in Dr
Seward's comments before the pursuit of Dracula on horseback, when he states that "we ride to death of some one. God alone knows who, or where, or what, or when, or how it may be..." (Stoker 1993, 474).

This uncertainty is being used by Stoker to generate suspense, a vital ingredient in adventure novels, a genre with conventions to which the chase of Dracula adheres. Seward's uncertainty is not shared by Stoker or even the reader, who both realise, as soon as the adventure genre assumes control, what the outcome will be. Indeed, Dracula is killed and the "heroes" barely scratched, apart from the very expendable token martyr figure of (American) Quincey Morris.

Stoker's attempt to remain in control of the text is evident in his focalisation of the narrative through the characters' journals. There is a sense that these accounts are meant to represent the unconcealed "truth", the keys to these characters' "authentic" beings. It can be seen as an attempt to preserve the illusion of a singular "truth" accessible to several witnesses. The guarantee of this "truth" is in Mina's assemblage of the different journals into a chronological whole from which she finds clues - as does Van Helsing - to the intentions of Dracula. As Seed argues, "[a]s the gaps between individual accounts close, so Dracula becomes better known, better defined, and therefore the easier to resist" (1988, 125-6).

The Crew of Light's pursuit ends with almost total success. Before the Count himself is vanquished, Van Helsing has the terrible (pleasurable) task of sinking his knife into the flesh of the three vampire women whose attempted seduction of Jonathan at the beginning of the novel provides such a resonant image for critical consumption (production). Of course, Van Helsing's consummation of this gory (but utterly necessary) task combines paradoxical elements of fear and desire, hesitation and resolution, to evoke a delicious, awful and sexually-charged sublimity:
I find one of them. She lay in her Vampire sleep, so full of life and voluptuous beauty that I shudder as though I have come to do murder... Yes, I was moved - I, Van Helsing, with all my purpose and with my motive for hate - I was moved to a yearning for delay which seemed to paralyse my faculties and to clog my very soul... that other fair sister... was so fair to look on, so radiantly beautiful, so exquisitely voluptuous, that the very instinct of man in me, which calls some of my sex to love and to protect one of hers, made my head whirl with new emotion. But God be thanked, that soul-wail of my dear Madam Mina had not died out of my ears; and, before the spell could be wrought further upon me, I had nerved myself to my wild work... but it was butcher work... I tremble and tremble even yet, though till all was over, God be thanked, my nerve did stand. Had I not seen the repose in the first face, and the gladness that stole over it just ere the final dissolution came, as realization that the soul had been won, I could not have gone further with my butchery. I could not have endured the horrid screeching as the stake drove home; the plunging of writhing form, and lips of bloody foam. I should have fled in terror and left my work undone. But it is over! (Stoker 1993, 475-77)

All that is left is the killing of the Count himself. And how anti-climactic this proves! The moment of execution, as Mina observes, is extremely brief after the prolonged pursuit:

I saw the Count lying within the box upon the earth, some of which the rude falling from the cart had scattered over him. He was deathly pale, just like a waxen image, and the red eyes glared with the horrible vindictive look which I knew too well.

As I looked, the eyes saw the sinking sun, and the look of hate in them turned to triumph.

But, on the instant, came the sweep and flash of Jonathan's great knife. I shrieked as I saw it shear through the throat; whilst at the same moment Mr Morris's bowie knife plunged into the heart.

It was like a miracle; but before our very eyes, and almost in the drawing of a breath, the whole body crumbled into dust and passed from our sight.

I shall be glad as long as I live that even in that moment of final dissolution, there was in the face a look of peace, such as I never could have imagined might have rested there. (Stoker 1993, 484)

We are reminded one last time of the artifice of the Count's forgery. He is a "waxen image". Dracula has an ambivalent ending although this does not initially appear to be the case. The Count is stabbed through the heart with the bowie knife. Meanwhile Mina loses signs of her taint and the mortal peril of all the characters' souls is over:

169
Mr Morris, who had sunk to the ground, leaned on his elbow, holding his hand pressed to his side; the blood still gushed through his fingers... The sun was now right down upon the mountain top, and the red gleams fell upon my face, so that it was bathed in rosy light. With one impulse the men sank on their knees and a deep and earnest "Amen" broke from all as their eyes followed the pointing of his finger as the dying man spoke:-

"Now God be thanked that all has not been in vain! See! the snow is not more stainless than her forehead! The curse has passed away!"8 (Stoker 1993, 484-5)

This "ending" is consistent with the impression of Dracula being concerned with the strenuous attempt to keep the "outside" out. To use Derridaean terminology, the text refuses to see the inside as already (irrevocably) contaminated. As Hindle notes, "the menace of the vampire is that... it works on us from the inside, taking over our bodies, 'infecting' our deepest desires with the lust for power and domination" (1993, ix, emphasis in original).

In his aforementioned article on Stoker, Glover (1992) discusses the liberal subject's refusal to perceive the schisms or conflicts within the self, preferring to flee from such internal crises. None of the characters consciously realise what is implicit or unconscious throughout: that the vampire is an expression of their repressed desires; it threatens them so terribly because it attacks from within. This recalls Jonathan not seeing the Count's reflection in the mirror because in this sense, the two are inextricably one.

Therefore, even though the Count has been killed, the implication that "they all lived happily ever after" does not ring true, despite Stoker's/Jonathan's symbolic note written on the seventh anniversary of the Count's death. Particularly interesting in this note are the following words:
Seven years ago we all went through the flames; and the happiness of some of us since then is, we think, well worth the pain we endured... In the summer of this year we made a journey to Transylvania, and went over the old ground which was, and is, to us so full of vivid and terrible memories. It was almost impossible to believe that the things which we had seen with our own eyes and heard with our own ears were living truths. Every trace of all that had been was blotted out. The castle stood as before, reared high above a waste of desolation. (Stoker 1993, 485-86)

It is as if Jonathan wishes the reader to believe that the threat was always an external one and that it could never resurface again from the mire of the id. What Jonathan could (would) not realise is that the self is always (already) other. Jonathan is always already Dracula, the consummate lover who satisfies even the insatiable desire of women while inducing a state of extreme fear in all who encounter him.

Thus Dracula is ambivalent even as Stoker attempts to provide closure to a fluid text. The mode of its composition through multiple viewpoints could also be seen as an unloosing of the monster into textuality, an impression intensified by the multiple subjectivity of perspectives which allows for even more readings of the creature-figure to emerge.

Where Dracula is conservative is in the fact that the Count is eventually killed, in such an "easy" and anti-climactic manner. Yet even here, when it seems that Stoker's conservative side was trying to achieve mastery over his unconscious side, there is ambiguity. In a footnote to her article "Suddenly Sexual Women in Bram Stoker's Dracula", Roth states that "two of my students argued that Dracula is not, in fact, destroyed at the novel's conclusion. They maintained that his last look is one of triumph and that his heart is not staked but pierced by a mere bowie knife" (1988, 67). Also, in his note Jonathan asserts that

[w]e were struck with the fact, that in all the mass of material of which the record is composed, there is hardly one authentic document; nothing but a mass of type-writing,
except the later notebooks of Mina and Seward and myself, and Van Helsing's memorandum. We could hardly ask anyone, even did we wish to, to accept these as proofs of so wild a story. (Stoker 1993, 486)

Dracula exists through his mobilisation in textuality. In other words, he comes to be only through being written about. Dracula may thus be seen as a metaphor for the "text". The implications of the assemblage of documents that comprise his being are that the author(s) (represented by our intrepid pursuers) can know the text of his/their creation. Therefore, in metaphorical terms, what is at stake in the pursuit of the Count is threatened in Stoker's construction of a narrative out of these fragments of the "truth". However, his own awareness of the contingency of this "truth" is evident in Jonathan's realisation at the end. As Hindle states,

it is the contingent status of each of these as "evidence" that ultimately makes the whole seem as unstable and shadowy as the protean Count himself. As the text's frame narrator and supposed voice of sanity Jonathan Harker reports at the end, they were all "struck with the fact, that in all the mass of material of which the record is composed, there is hardly one authentic document; nothing but a mass of typewriting..." (1993, xxv)

The Count is "protean", "shadowy", "unstable" because he is a figure for what is unspeakable within. In psychoanalytic terms, a correspondence can be observed in Dracula between Jonathan or Van Helsing on the side of the ego and the Count on the side of the id. Mina is attacked by Dracula but does not ever attack anyone else vampirically and is redeemed and restored to virtuous motherhood by the end of the novel. Lucy, on the other hand, is also attacked by the Count, but becomes a fully-fledged vampire who can only be "saved" by the phallic stake her fiancé drives into her.

In Dracula in general, there is a constant dualism between good and evil which is metaphorical for the battle between the ego and the id. In this particular text, I would represent
this battle as being I/D or i/d. This is the rational I/eye of the ego opposed to the irrational id represented by the "d" or "D" of Dracula, which is how he signs his letters in the novel (in other words how this Un-dead non-entity constitutes himself, letter within letter - like the unconscious itself - in the symbolic order).

All that separates the "I" from the "D" in Dracula is a division ("/") which takes place at the moment the unconscious is formed by the repression of desire. This division begins to be eroded by the force of the D lying underneath or alongs(id)e it. This is why Dracula is a horror that emerges from within, the other that is already inside and not outside the self as is imagined. D(racula)'s triumph is inevitable no matter how censorious the "I" may be because, as Freud noted in his analysis of jokes, child's play, slips of the tongue and other manifestations of the unconscious, the repressed always returns in a displaced form (just as the Count's penetration of the throat is metaphor for sexual or orificial penetration). D is the embodiment of this displacement from the nightmarish Transylvanian darkness to the ostensible light of civilised London (especially given the etymology of "Transylvania" - literally, "beyond the forest", that which is darker than darkness itself).

The return of the repressed is signalled by the momentary erosion of the division between I and D. In these moments of darkness, D(racula) appears and the separation of the I and the D, the familiar and strange, is effaced by "das unheimlich". Even in the moment that the knife is inserted into the Count's heart, the elision is not solidified; the D is not forever entombed. It is not certain that D(racula) is dead - is his last look one of peace or of triumph? Even if it is one of peace as most have assumed, then the D is still alive in the child of Jonathan and Mina. Indeed, as Hennelly Jr. reminds us, "the birth of the Harker child through whose veins run not only the Victorian blood of his parents but also the vitality of the Count whose blood Mina has drunk."
Furthermore, this child is "appropriately born on the anniversary of Dracula's death" (1988, 90). The Count has been transported from one body to another to enjoy a resurrection in the (id of the) child.

Finally, the Count is unleashed into a textual body (or bodies, given the "productive consumption" entailed by readings-as-rewritings). This textual unleashing, with its promise of proliferation and multiplicity, is the final guarantee that the division cannot be solidified; the D cannot be forever entombed, there is no final closure to polysemic texts, only ceaseless signifying. That this is implied all along, even if the "I" which desires wholeness and coherence continually denies it, is evident in the I/D formulation itself. When the division is eroded, an undeniable and emphatic ID emerges, which the self-as-other cannot be rid of, as it parasitically infects all (id)entity. Where erosion has taken place, this is the subject's very "I.D.". Here, the textual level of signification invades the narrative level and permeates it with its own irreducible fugitivity.

Stoker's adventurous text becomes resolutely conservative and conventional in its manner of "closure" once it makes the adventure genre dominant. However, as Roth's observation of the ambiguity surrounding Dracula's "death" makes clear, Stoker's desire to repudiate the textual otherness of the Count in a conventional and anti-climactic manner is profoundly problematised. One significance of the uncertainty surrounding Dracula's "death" and the fact that his blood is passed into the body of Quincey Harker, is that Seward's dramatic, suspense-building statement before the chase - which ostensibly evinces uncertainty but actually allows us the comfort of being in Stoker's calm, measured control - might just betray some authorial anxiety after all.

In other words, just as it is possible that the characters may be meeting their deaths, so too may the author himself be meeting his, "riding off" the textual stage as it were and allowing
the wild horse of textuality free rein. Even at its most conservative moments, Stoker's text, remains exactly that, a "text" - profoundly ambivalent and incapable of closure in the sense of a final, complete, comfortable sealing off. The tomb of meaning is always open, never nailed shut or even if it appears to be, the elusive vampire continually escapes it to walk among the living again.
HYDE BEH(IN)D THE MIRROR:

STEWENSON'S STRANGE BEDFELLOWS

We're all at the mercy of each others' little whims

Mmm, we're all at the mercy of the little man within
Hey Mister, how did you fit into the same shoes as him?
No more mercy, no more mercy, mmm
Show no mercy, no more mercy for the little man within

He's an animal but he thinks he's God
Gets him mixed up with Him

Come on now kill, kill the little man within
Kill, kill the little man within
Go on, kill, the little man within
We've got to kill, kill the little man within
Kill, wooh
Come on now kill the little man within.

- "The Ballad of The Little Man" (World Party)

Turning from Stoker's Dracula, the focus shifts to one of his contemporaries, Stevenson, and his Gothic text, Jekyll and Hyde. Superficially, there may appear to be little connecting these texts, other than their generic designation as "Gothic". Yet, as will become clear, the two implicate themselves in the most far-reaching figurations of "monstrosity" this term entails"entales". Moreover, Stevenson's text engages with issues and modes of narration already observed in relation to Dracula. Before elaborating, a "contextualisation" of Jekyll and Hyde is necessary.

As with all the other major texts (to be) studied in this thesis, Stevenson's novel(1) uneasily situates itself between popular and high (literary) culture. It is simultaneously adopted/disowned as an icon of mass entertainment and as part of a canon of "Great Literature". It is ironic that more than a hundred years since the book's first publication, issues of its generic
status are as relevant as when it was written. One reason for this is, of course, its "Gothic" engagement with "Gothic" themes (i.e. its problematising and problematic narration of the "problem" of identity and its disintegration). Clearly, Stevenson's concerns about writing a "shilling shocker" have been thoroughly dispelled in the text and its reception.

I raise these "troubling" issues of genre to immediately "contextualise" Stevenson's novel as a text engaging with issues of authority, identity and patriarchy. As will become apparent, these issues permeate the narration, form and thematic content of the text. Indeed, they are not only inscribed in the text, but actually incorporate or constitute it in a Hyde-like manner. In other words, the problems outlined above cannot be objectively analysed as "parts" of Stevenson's "text": they are always already there, inextricably enmeshed in its many signifying networks.

Stevenson's text figures itself as a "strange" case, then, because it resists classification. This extends beyond its continually negotiated historical position in relation to popular/high culture. In terms of literary taxonomy, it is also "problematic". For the purposes of this discussion, it is being regarded as a "Gothic" text. Indeed, numerous analyses foreground the book's "Gothic" characteristics to support their various trajectories. However, to describe the text as "Gothic" is to do so with an awareness that it is not circumscribed by this generic signifier. The novel is "Gothic", but it may also be seen as science fiction, fantasy, horror, allegory, fable, moral tale, prototypical modernist text (for example Thomas 1988) etc. Its being "Gothic" does not eliminate these other generic possibilities; rather, the "Gothic" embraces these forms of "otherness". Indeed, the "Gothic" disavows rational singular authority. It affirms and is constituted by a radical unstable heterogeneity which is inherently disruptive. Stevenson's choice of the word "strange" to describe the "case" is apt at the narrative level because it details the
mysterious relationship between Jekyll and Hyde. However, "strange" also works at the textual level because it designates the generic hybridity and heterogeneity referred to above.

Stevenson's text then is strange, enigmatic, baffling: it generates (through its generic instability) more questions than definitions. In terms of its content, we will see that the figures in the novel are as baffling as Stoker's Count. It is the level of the text's significations to which we must now turn.

Unspeakably Hideous: The Sublimely Inexpressible Hyde

The text is (should be) that uninhibited person who shows his behind to the Political Father.

(Barthes 1975, 53, emphasis in original)

As already discussed, an important aspect of the sublime is that it is inexpressible. Within those who witness the sublime a response of fear and desire is engendered, along with an inarticulate acknowledgement of the ineffable nature of the experience. "In Jekyll and Hyde the latter embodies the sublime, and this is made evident when Utterson's friend, Richard Enfield, states that Hyde defies description:"

He is not easy to describe. There is something wrong with his appearance; something displeasing, something downright detestable. I never saw a man I so disliked, and yet I scarce know why. He must be deformed somewhere; he gives a strong feeling of deformity, although I couldn't specify the point. He's an extraordinary-looking man, and yet I really can name nothing out of the way. No, sir; I can make no hand of it; I can't describe him. And it's not want of memory; for I declare I can see him this moment. (Stevenson 1979, 34)
While Hyde's strange inexpressibility is initially registered in the text by Enfield, the mystery of his involvement with Jekyll is presented by the intrigued lawyer Gabriel John Utterson. Jekyll's will is drafted to the mysterious Hyde's benefit:

[Utterson] opened his safe, took from the most private part of it a document endorsed on the envelope as Dr Jekyll's Will, and sat down with a clouded brow to study its contents. The will was holograph; for Mr Utterson, though he took charge of it now that it was made, had refused to lend the least assistance in the making of it; it provided not only that, in case of the decease of Henry Jekyll, M.D., D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S., &c., all his possessions were to pass into the hands of his "friend and benefactor Edward Hyde"; but that in case of Dr Jekyll's "disappearance or unexplained absence for any period exceeding three calendar months," the said Edward Hyde should step into the said Henry Jekyll's shoes without further delay, and free from any burden or obligation, beyond the payment of a few small sums to the members of the doctor's household. (Stevenson 1979, 35)

This passage refers tantalisingly to "disappearance or unexplained absence". At this early stage in the narrative, Stevenson is playing with the opposition between presence and absence. For Utterson - and the reader - Hyde remains unencountered, absent, for quite some time. However, he marks his presence in the text through the incomplete descriptions of others, as well as the continual allusion to him, especially in documents like Jekyll's will. Hyde is thus present in writing. This is all too appropriate, since as Thomas observes,

Hyde is from the outset the product of Jekyll's pen. Not only does Hyde begin his existence as the chemical formula Jekyll writes out in his notebook; he is sustained by the banknotes and account books Jekyll writes for him. He even has his future provided for by the will that names him heir - again, in Jekyll's own handwriting. (1988, 78)

Hyde then is very much a textual figure in that he exists through writing. Hogle acknowledges the figural nature of Hyde in his statement that "[a]ll self-representations are figural concealments of other figural concealments" (1988, 186). This means Hyde is present where he
is absent. Also, because no one, when he is seen, can describe him adequately, he is "absent" where he is present. This quality points to his sublimity. As already seen in *Dracula* (in particular, the famous shaving mirror scene), the sublime fugitive figure registers/effaces itself paradoxically. Indeed, the dynamic of revelation/concealment is abundant in Stevenson's text. It signals and is symbolised by the appearance-and-disappearance of the fugitive figure. Before Utterson even meets Hyde, Enfield's story of his encounter with the man "presents an enigma that baffles him as its teller and baffles his listener, Utterson, as well" (Thomas 1988, 76). After Utterson has heard Enfield's story of the strange *figure*, he describes Hyde in the following tantalising way:

And hitherto it was his ignorance of Mr Hyde that had swelled his indignation; now, by a sudden turn, it was his knowledge. It was already bad enough when the name was but a name of which he could learn no more. It was worse when it began to be clothed upon with detestable attributes; and out of the shifting, insubstantial mists that had so long baffled his eye, there leaped up the sudden, definite presentment of a fiend. (Stevenson 1979, 35-6)

*In Jekyll and Hyde*, there is a blurring of sorts between not only Hyde and Jekyll, but also Hyde and Utterson. In fact, *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* is equally "The Strange Case of Mr Utterson and Mr Hyde". Most of the narrative is focalised through Utterson who is entrusted with connecting the diverse textual evidence after the novel's climax. In a sense, he is a hybrid figure for the author and the reader (recalling Gelder's argument that Mina blurs these traditionally opposed positions in *Dracula*). He represents the author by undertaking the main task of narrating the story. His "baffled" eye is also Stevenson's before the unrepresentable (just as the Count "baffles" the Crew of Light). He stands for the reader through attempting to solve
the mystery of Hyde, to close, as it were, "the strange case". In Chambers' terms, he is the figure to whom has fallen the task of reconciling narrative and textual signifying levels.

The passage above inscribes resonant tensions between presence and absence. Hyde is initially "but a name" shrouded by "shifting, insubstantial mists" suddenly manifesting a coherent image - "there leaped up the sudden, definite presentment of a fiend." Stevenson's image of mists recurs in the narrative. Here, it supplies Hyde with a mysterious air. He is apparently distant and concealed from sight. However, this distance is suddenly traversed and the fugitive figure revealed while remaining ineffable. Hyde shifts from being a vague name to a sublime presence for which there are no words or names. This is the paradoxical nature of fugitivity; it conceals while it reveals and reveals when it conceals: there is blurring, indefiniteness, indeterminacy, but no union between collapsed dualities.

Utterson self-consciously "describes" Hyde. He seems aware of the impossibility of attaching "meaningful" words to the sublime. Instead, he chooses, like Conrad's Marlow in Heart of Darkness, to articulate how inarticulate he is facing the unnameable. Significantly, his use of "presentment" rather than "presence" foregrounds Hyde's construction as a literary artifice - a "theatrical representation; delineation, portrait" (Sykes 1987, 812) - rather than somebody wholly, physically there.

Stevenson's self-conscious manner and means of representing the unrepresentable Hyde are emphasised by the images of "shifting, insubstantial mists", the "baffled" eye and his use of "clothed". These are images repeated throughout the text. They signify beyond their concealing of the mysterious Hyde.

At the narrative level, Stevenson posits Hyde as a fugitive figure - in other words, an unknown, creepy, detestable villain or fiend who escapes adequate description. Yet
simultaneously, Stevenson (unavoidably) inscribes something supplementary. He implicitly refers to "Hyde" as a fugitive figure. The signifier "Hyde" generates numerous denotative and connotative associations. These reflect/deflect an irresolvable play of textual signification. The observer's "baffled" eye is also the reader's, perceiving the innumerable connotative significations in the text. It is also, in a sense, the baffled "I" before textual profusion and indeterminacy. Indeed, as Thomas observes, the "novel is no longer the scene of self-possession; it has become a sign of the self's dissolution" (1988, 74).

Stevenson's use of "clothed" is appropriately ambiguous, referring to both the narrative and the textual. In other words, at the narrative level, it describes Hyde's "detestable attributes" (which significantly are not specified or named) adding to the general impression of his fiendish being. Meanwhile, at the textual level, it again indicates Stevenson's anxiety about representing, "clothing" the embodied "shape" of Hyde as a fantastic figure.

Importantly, Jekyll's erstwhile friend, Dr Hastie Lanyon, later describes Hyde in Jekyll's loose, ill-fitting clothes. Here, language, used to provide the formless with a form, the unnameable with a garment stitched to its skin, fails to adequately assign a name, "pin down" "meaning". Lanyon describes Hyde as a shrunken, stunted being on whose frame the doctor's garments hang loosely and ridiculously:

This person (who had thus, from the first moment of his entrance, struck in me what I can only describe as a disgustful curiosity) was dressed in a fashion that would have made an ordinary person laughable; his clothes, that is to say, although they were of rich and sober fabric, were enormously too large for him in every measurement - the trousers hanging on his legs and rolled up to keep them from the ground, the waist of the coat below his haunches, and the collar sprawling wide upon his shoulders. (Stevenson 1979, 77-78)
With Hyde in Jekyll's clothes there is slippage, both literally and figuratively. Stevenson succeeds only in simultaneously revealing and concealing fugitive meaning. He conceals with mists and clothing and reveals in sudden dispersals of the mist or movements of the body which suggest the true unrepresentable energy beneath the apparent form. The blurring between Jekyll and Hyde, sudden shifting between form and formless, sense and senseless, self-possessed and fugitive, is continued in Jekyll's later description of his transformation into Hyde. The following passage again makes use of the image of clothing to indicate the extent of this blurring:

I began to be aware of a change in the temper of my thoughts, a greater boldness, a contempt of danger, a solution of the bonds of obligation. I looked down; my clothes hung formlessly on my shrunken limbs; the hand that lay on my knee was corded and hairy. I was once more Edward Hyde. A moment before I had been safe of all men's respect, wealthy, beloved - the cloth laying for me in the dining-room at home; and now I was the common quarry of mankind, hunted, houseless, a known murderer, thrall to the gallows. (Stevenson 1979, 92-93)

Shortly after Enfield's story of his encounter with the abominable Hyde, Utterson has a restless night in which

Mr Enfield's tale went by before his mind in a scroll of lighted pictures... he would see a room in a rich house, where his friend lay asleep, dreaming and smiling at his dreams; and then the door of that room would be opened, the curtains of the bed plucked apart, the sleeper recalled, and lo! there would stand by his side a figure to whom power was given, and even at that dead hour, he must rise and do its bidding. (Stevenson 1979, 37)

As we shall see, this echoes the similar scene of a monster disturbing the narrator's sleep in *Frankenstein.* The passage above is marked by a sense of homoerotic vulnerability with Hyde plucking back the curtains in a profoundly sexual image of rupture, of *penetration.* The conflation of the inside and outside foreshadows the ultimate dissolution. The dreamer is dreaming of the dream-figure, the unconscious contemplating the unconscious stealing into the
waking world. Wolf mentions the ambiguous references made by Stevenson to the relationship between Jekyll and Hyde. It consists of age and class disparities and the "illicit" liaison appears sexual. Nothing is explicit, making the book’s atmosphere homoerotic rather than homosexual, but insinuations proliferate. Indeed, shortly afterwards, Utterson declares that it "turns me quite cold to think of this creature stealing like a thief to Harry's bedside" (42). As Wolf states,

The idea that Hyde steals to Jekyll's bedside appears first in the account we have of Utterson's sleepless or fitful night... Utterson reimagines it here and inevitably makes us wonder once again whether Hyde's "black secrets," as well as Jekyll's do not also include homosexuality.

The image, reiterated twice, of a monstrous being appearing at Jekyll's bedside, is powerfully suggestive of Fuselli's famous painting "The Nightmare," in which a horse with pupilless eyes stares at a sleeper on whose chest some apelike creature squats. (1995, 53)

Like Dracula, Jekyll and Hyde seeks to exclude women, although in less explicit and graphic a manner. Women barely figure in the narrative(s) in fact, occupying only marginal roles implying their exclusion from bases of power in Victorian patriarchal society. This serves to highlight the book's focus on the role of men in the symbolic order and its signifying of unresolved Oedipal dramas. Pride, prestige and a place in the symbolic order are achievable only after repressing the deepest and most fundamental of desires. This is "the case" not only for Jekyll but also for the other prominent professional men in the book who are all leading drab lives. Women are also marginalised through Hyde's activities remaining largely undisclosed although it is implied that he frequents brothels and the steamy underside of the city (as his living in Soho and the reference to a woman who approaches him with a "box of lights" [94] suggests).
It is not surprising then that repressed homoerotics are evident in *Jekyll and Hyde*. The main protagonists are all "civilised" men who have, in choosing to live professional lives, necessarily adapted to the suffocating moral strictures concomitant with such social positions. The men are all bachelors - which does not necessarily mean that they are homosexuals - but women are implicitly excluded from their "respectable" homosocial lives.

The mystery of Jekyll and Hyde is solved by a group of men: Utterson, Lanyon, Poole, Guest, Newcomen and Enfield. These men discover the secret in a textual unveiling involving a gradual penetration into Jekyll's "hidden" life. Utterson assumes responsibility in "getting to the bottom" of the "strange case". He seems to want to protect Jekyll from Hyde.\textsuperscript{10} Jekyll is feminised by his colleagues and his own behaviour. He cannot keep his irrational desires from irrupting into his everyday life, thus he threatens Utterson and the men's "civilised" social circle. This feminising of Jekyll takes place in response to the threat Hyde poses (which clearly affronts Utterson personally). Two examples from the text evidence this process. The first is in the passage cited above: "[t]hings cannot continue as they are. It turns me quite cold to think of this creature stealing like a thief to Harry's bedside; poor Harry, what a wakening! And the danger of it!" (1979, 42). This passage implies that Jekyll is somehow immobilised, trapped in a nightmare. This sense of imprisonment is reinforced in the brief but telling "Incident at the Window" in which Utterson confronts Jekyll: "'You stay too much indoors,' said the lawyer. 'You should be out, whipping up the circulation like Mr Enfield and me. (This is my cousin - Mr Enfield - Dr Jekyll.) Come, now; get your hat and take a quick turn with us'" (60).

Stevenson repeats words like "secret" and "search". These terms reinforce an effort made by a member of a male professional community to maintain the repression of taboo desires and sterilise the threat that Hyde embodies. Hyde gradually gains mastery over Jekyll so the doctor
becomes passive, supplicant to his desires. Yet even earlier, Hyde is intimately associated with Jekyll, something inside him but beyond his control. In its being taken orally, Jekyll's potion is suggestively sexual. Imbibing it involves Hyde's insemination of Jekyll's being.

The self/other blurring symptomatic of and expressing textual fugitivity, occurs not only literally, but in more covertly metaphorical ways in the text. These metaphorical instances, like repressed (homo)sexuality, point to a more general and fundamental blurring of the self/other configurations which they inscribe.

As Wolf notes, Utterson's dreams inscribe homoerotics in the text. He also observes that Stevenson "used his own dreams as a source of plot ideas and described the contribution of his dreams to the development of the Jekyll and Hyde story. He spoke, too, about the power of nightmare and gave several vivid examples" (1995, 47). Hyde's parting of the curtain thus indicates not only his power and the intense homoeroticism between creator and creature. It also suggests the interaction between the conscious and the unconscious (since the fugitive figures the erupting unconscious). According to Wolf, Stevenson explicitly alluded to this:

[Stevenson's] essay ["A Chapter on Dreams"] is remarkable for its surprisingly modern point of view about the role of the unconscious in the creative process. Stevenson divided the responsibility for creative work equally between the contribution of the unconscious (which he called his busy Brownies) and the work of his conscious mind as it attended to the details of writing - organization, editing, diction. Astutely, he suggested that the Brownies might even be affecting his conscious labors. (1995, 47)

The elusive fugitive figure threads itself through Utterson's own dreams. It is articulated in typically evanescent fashion:

The figure in these two phases haunted the lawyer all night; and if at any time he dozed over, it was but to see it glide more stealthily through sleeping houses, or move the more swiftly and still more swiftly, even to dizziness, through wider labyrinths of
implighted city, and at every street corner crush a child and leave her screaming. (Stevenson 1979, 37)

Wolf, evoking the fluidity of the fugitive figure, states: "The facelessness or the amorphous quality of the figure and the reiterated whirling images of nightmarish detail are remarkably cinematographic, yet no film has yet exploited this passage" (1995, 47).

The impression of these powerful images leads Utterson to focus obsessively on Hyde and begin assuming characteristics of the fugitive figure himself:

From that time forward, Mr Utterson began to haunt the door in the by street of shops. In the morning before office hours, at noon when business was plenty and time scarce, at night under the face of the fogged city moon, by all lights and at all hours of solitude or concourse, the lawyer was to be found on his chosen post.

"If he be Mr Hyde," he had thought, "I shall be Mr Seek." (Stevenson 1979, 38)

The name "Utterson" logically associated itself with "Hyde". Not only does he decide to play "Mr Seek" to Jekyll's Mr Hyde, but his own name already suggests this - he is "Utters-on". While Hyde conceals himself in the "shifting and insubstantial" mists of language, Gabriel John Utterson (who is not quite as angelic as his name suggests) tries to reveal or represent the formless unrepresentable; he "utters" "on" Hyde. Utterson wants to reveal, Hyde to conceal. Jekyll is the body, site or "text" where this intrigue takes place.

Another inscribed blurring between Utterson and Hyde is in the lawyer's contemplation of past unsavoury acts (importantly, these are not specified):

And the lawyer set out homeward with a very heavy heart. "Poor Harry Jekyll," he thought, "my mind misgives me he is in deep waters! He was wild when he was young; a long while ago, to be sure; but in the law of God there is no statute of limitations. Ah, it must be that; the ghost of some old sin, the cancer of some concealed disgrace; punishment coming, pede claudio, years after memory has forgotten and self-love condoned the fault. And the lawyer, scared by the thought, brooded awhile on his own past, groping in all the corners of memory, lest by chance some Jack-in-the-Box of an
old iniquity should leap to light there. His past was fairly blameless; few men could read the rolls of their life with less apprehension; yet he was humbled to the dust by the many ill things he had done, and raised up again into a sober and fearful gratitude by the many that he had come so near to doing, yet avoided. (Stevenson 1979, 41-42)

If the apparently virtuous Jekyll could be overwhelmed by immoral and insatiable desires for sensual gratification, then Utterson or anybody else could also. That this perceived failing could become public knowledge perturbs Utterson even more. This realisation typifies the irresolvable play between revealing and concealing symbolised by repression and its inevitable return. Jekyll's problem so vexes Utterson because Victorian morality lauds virtuous public conduct while denying the reality of licentious private activities. Utterson does not question the hypocrisy of this viewpoint, only the unsettling possibility of the private becoming public.

Utterson tries to aid Jekyll (or, less charitably, succumbs to his curiosity). However, when the lawyer, with his knowledge of Hyde, confronts him, Jekyll vehemently insists that "[i]t can make no change. You do not understand my position, I am painfully situated, Utterson; my position is a very strange - a very strange one. It is one of those affairs that cannot be mended by talking" (Stevenson 1979, 44). This merely increases the mysterious homoerotic insinuation rather than demystifying it. Jekyll's evasive silence is crucial to the (non-)representation of the fugitive figure, helping to explain Stevenson's oblique presentation of the "story".

Hyde's embodiment of fugitivity is continually mobilised through deference to his inexpressibility. After a maid has seen him murder respected citizen, Sir Danvers Carew, the voice of the omniscient narrator observes:

Mr Hyde had numbered few familiaris - even the master of the servant-maid had only seen him twice; his family could nowhere be traced; he had never been photographed; and the few who could describe him differed widely, as common observers will. Only
on one point were they agreed; and that was the haunting sense of unexpressed deformity with which the fugitive impressed his beholders. (Stevenson 1979, 50)

Again, Stevenson relies on Hyde's "haunting deformity" to signify him, leaving other potential descriptions "unexpressed". Hyde apparently has no origins. He is recognisable only by his otherness, his alien figural deformity. This absence of origins positions him as an id-figure, a darkly signifying other. He promises to liberate the ego from constraining everyday life, instead imprisoning it in his dark absence. Thus, Hyde acts as a literary precursor of the (absence of a) transcendental signifier. This signifier would be simultaneously part of yet outside signification, providing an origin for the apparently seamless play of polysemic signifiers. Hyde represents this possibility, being part and outside of social interaction, yet he leaves no trace of an origin as suggested above. He reveals the possibility of an origin explaining the conditions of being, yet conceals all traces of this origin. Utterson later locates these traces in Jekyll's scrawled "formula" only to find that the precise transforming agents remain mysterious because of an unknown impurity contaminating the "original" draught.

So far, sublimely unspeakable glimpses of Hyde have been foregrounded. This chapter's title, "Hyde Beh(in)d the Mirror", necessitates considering how Stevenson positions the mirror to reflect/deflect Hyde. As in The Vampire Lestat and Dracula, the mirror is symbolic in the narrative development. As clarified near the novel's end, Jekyll uses a cheval-glass to observe the results of his secret experiments. However Utterson, visiting Jekyll after Carew's murder, with Hyde assumed culpable, describes his room's contents:

At the further end, a flight of stairs mounted to a door covered with red baize; and through this Mr Utterson was at last received into the doctor's cabinet. It was a large room, fitted round with glass presses, furnished, among other things, with a cheval-glass and a business table, and looking out upon the court by three dusty windows barred with
iron. The fire burned in the grate; a lamp was set lighted on the chimney-shelf, for even in the houses the fog began to lie thickly; and there, close up to the warmth, sat Dr Jekyll, looking deadly sick. (Stevenson 1979, 51)

This description indicates that Jekyll is a prisoner of his own making - and in his own mind. It also emphasises reflecting surfaces (just as Jekyll is a "reflecting surface" for Hyde). Utterson (as reader) learns of the mirror's importance only after all the tragic events have unfolded. However, even at this stage, Jekyll's room furnishings provide for the 1990s reader a jarring note recalling Lacan's theory of the beginnings of self and its constitution through differentiation from the other.

By this point, Jekyll's silent, scandalous allegiance to Hyde confounds Utterson. He can neither comprehend his friend's actions nor cease being alarmed by them. A note delivered to him bearing Hyde's name - another written sign of Hyde's presence in absence - is identified by a colleague as a Jekyll forgery and this perturbs him further: "But no sooner was Mr Utterson alone that night than he locked the note into his safe, where it reposed from that time forward. 'What!' he thought. 'Henry Jekyll forge for a murderer!' And his blood ran cold in his veins" (Stevenson 1979, 55).

Utterson's horror evokes Jekyll's duplicity and ongoing hypocrisy. Also, the image of forgery, as in Dracula, subtly and ambiguously inscribes the narrative and textual simultaneity of this duplicity. This moment indicates the blurring of Jekyll/Hyde at both narrative and textual levels. Utterson's statement also foregrounds the fine line (') between Jekyll/murderer, a line Hyde gradually effaces. "Forge" denotes an arduous undertaking (Jekyll's prolonged experimentation) or fraudulently signing something. The word may suggest pejorative connotations of illicit, shady dealings, but has other important designations. For example, it
recalls the image of a "smithy; blacksmith's hearth or fireplace, with bellows; furnace or hearth for melting or refining metal" (Sykes 1987, 385). This designation associates with Jekyll's alchemy in producing the potion eliciting Hyde. The verb form of "forge" not only signifies "fraudulent imitation" but also "shape by heating in fire and hammering (lit. or fig.)" (385). It may also mean "fabricate, invent, (tale, lie)" (385), referring to Jekyll's production of Hyde and his initial attempts to conceal him. (Stevenson's textual fabrication is itself implicated in this signification.) Jekyll's "forging" of Hyde literally makes him live a "lie". However, he is not content living this lie, but feels compelled to "tell" it as well, through the documents Utterson finds after his disappearance.

Yet another sense of "forge" comes into play here. It means "to make one's way, advance, gradually or steadily; (ahead), take lead in race, move forward rapidly" (385). As his "Full Statement of the Case" reveals, Jekyll is intensely ambitious, insatiably acquiring knowledge in his chosen field. He parallels Victor Frankenstein whose hubristic desire leads him to disaster. Hyde's eruption out of Jekyll's sedate body is due to the doctor's severe self-imposed repression to attain prestige in the community. Hyde is an embodied expression of Jekyll's repressed desire. His otherness allows Jekyll to be selfishly oblivious to the rigid demands of his professional and social aims. The doctor's discovery of a means of separating dual identities is a potential means of "forging" even further ahead in his professional life. Yet by this time, the illusion that he is in control of his desires has all but evaporated. Indeed, the only "forging" he will be doing is of the lying, hiding kind, the only "hammering" out of destiny the consequences which follow his sickening killing of the elderly Carew.

Forgery places in question the notion of an origin. Stevenson plays with this idea of origin, describing how, after killing Carew,
[t]ime ran on; thousands of pounds were offered in reward, for the death of Sir Danvers was resented as a public injury; but Mr Hyde had disappeared out of the ken of the police as though he had never existed. Much of his past was unearthed, indeed, and all disreputable: tales came out of the man's cruelty, at once so callous and violent, of his vile life, of his strange associates, of the hatred that seemed to have surrounded his career; but of his present whereabouts, not a whisper. From the time he had left the house in Soho on the morning of the murder, he was simply blotted out... (Stevenson 1979, 56)

"Blotted out" aptly alludes to both narrative and textual fugitive figures. Hyde, in the moment he signifies himself most violently and emphatically as a presence, dies or effaces himself. Like language, he has the power to signify, make present, but only fleetingly. When a word is spoken, its senses disseminate, fleeing from the grasp. The word's presence, even at its most intense, is, like Hyde, evanescent. As his invocation through the potion testifies, he constitutes a fundamental, primal orality. The oral frenzy of his sensory existence is figured (evaded) at textual and narrative levels. His most transgressive acts (trampling the girl, killing Carew) are all "spoken" by somebody else. Hyde speaks forcefully, but through the dissimulating media of other voices/written words. Hyde, the fugitive figure, lives and dies in the all-consuming moment of intense gratification and loss, the orgasm: as soon as he comes (and conquers), he is gone.13

As the novel develops, Hyde supplements this evanescence by becoming increasingly uncontrollable, erupting unexpectedly (and frequently) out of Jekyll. The doctor's dealings with his servant, Poole, make this clear:

Poole felt in his pocket and handed out a crumpled note, which the lawyer, bending nearer to the candle, carefully examined. Its contents ran thus: "Dr Jekyll presents his compliments to Messrs Maw.14 He assures them that their last sample is
impure and quite useless for his present purpose. In the year 18-, Dr J. purchased a somewhat large quantity from Messrs M. He now begs them to search with the most sedulous care, and should any of the same quality be left, to forward it to him at once. Expense is no consideration. The importance of this to Dr J. can hardly be exaggerated." So far the letter had run composedly enough; but here, with a sudden splutter of the pen, the writer's emotion had broken loose. "For God's sake," he had added, "find me some of the old." (Stevenson 1979, 65-66)

Just as Jekyll by this point in the novel cannot prevent himself from turning into Hyde, neither can he prevent the textual fugitive figure from asserting itself. His lapses leak into the supposedly controlled, safer, distant medium of writing. The entire letter is penned by Jekyll; at no stage does Hyde take control. However, Jekyll's normally restrained and polite demeanour as evidenced by the early part of this note, is displaced by an uncharacteristic eruption of angry desperation. The expression of this emotion is an indulgence Jekyll would presumably not have allowed himself "before" Hyde. However, the line between the ideal and the animal is by this stage so "covered" that the physical Jekyll can act like Hyde and vice versa. Once again this indicates that Hyde is a figure of fugitivity as menacing and present in the text as he is in the narrative of Jekyll's world. It also demonstrates that the narrative and textual are inseparable and that the fugitive figure, through its irrupting/erupting ambiguity, is central to this inseparability.

As Hautala observes (1995, 30), Stephen King's The Dark Half (1989) is a fictional text grappling with issues of duality Stevenson generated in his novel more than one hundred years earlier. King's novel presents a contemporary version of Jekyll/Hyde duplicity. This sense of duplicity is heightened by the fact that Thad Beaumont is a writer (allowing textual fugitivity free rein) and that his demonic double George Stark is a pseudonymous fiction who has been symbolically "buried". The richness of these elements is further intensified by the knowledge that King "in real life" has been troubled by his own double, the literary pseudonym Richard Bachman, a fictitious identity who still, for King, casts a "bogeyman's" shadow. One double
leads to another as Strickland (1995, 70) observes in relation to *Jekyll and Hyde*. In Beaumont's life, the evil Stark is associated both with the writing of a portentous phrase "The sparrows are flying again" and the overwhelming presence of these birds. At first, Beaumont can keep Stark at bay, but the writer's restless alter ego starts to assume control of his life in a manner corresponding to Hyde's gradual but eventual overpowering of Jekyll. Like Hyde, Stark is pure id, driven only by selfish and brutal desire. He leaves behind him a trail of grisly and senseless murders and the police become increasingly suspicious of Beaumont. He is forced to confront Stark and unlike the hapless Jekyll, who finds the marauding Hyde too strong, manages to rid himself of his evil counterpart, if at great personal cost.

Just as Beaumont is forced to face the horrors of Stark, so too Utterson feels impelled to confront Hyde. When he meets Jekyll's butler, he finds him greatly agitated. Importantly, this agitation does not prevent the man from adding to the "pool" of images Stevenson immerses Hyde in. As Poole states:

It was this way. I came suddenly into the theatre from the garden. It seems he had slipped out to look for this drug, or whatever it is; for the cabinet door was open, and there he was at the far end of the room digging among the crates. He looked up when I came in, gave a kind of cry, and whirled upstairs into the cabinet. It was but for one minute that I saw him, but the hair stood upon my head like quills.29 Sir, if that was my master, why had he a mask upon his face? If it was my master, why did he cry out like a rat and run from me?... that thing was not my master, and there's the truth. My master" - here he looked round him, and began to whisper - "is a tall fine build of a man, and this was more of a dwarf." Utterson attempted to protest. "O, sir," cried Poole, "do you think I do not know my master after twenty years? do you think I do not know where his head comes to in the cabinet door, where I saw him every morning of my life? No, sir, that thing in the mask was never Dr Jekyll - God knows what it was, but it was never Dr Jekyll; and it is the belief of my heart that there was murder done. (Stevenson 1979, 66-67)

As we have seen, the narrative and textual doubling in Stevenson's novel takes many forms. To add to the images of the mist, the baffled eye and the unnameable villain clothed with detestable
attributes, Stevenson now describes Jekyll/Hyde as a masked figure. "That thing in the mask" is, we infer, Hyde. Of course, he is not really masked; Poole has projected this. He does so because of the hideous (unspeakable) appearance of Hyde. Jekyll's "other" has no official identity and secures his "place" in the world through Jekyll's physical and financial support. His unspeakable facelessness reinforces his dependence on Jekyll. His situation is as unbearable as Jekyll's because his movements are limited to lower-class, unrespectable places. He has no access to the symbolic realm of Jekyll's privileged upper middle-class world without Jekyll himself. Yet he feels restrained by the repressive ego of Jekyll, just as the latter feels afraid of Hyde's wild sensuality.

Poole's reference to a "mask" is another image of revealing/concealing (the mask hides the identity of the person behind it, but can very easily be removed). In other words, anybody could be behind the mask. We assume that it is Jekyll or Hyde but, the important implication is that it could be anyone else. Metaphorically speaking, the apparently innocent and morally upright Utterson (or Poole) could well sport behind such masks as he himself realises in his "Jack-in-the-Box" speech cited earlier.

It needs to be emphasised that in terms of textual fugitivity, the sign is always, to some extent, masked. It expresses its presence but this presence is always qualified by its own absence, symbolised by the mask. The revealed is always at the same time the concealed. The "be-holder" of the fugitive, thinking in that moment of witnessing the fugitive, s/he has captured it, taken possession of it, apprehended it, is self-deluding. The fugitive is made captive in this instance, but it always retains an ineluctable, secretive side.

Ultimately, this captive/secretive fusion, epitomised by the mask, is enacted when Utterson and Poole find the dead body of Hyde and the tale to go with it, but realise that Jekyll
and the "impure" secret of the potion have both disappeared. The tale itself, like the living lie of 
Hyde, is, unavoidably a "tissue" of half-truths. Remove one mask and another lies underneath. 
The insubstantial mists/clothes/masks suggesting a form for the formless underneath, endlessly 
defers their promise to denude. The text is a titillating (fore)play promising a resolutely fulfilling 
climax, but delivering only brief, inherently self-contradictory moments of narrative orgasmic 
bliss. These moments are registered in the fugitive figurations of Jekyll's "full" and final 
statement in which the textual excess of Hyde (his being blissfully "all too much") is silenced. 
However, as we shall see, this physical and textual silencing of the primally oral being (id) is 
illusory. In this, it mirrors Jekyll's doomed quest for "full" unmediated gratification through self-representation.

Importantly, in this part of the narrative, Stevenson, through the character of Poole, 
begin to call the figure locked in Jekyll's cabinet "it":

"So it will walk all day, sir," whispered Poole; "ay, and the better part of the night. 
Only when a new sample comes from the chemist, there's a bit of a break. Ah, it's an ill 
conscience that's such an enemy to rest! Ah, sir, there's blood fouly shed in every step 
of it! But hark again, a little closer - put your heart in your ears Mr Utterson, and tell 
me, is that the doctor's foot?"

The steps fell lightly and oddly, with a certain swing, for all they went so slowly; it was different indeed from the heavy creaking tread of Henry Jekyll. Utterson sighed.
"Is there never anything else?" he asked.

Poole nodded. "Once," he said. "Once I heard it weeping!" (Stevenson 1979, 69)

The "it" we have encountered in Dracula and as King's eponymous spidery shape-changer 
surfaces here as well. This use of "it" indicates not only that Poole does not know exactly what is 
happening to Jekyll but also suggests that the figure in the cabinet is not worthy of being called 
"he": it is too monstrous. It is unknown and unnameable but also animal and monstrous, taboo.

As Wolf (1995, 98) argues, Hyde has been associated with "animal light-footedness" throughout
the narrative. By this stage, he appears to be like a rampaging monkey. The repetition of animal imagery, in particular that of apes, throughout the novel, resonates most suggestively with ideas of social Darwinism and the criminal "type". In *Dracula*, the Count embodies many of the physical characteristics outlined by the phrenologist Lombroso in his classification of this type. Likewise, Stevenson draws on an idea of the devious criminal as being physically as well as morally retrogressive. His use of animal imagery suggests social Darwinism, but given the means of Hyde's "origination", extends beyond this to connote a form of psychic Darwinism. Stevenson's use of animal imagery is important historically or sociologically then, but it is also significant for other (textual) reasons as we shall later see. The occasional use of "it" to describe the villains in these Gothic texts rather than "he" indicates their unnameable monstrosity, their existence before and outside the symbolic "he".

The appearance of this trope is marked by the inability to articulate the sublimity of Hyde and Dracula. This combines with the social and psychic need to repress or conceal the terrifying and h(id)eous. It accounts for the silence surrounding the villains' deeds, elusive fugitive *figures* eluding fugitive figures. Jekyll's attempts at h(id)ing h(id)eous Hyde are futile because Hyde erupts when Jekyll least expects or wants him to. The way in which Hyde escapes Jekyll's control in the text parallels the reader's encounter of the text itself which assumes Hyde's characteristics and remains as frustratingly elusive as Hyde does for Jekyll. This will become more apparent in due course. Stevenson and Stoker empower their villains as frighteningly (and frustratingly) as possible, deliberately using the inexpressible to shroud their mysterious fugitives.

Stevenson, like Stoker, explores the self/other problematic through an aesthetic of the sublime unnameable. They both register the strange other as an inexpressible "it", causing paralysing fear and desire. "It" emerges in the midst of an apparently innocent (bourgeois)
everyday reality. Through its uncanny escape, its ritual of unexplained appearance and disappearance, "it" transforms this reality (into reality), acting as the catalyst for a problematic reading of the characters' "identities" and the text itself. The Gothic figures the strange other as sublime and unnameable. "It" is metaphoric for a widespread textual "fugitivity", the uncanny escape of meaning in polysemic chains of signification. This is where Gothic and postmodern writing may be seen to intersect: the irreconcilable fear of and desire for the unnameable other ("it") characteristic of the sublime.

In relation to Utterson and Poole breaking into Jekyll's cabinet, Wolf makes the following point:

Throughout this fiction, Stevenson has made use of the tension between order and disorder. Utterson is the supremely orderly fellow. Jekyll, the hypocrite, maintains a façade of order. Now here, Utterson (with the help of his accomplice, the equally orderly Poole), has briefly entered the domain of chaos. No wonder they are appalled. (1995, 99)

This illustrates another dimension to Hyde's status as a fugitive figure. Hyde threatens order, promising disorder, dissolution, chaos, indeterminacy. This explains why class issues arise in the novel as well. One reason why Utterson is so appalled by Jekyll's association with Hyde is because the latter is in no way connected with good society: he is one of the abominable masses with a room in Soho and a detestable appearance. This threat to the established order is also evident in Dracula. While the Count is aristocratic and does not evoke the same class threat as Hyde, his obvious racial otherness, his difference and desire to invade England increases his repugnance to the intended reader of the time. For Utterson and Poole, what they find in Jekyll's cabinet is so "appalling" because it is an image of unhingeing too "hideous" to face.
The Captive Fugitive/Fugitive Captive:
Closed Cases/CEaseless Signifying

You've gotta keep 'em separated...
Hey... come out and play!

- "Come Out and Play" (The Offspring)

The "ending" to Jekyll and Hyde is intriguing and disturbing. The blurring that Stevenson has produced between the two achieves its ultimate manifestation in the suicide of Jekyll - and murder of Hyde, to look at it from an(other) perspective:

Right in the midst there lay the body of a man sorely contorted and still twitching. They drew near on tiptoe, turned it on its back, and beheld the face of Edward Hyde. He was dressed in clothes far too large for him, clothes of the doctor's bigness; the cords of his face still moved with a semblance of life, but life was quite gone; and by the crushed phial in the hand and the strong smell of kernels that hung upon the air, Utterson knew that he was looking on the body of a self-destroyer. (Stevenson 1979, 70)

As in Dracula, a considerable degree of ambiguity attends the vanquishing of the "villain". As Myers noted in a letter to Stevenson shortly after the story's publication, the suicide which takes place is "of Jekyll in my view, not of Hyde" (1995, 274). Ultimately of course, the self-destroyer and self-destroyed is inextricably Jekyll/Hyde, a new entity forged by drinking the potion.33 Importantly, Hyde would rather commit suicide than be apprehended and sentenced. He prefers textual to judicial sentencing and the endless hanging of the deferred signified to that of the gallows. The suicide is also Hyde's final triumph in that Jekyll has fallen to instinct. If the suicide is seen as an expression of thanatos, then he has acted in accordance with the desires of the id since it is the role of the (super)ego to regulate, repress or control such desires. Hence the "je-kyll" pun several commentators (for example, Miyoshi 1969) have exploited. It is possible to make a similar sound-pun out of Hyde's name: H(yd)e: "He-id".
Throughout the novel, Jekyll can find no middle ground between the harsh terrains of the superego and the id. He literally aborts his own ego by deciding to have two separate identities. This is what allows the superego's killing of the "je" and the explosive instinctual desire of the id-Hyde without any tempering ego. He sl(id)es between either extreme and can find no coherent self or ego at the centre to prevent this sliding. The superego is as dangerous as the id because of its repressive nature. It is extremely censorious, causing desires to be repressed in the unconscious from which they will inevitably return regardless of its prohibitive power. Suicide is also inevitable because there is no ego with which to respond to everyday life in the moderate manner civilisation requires. Indeed, the intransigence of the superego coll(id)es with the irresistible nature of the id in the doctor's unavo(id)able sl(id)e into suic(id)e. This coinc(id)es with the doctor's inability to control the explosive comings²⁴ (more and more frequent as the number of parentheses above suggests) and goings of Hyde. With the doctor's suicide, the id (Hyde) has won its battle with the (super)ego (Jekyll) although the two remain inseparable: in taking his "own" life, Jekyll has also taken Hyde's.

It might be argued that the ceaseless signifying desired and threatened by Hyde in his murderous excess and in Jekyll's incapacity to contain him is avoided or nullified by Jekyll's radical "solution".²⁵ In other words, it appears that, by poisoning himself, Jekyll pays the necessary price to prevent any further attempt by Hyde to enter into such signification. However, this is a continuation of Jekyll's self-delusion that he created and thus controls Hyde, a delusion which is all too evident in his earlier inability to maintain a life of self-imposed Hyde-less austerity. Jekyll's suicide potion and "full statement of the case" represent last-ditch attempts to assert mastery over Hyde (the id). Yet the "truth" of the matter is that the suicide is Hyde's ultimate triumph, the most "reckless" and "headiest" of all impulses, in response to primal
thanatos. This is emphasised by the fact that the dead body found by Utterson and Poole is Hyde's while Jekyll has disappeared without a trace (Hyde, it seems, has fully and finally swallowed him up).

The text (figured by Hyde) usurps the authority of the author and displays a wilful desire to render ambivalent or ambiguous any ostensible attempt to put forward a singular, indisputable meaning. This is evidenced in Jekyll's demise. When he and Poole burst into the locked room, Utterson notices that "[t]here were several books on a shelf; one lay beside the tea things open, and Utterson was amazed to find it a copy of a pious work for which Jekyll had several times expressed a great esteem, annotated, in his own hand, with startling blasphemies" (Stevenson 1979, 71). Aside from Hyde's "startling" disrespect for any sources of order and authority (thus fulfilling Barthes' injunction quoted earlier in an epigraph), this scene is important in demonstrating the textual fugitivity of Hyde. He not only erupts uncontrollably out of the body of Jekyll once the potion is drunk, or, later on, spontaneously and apparently unhidden. In this instance (as well as in the case of the forged letter which Utterson and Guest read and the increasingly desperate letter to the Maws chemists) Hyde erupts uncontrollably out of the pen of Jekyll. Indeed, Jekyll tries to keep Hyde "penned in" right to the end with his full statement of the case, but the figure of Hyde cannot be contained so easily; he exceeds and flows over the prescriptions (and inscriptions) of Jekyll. The madness that occurs in Jekyll's cabinet is partly because Hyde cannot stand to be penned in, he needs to roam, act, move. Here, the running riot of the id/text in wanton disregard of the desire for order expressed by the (super)ego/author is symbolically and powerfully revealed. The desecration of Jekyll's esteemed book is a definitive and unmistakable rejection of (author)ity.
While Hyde is busy defiling the authority embodied in patriarchal names and figures, Jekyll is lapsing into abject despair:

MY DEAR UTTERTON, - When this shall fall into your hands, I shall have disappeared, under what circumstances I have not the penetration to foresee, but my instinct and all the circumstances of my nameless situation tell me that the end is sure and must be early. Go then, and first read the narrative which Lanyon warned me he was to place in your hands; and if you care to hear more, turn to the confession of

Your unworthy and unhappy friend,
HENRY JEKYLL (72)

Jekyll refers to "my nameless situation". The extent of his surrender to Hyde is evident in this admission that he, like Enfield and Utterson, cannot make verbal sense of his situation.

When he can articulate his position, Jekyll/Stevenson does so through metaphor. The shipwrecked self is a metaphor which is used and repeated in many of the Gothic texts discussed. It will be most obvious in Frankenstein with Walton the stranded mariner, but it has already appeared in the wreck of the Demeter in Dracula. Jekyll himself deploys it self-consciously and dramatically in two notable instances, firstly in the letter to Lanyon anticipating his staged transformation back from Hyde: "Five minutes afterwards, if you insist upon an explanation, you will have understood that these arrangements are of capital importance; and that by the neglect of one of them, fantastic as they must appear, you might have charged your conscience with my death or the shipwreck of my reason" (Stevenson 1979, 75). Here, Jekyll presciently hints at his own fate. His "death" or "shipwreck of reason" are one and the same, precipitated by Hyde's fully realised infiltration of his body. The significance of this image will become clearer when we observe its repeated use in Jekyll's confession.

As suggested earlier, Jekyll, finding that he has no control over Hyde's appropriations of his body, resorts to the pen which conceived his alter-ego in a desperate last attempt to retrieve a
sense of integrity (in both the moral and bodily senses of the term). He does so, as Garrett observes, in a parodically autobiographical format. Indeed, the "act of self-narration is revealed in *Jekyll and Hyde* to be a ritual act of self-estrangement rather than the act of self-discovery that it purports to be in the case of a traditional autobiographical novel such as *Jane Eyre* or *David Copperfield*, for example" (1988, 73). The key term here is "self-estrangement": Jekyll tries to rediscover his lost self through his statement, but ultimately, cannot prevent a radical re-incorporation of the estranging force of Hyde. He traces this irrational otherness to his early manhood:

_and indeed, the worst of my faults was a certain impatient gaiety of disposition, such as has made the happiness of many, but such as I found hard to reconcile with my imperious desire to carry my head high, and wear a more than commonly grave countenance before the public. Hence it came about that I concealed my pleasures; and that when I reached years of reflection, and began to look round me and take stock of my progress and position in the world, I stood already committed to a profound duplicity of life. (Stevenson 1979, 81)_

Hyde can also be seen as an unruly child returning to plague Jekyll who tries to repress "a certain impatient gaiety of disposition" but finds it impossible to do so. Jekyll is so tormented by the fact that he has a kind of dual existence that he attempts to separate these characteristics. He can be seen to long for differentiation. This longing is synonymous with the desire to remain within the symbolic order since the pre-symbolic is characterised by the undifferentiated. Yet paradoxically, he also desires to return to the pre-Oedipal to escape the austere, severe symbolic presided over by his (super)ego. Out of this paradox, emerges Hyde. Significantly, his experiments with the potion occur in front of the mirror, the symbol of the formative stage of differentiation, Lacan's "mirror-stage". These experiments constitute a desperate attempt to complete this return while maintaining the benefits of his place in the symbolic order. However
Jekyll does not want to leave the pre-symbolic behind him and this ambivalence leads to an eventual blurring between the adult ego Jekyll and the child id Hyde.

Meanwhile, Jekyll is enabled to have a truly dual existence, for a little time at least, through drinking his potion. In his "Full Statement of the Case", Jekyll acknowledges that the process he has undertaken is probably infinite, signalling a potential for the self to be not only double, but multiple:

With every day, and from both sides of my intelligence, the moral and the intellectual, I thus drew steadily nearer to that truth by whose partial discovery I have been doomed to such a dreadful shipwreck: that man is not truly one, but truly two. I say two, because the state of my own knowledge does not pass beyond that point. Others will follow, others will outstrip me on the same lines; and I hazard the guess that man will be ultimately known for a mere polity of multifarious, incongruous and independent denizens. (Stevenson 1979, 82)

Thus the image of shipwreck recurs, referring not only to the metaphor of the ship as self on a pre-determined journey in which it is capsized. The use of the ship as an image of wrecked order utilises the traditionally feminine sea as the capricious instigator of chaos - for example, Hamlet's well-known "taking arms against a sea of troubles". The sea suggests chaos because it is subject to the whims of nature of which it is a part, but also through the fluid, protean medium it represents. It is fundamentally treacherous, explaining why Proteus, the "Old Man of the Sea", could never be captured - he is a shape-changer, a metamorphoser, a fugitive figure. Importantly, as Veeder (1988) observes, Jekyll associates becoming Hyde with fluidity, describing changing as "a current of disordered sensual images" (Stevenson 1979, 83). For the repressed doctor, to transform into Hyde is to "spring headlong into the sea of liberty" (86).

This use of a potentially exhausted metaphorical vehicle, the wrecked ship, retains a resonant quality when this fugitive figuration is accounted for. In Stevenson's writing, shipwreck
is a prominent and important image, as demonstrated by his disturbing short story "The Merry Men". In this tale, the father of the narrator's girlfriend is shown to gradually lose his sanity on an isolated Orkney island. He becomes so obsessed by the possibility of a shipwreck that he stays out in a violent storm to witness one happening. He salvages the pieces as hideous souvenirs the next morning. This is a powerful metaphorical use of the image of shipwreck once again, as well as the chaos the sea represents and inflicts on the island (of the self). The madness of the father is underscored by the singing of the "merry men" as the ship is wrecked. The "merry men" are the roaring breakers formed by the turbulence of conflicting currents off the coast of the island. As Stevenson's narrator states, "[w]hether they got the name from their movements, which are swift and antic, or from the shouting they make about the turn of the tide, so that all Aros shakes with it, is more than I can tell" (1995, 198).

As well as the image of shipwreck, Jekyll refers to "a mere polity of multifarious, incongruous and independent denizens." This multiplicity and the fragmentation of the ego anticipate high modernism. In literary history, this sense of fragmentation is inscribed in modernist novels, where traditional ideas of sense and structure are dislocated and the notion of "self" profoundly interrogated. The "ego" of the modernist novel is multiplied and complicated indefinitely. This is apparent in such renowned texts as Joyce's *Ulysses* and Beckett's *The Unnamable*.

While *Jekyll and Hyde* is not a high modernist novel, it was published in 1886 and does problematise the notion of the determinate self in its content and means of narration (if not through the radically distorted forms employed by writers like Joyce and Beckett). In particular, like Stoker's *Dracula*, it evokes a sense of the threat of the self proliferating into monstrous, meaningless multiplicity. The vehicle through which this threat announces itself (or becomes
organised) is, of course, the mouth. With its associations of dependence on others and the teeth of a voracious and deadly appetite, the mouth aptly symbolises the insatiable oral consumption of this multiplicity. Therefore it can be said that these ideas in Dracula and Jekyll and Hyde prefigure important aspects of modernism. Certainly, the idea of there being a proliferation of Hydes and countless Draculas is an evocative foreshadowing of the textual multiplicity of twentieth century writing and mass media. This imagined proliferation is possible through the image of insatiable oral consumption, which recalls - especially in the evoked imagery of vampirism - Gelder's discussion of "productive consumption" referred to in the previous chapter. Not only does Jekyll through Hyde threaten to embody innumerable incarnations of otherness, but the text of Jekyll/Hyde or Jekyll and Hyde promises similar proliferation. The implication of this unending proliferation is a brutal assault on the symbolic imperative to make sense. This is mirrored in Stevenson's text by Hyde's destructive influence on two pillars of patriarchal society, Carew and Lanyon. His "brutal assaults" on them - physical and psychic respectively - mesh with the impossibility of unity at the textual level.

In "The Law of Genre" (1981), Derrida discusses Blanchot's La Folie du Jour (The Madness of the Day) as a novel which plays with the process (folly) of trying to make sense of writing. As Derrida states, necessarily elucidating the illusion that the critic can bring the text "to the light of day" (it, like the fugitive vampire figure, remains underground, under cover of darkness):

One could fashion a non-finite number of readings from La Folie du jour. I have attempted a few myself, and shall do so again elsewhere, from another point of view. The topos of view, sight, blindness, point of view is, moreover, inscribed, and traversed in La Folie du jour according to a sort of permanent revolution that engenders and virtually brings to the light of day points of view, twists, versions, and reversions of
which the sum remains necessarily uncountable and the account, impossible. (1981, 62, emphases in original)

For Jekyll, the loss of the identity he tried to preserve through an artificial duality, is imaged in this expressed fear of multiplicity. His realisation that the patriarchal ideals of rational, singular coherence are forever denied him is evoked in the image of shipwreck already referred to. The "sea of liberty" Hyde falsely promises has been transformed into a terrifying, engulfing fluidity. While Jekyll tantalises the reader with metaphors of shipwreck and multiplicity, the metaphoric meanings of the images of mist and clothing climax in his realisation that

I began to perceive more deeply than it has ever yet been stated, the trembling immateriality, the mist-like transience, of this seemingly so solid body in which we walk attired. Certain agents I found to have the power to shake and to pluck back that fleshly vestment, even as a wind might toss the curtains of a pavilion. (Stevenson 1979, 82)

This statement functions not only as a realisation of the fugitivity of being, but works again as a metaphor for form. Stevenson, in the guise of Jekyll here, intimates that our attire suggests a "solidity" that conceals a fundamental "transience" or "immateriality". Likewise, our ways of perceiving and acting in the world are "cloaked" by language: textuality itself conceals the insubstantial through signification at the same time that it "reveals" it.

Shortly after this passage, Jekyll's descriptions of his transformation into Hyde become a crucial part of the narrative and evoke powerful imagery:

The most racking pangs succeeded: a grinding in the bones, deadly nausea, and a horror of the spirit that cannot be exceeded at the hour of birth or death. Then these agonies began swiftly to subside, and I came to myself as if out of a great sickness. 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, a current of disordered sensual images running like a mill race in my fancy, a solution of the bonds of obligation, an unknown but not an innocent freedom of the soul. (Stevenson 1979, 83)
Once again, Jekyll insubstantially "describes" the process of changing into Hyde as "something strange in my sensations, something indescribably new". Here, he is meeting the inexpressible, so fittingly, he uses terms like "cannot be exceeded", "indescribably" and "incredibly". The force of this experience is so monstrous it rivals birth and death, binary opposites in close quarters again. The fantastic uncannily invades Jekyll's familiar surroundings - "something strange in my sensations" (the outside coming in, other invading self, although it was always already there). In a sense, this passage is like those by Shelley describing the awakening of Frankenstein's creature. Jekyll's description of the self (or the other within the self) as out of control, prefigures the modernist novel's intense self-problematisation. Hyde is a prototype of the modernist assertion that the literary text itself might be out of control. He/it is a monstrous product of the unknowable unconscious, and "defamiliarises" Jekyll from everyday life and reason, foregrounding duality, ambiguity, multiplicity, impossibility, fugitivity.

The image of a body racked with pain barely containing something struggling to break out of it is also a metaphor for the creative process, particularly one which involves the "return of the repressed". Hogle (1988, 177) discusses the description's evocation of birth and death, particularly as they relate to the abject and desire for and fear of re-absorption into the mother's womb. The eruption of Hyde can be seen as the "figure" of such a process. He is the author's expression of a desire to incarnate otherness not only in narrative bodies but in bodies of textuality. This otherness resonates in the ambiguity of numerous images in the text. For instance, not long after Jekyll has produced Hyde:

I crossed the yard, wherein the constellations looked down upon me, I could have thought, with wonder, the first creature of that sort that their unsleeping vigilance had yet disclosed to them; I stole through the corridors, a stranger in my own house; and
coming to my room, I saw for the first time the appearance of Edward Hyde. (Stevenson 1979, 84)

This passage inscribes many tantalising semantic ambiguities. Jekyll claims that, as Hyde, "I stole through the corridors, a stranger in my own house" (84). The use of the word "own", with its connotations of property and familiarity indicate the extent to which Hyde is an uncanny ("unhomely") figure. The use of the word "stole" evokes a criminal sense of elusive stealth and suggests different aspects of narrative fugitivity. It is also mirrored in French by "voleur" meaning to steal or to take flight as we shall see in the analysis of Poe's "The Purloined Letter" concluding this thesis.

As the title of the novel makes immediately apparent, Jekyll and Hyde grapples with dualism. The two are ultimately irreconcilable. Hyde is the secret of the isolated Jekyll until escaping his control entirely. He has emerged from within Jekyll's (metaphorical) mirror. Even though society decrees that such wildly sensuous and unruly desires be kept "behind closed doors", Hyde's power over Jekyll overr(id)es such a decree. The site/sight of the eye is important in Jekyll and Hyde because the eye symbolises reason, rationality and Enlightenment progress, qualities which the eager-to-please Jekyll craves and is desperate to maintain. Hyde threatens the rational eye by "coming to light", by being something dark, irrational and unwholesome threatening to overwhelm the reasoning (and repressed) self. Hyde is the h(id)den force threatening to puncture the ego "I"/eye, to disempower Jekyll and make permanent his unruly descent into mindless urge gratification. Hence, given that he imperils Jekyll's prestigious place in the symbolic order, Hyde is a figure who threatens castration.

Although Jekyll conjures up Hyde, his apparent control over the latter is quickly eroded. As already noted, Hyde reappears as frequently and unexpectedly as he desires. He does so
without Jekyll drinking the potion and sometimes without his conscious awareness (as, for instance, when the doctor is asleep and changes into Hyde). Hyde keeps Jekyll in a state of constant fear and isolation and masters his "master":

in one of my more wakeful moments, my eye fell upon my hand. Now, the hand of Henry Jekyll (as you have often remarked) was professional in shape and size; it was large, firm, white and comely. But the hand which I now saw, clearly enough in the yellow light of a mid-London morning, lying half shut on the bed-clothes, was lean, corded, knuckly, of a dusky pallor, and thickly shaded with a swart growth of hair. It was the hand of Edward Hyde.

I must have stared upon it for near half a minute, sunk as I was in the mere stupidity of wonder, before terror woke up in my breast as sudden and startling as the crash of cymbals; and bounding from my bed, I rushed to the mirror. At the sight that met my eyes, my blood was changed into something exquisitely thin and icy. Yes, I had gone to bed Henry Jekyll, I had awakened Edward Hyde. How was this to be explained? (Stevenson 1979, 87-88)

By this stage, Jekyll begins to panic and decides to be rid of Hyde "for good". Of course, this is another example of expert self-delusion. Importantly, he deploys an image of narrative fugitivity to evoke Hyde in this instance. Even when he is not "describing" his wild alter ego in the nebulous terminology of awe, he reverts from textual figuration to narrative figuration, thus not escaping the inescapable elusiveness of Hyde and his representation. This use of narrative figuration is in the image of Hyde as a bandit concealing himself from pursuit. Here the metaphor of the fugitive figure is returned to its most literal roots:

Between these two I now felt I had to choose. My two natures had memory in common, but all other faculties were most unequally shared between them. Jekyll (who was a composite) now with the most sensitive apprehensions, now with a greedy gusto, projected and shared in the pleasures and adventures of Hyde; but Hyde was indifferent to Jekyll, or but remembered him as the mountain bandit remembers the cavern in which he conceals himself from pursuit. Jekyll had more than a father's interest; Hyde had more than a son's indifference. (Stevenson 1979, 89)
Particularly relevant in this passage are the comments pertaining to a father/son relationship between Jekyll and Hyde. These comments figure a kind of Oedipal struggle between the two, especially as Stevenson deploys the imagery of crime and pursuit. This imagery foreshadows the emphasis Freud would later place on the guilt and shame of the son and his envy of the father (one wonders about the haven of the cavern in this context). The juxtaposition of images of the bandit, cavern, pursuit, father/son suggest - at least to the post-Freud reader - an Oedipal situation. As a "bandit", Hyde threatens the castration of the empowered father represented by Jekyll. A bandit is an "outlaw", signifying the rebellious selfishness of Hyde. To extend the Oedipal reading, this means that he exists outside the symbolic order. Jekyll meanwhile is firmly entrenched in this order and wishes to bring Hyde into it so they can enjoy the "best of both worlds". Jekyll's patronage of his "outlaw" son (and the use of "interest" in the above quote is nicely ambiguous because of its financial and hence symbolic connotations) is doomed because of Hyde's "indifference". This term once again suggests that Hyde is outside the symbolic order of demarcation and division - difference is everything. While Jekyll wants to drag Hyde into the symbolic, Hyde desires Jekyll's castration: he tries to do no less than sever the Phallus. Ultimately, the only possible result is the destruction of their warring body because the symbolic order associated with Jekyll and the infantile pre-symbolic of Hyde are not so easily distinguished. Jekyll's desire to separate his "good" and "bad" elements is an oversimplification of the psychically fragmented, potentially multiple self.

This fragmented self is ravaged by the irreconcilable forces of fear and desire. Later in Jekyll's statement, there are instances of the simultaneous experience of these sublime, conflicting emotions. One notable example is after Hyde/Jekyll has been seen killing Carew and is "wanted" for this crime:
A mist dispersed; I saw my life to be forfeit; and fled from the scene of these excesses, at once glorying and trembling, my lust of evil gratified and stimulated, my love of life screwed to the topmost peg. I ran to the house in Soho, and (to make assurance doubly sure) destroyed my papers; thence I set out through the lamplit streets, in the same divided ecstasy of mind, gloating on my crime, light-headedly devising others in the future, and yet still hastening and still harkening in my wake for the steps of the avenger. (Stevenson 1979, 91)

Here, Hyde has become a fugitive figure in the popular sense of the term. He fears the pursuit of avengers, yet still triumphs in his crimes and desires to perpetrate more in the near future. His mind is overwhelmed by both fear and desire, manifestations of the conflicting Freudian dualities of the reality and pleasure principles.

Paradoxically, even as he is the child, Hyde is the "dreaded father" threatening castration through his capacity to endanger Jekyll's privileged place in the patriarchal social order. The confusion between father and child is evident as Jekyll's illusory control is being irreparably damaged:

The veil of self-indulgence was rent from head to foot, I saw my life as a whole: I followed it up from the days of childhood, when I had walked with my father's hand, and through the self-denying toils of my professional life, to arrive again and again, with the same sense of unreality, at the damned horrors of the evening. (Stevenson 1979, 91)

Here, the figures of the child and the father intertwine as do their hands in Jekyll's memory. The line "when I had walked with my father's hand" is ambiguous since it could either mean that a young Jekyll is literally holding his father's hand or that Jekyll has internalised his father's characteristics and the latter's hand is metaphorical. In this case, the father's association with Jekyll's body/memory would be as a kind of conscience or superego.

My main point in this reference to the threat of castration as it is embodied in the figure of Hyde is to once again highlight the profound ambivalences of the text. This signifies a kind of
blurring between adult/child and self/other as already discussed. It also serves to situate the text at the threshold of the transition from the infantile pre-symbolic - precisely when the unconscious is formed - to the differentiation of the symbolic order. Because the narrative of the text is situated at this threshold, there is a generation of ambivalence and multiplicity which characterises a permeating fugitivity. As Jackson argues of fantastic narratives,

Movement and stillness, life and death, subject and object, mind and matter, become as one. The impossibilities upon which fantastic narratives are structured (they have been defined as antinomical, oxymoronic in structure) can be related to this drive towards a realization of contradictory elements merging together in the desire for undifferentiation. (1981, 80)

Stevenson's text exceeds his intentions, being, as Frankenstein was for Shelley, a "monstrous progeny" not entirely his own. This is evident in the following passage:

The powers of Hyde seemed to have grown with the sickness of Jekyll. And certainly the hate that now divided them was equal on each side. With Jekyll, it was a thing of vital instinct. He had now seen the full deformity of that creature that shared with him some of the phenomena of consciousness, and was co-heir with him to death: and beyond these links of community, which in themselves made the most poignant part of his distress, he thought of Hyde, for all his energy of life, as of something not only hellish but inorganic. This was the shocking thing; that the slime of the pit seemed to utter cries and voices; that the amorphous dust gesticulated and sinned; that what was dead, and had no shape, should usurp the offices of life. And this again, that that insurgent horror was knit to him closer than a wife, closer than an eye; lay caged in his flesh, where he heard it mutter and felt it struggle to be born; and at every hour of weakness, and in the confidences of slumber, prevailed against him, and deposed him out of life. (Stevenson 1979, 95-96)

Once again, there are the recurring images of the eye, imprisonment ("caged") and clothing ("knit"). When Jekyll discusses Hyde's emergence, his description of the process of Hyde's coming mirrors birth itself ("caged in his flesh"). Yet the birthing image is always complicated by a juxtaposed antithetical image of death. Jekyll, order, the (super)ego, reason, dissipate with
the coming of Hyde. The importance of the blurring of life and death in passages like these is that it is figured through a monstrosity which signals a transgression of traditionally inviolable opposites. Derrida plays with this transgression in his article "Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences". This paper interrogates the structuralism of Lévi-Strauss and asserts the value of deconstructive criticism and the free play of indeterminate meanings. In showing structures collapsing in on themselves and the ongoing creation of an irresolvable indeterminacy to signification, Derrida employs the figure of the transgressive monster. Indeed, the monstrosity at the narrative level alluded to above corresponds to the "monstrosity" of language at the textual level. It is the hideous creature evoked by Derrida in his critique of Lévi-Strauss which responds to nothing but the desire for transgression, a desire which accords it narrative and textual fugitivity:

Here there is a kind of question, let us still call it historical, whose conception, formation, gestation, and labor we are only catching a glimpse of today. I employ these words, I admit, with a glance toward the operations of childbearing - but also with a glance toward those who, in a society from which I do not exclude myself, turn their eyes away when faced by the as yet unnamable which is proclaiming itself and which can do so, as is necessary whenever a birth is in the offing, only under the species of the nonspecies, in the formless, mute, infant, and terrifying form of monstrosity. (1988, 122, emphases in original)

The ineffable Hyde is monstrous, transgressive, a baffling incarnate impossibility. His formless non-specific belonging to the "species of the nonspecies" is attested to by Jekyll's reference to the vocal, crying inorganic "slime of the pit". His "terrifying" proclamation of himself is conducted at two levels, both perversely metaphorical Oedipal rages at the patriarchal symbolic order itself. The first is through a bloody physical, narrative trampling and caning of feared and desired bodies (the child and Carew). The second is through the textual disfiguring of
authority. Thus he destroys the portrait of Jekyll's father, rebelling against another authority figure, indeed figuratively destroying the castrating father:

The hatred of Hyde for Jekyll was of a different order. His terror of the gallows drove him continually to commit temporary suicide, and return to his subordinate station of a part instead of a person; but he loathed the necessity, he loathed the despondency into which Jekyll was now fallen, and he resented the dislike with which he was himself regarded. Hence the ape-like tricks that he would play me, scrawling in my own hand blasphemies on the pages of my books, burning the letters and destroying the portrait of my father; and indeed, had it not been for his fear of death, he would long ago have ruined himself in order to involve me in the ruin. (Stevenson 1979, 96)

Throughout *Jekyll and Hyde*, as Wolf observes, Stevenson deploys metaphors of animals to describe Hyde. One is the above image of Hyde's "apishness" repeated on page 97 (Hyde's "ape-like spite"). Yet this has both a narrative and textual significance. Its narrative importance is relatively obvious and straightforward. It denotes Hyde's stunted growth, great strength, hirsute body and sub-human intellect as well as a kind of fundamental regression (recalling the earlier discussion of social and psychic Darwinism). In textual terms, this reference to Hyde as being apish is important because it implicitly refers to what Utterson calls Henry Jekyll's forging "for a murderer". Hyde's writing style is a crude, infantile mirror image of Jekyll's and he realises that it is not enough to act in the world to have sufficient symbolic status; you need to write, encode, inscribe yourself in(to) it.

Hyde, as an aberrant signifying force, tries to efface Jekyll from his life (hence the will) but it is impossible for either Jekyll or Hyde to erase the other without themselves perishing. This is testified to by the ending to "The Last Night" chapter, with Utterson and Poole finding the narrative body of Hyde and the textual body of Jekyll's confession. Jekyll strives in vain for a transcendent purity of signification through artificial separation of antithetical elements. Yet these elements became *re-incorporated* into a signifying body warring with itself in a more
profound manner. At the narrative level, Utterson and Poole/the reader are left to "account for" the dead body of Hyde and the missing body of Jekyll. At the textual level, the death of Hyde is overridden by his continuation in Jekyll's account. In either case, the signifying "body" (or "text") still remains mysterious, elusive, fissured. If the reader is to identify with the ostensible figure of sense(-making), Utterson, then it is only to realise that the signifying body being addressed is, through Jekyll and Hyde's full and final narrative and textual intersection, ultimately senseless. The only end to the attempt to control the text through the logical processes of sense-making is encountering Derrida's abyss or what Barthes referred to as "degree zero". Therefore, the sense of apishness being a weak copy, simulacrum, forgery, especially given its literary or textual connotations, is very much foregrounded here.

By positing Hyde as insatiable, fundamentally irrational and driven by his aberrant and socially abhorrent desires, *Jekyll and Hyde* asserts a profound unease with the notion of ceaseless signifying. There is an epistemological fear of insatiable textuality: the apparently endless and ultimately senseless sprawl of signifiers in rampant polysemy. The potential threat of ceaseless signifying is paradoxically juxtaposed with Hyde's capacity for exhilaration (what Jekyll experiences in his initial transition into Hyde as "something strange in my sensations, something indescribably new and, from its very novelty, incredibly sweet" [Stevenson 1979, 83]). This combination of possible threat and exhilaration is characteristic of the desire which motivates and mediates insatiable textuality.

As textuality is insatiably displaced in chains of ceaseless signifying one could, in other words, say that it denies closure into coherent, knowable, nameable things. Much contemporary writing, both fictional and critical is, if not entirely comfortable, then at least deeply aware of the impossibility of closure of the literary text into a complete, final, sealed artefact. It is interesting
to consider then how Stevenson, who wrote in an age when closure was desired and imagined as natural and necessary, attempted to close a text which had, at least partially and to some extent unconsciously, explored what twentieth century philosophers, linguists and literary practitioners, would regard as unresolved signification. Significantly, Stevenson burned the "original" story following his wife's criticisms.  

The "true" goings-on of Jekyll and all the details of the mystery of his "relationship" with Hyde are kept obscure until the very end of the book, with little clues accumulating along the way. Information is provided to the reader through the eyes of other characters like Utterson and Lanyon. Significantly, Hyde is always spoken for and about, asserting himself instead through the brutal means outlined above. A written record of the monster accumulates that the reader beholds only after Hyde's death/Jekyll's disappearance. The record on Hyde is appropriately collated by "Utters-on".

It is important that the story is told as it is, through the accumulation of clues and the retrospective assemblage of all the crucial information on the "case" in the different narratives. The telling of the story through these narratives serves to distance the reader from the "truth" of the matter. This also reinforces the idea that the narrative is as concerned about the nature of textuality as the particulars of Jekyll's demise. When we read these accounts, we find that the monster is not dead at all, but has in fact been let loose by Stevenson into textuality. As already discussed, Jekyll refuses to acknowledge that Hyde has control over him and for a time succeeds in keeping his creature at bay. Yet this eventually (inevitably) fails and Jekyll's final manoeuvre as he is "sinking" is to provide a "full statement of the case". This does not capture nor contain the fugitive Hyde either. Rather, it unleashes him into another body so that he can "carry on" after the doctor's suicide, the ultimate act of symbolic self-castration. Jekyll's suicide is a fatal
expression of *thanatos* and the desire to escape the severe injunctions and repressions of the symbolic order (indeed by this stage, it is very much a case of Mister Hyde and *doctored* Je-kyll). Hyde is transferred from Jekyll's body to the body of textuality and all Jekyll has achieved is his own sacrifice before Hyde (if the two can any longer be regarded as distinguishable) could complete the job. Both creator and creature die/disappear. In this sense, Stevenson's novel again mirrors Shelley's *Frankenstein*.

As already mentioned, the only dead body found by Utterson and Poole is Hyde's. We infer from this that Jekyll too is dead. However, there is no physical evidence of this, only the textual "evidence" of Jekyll self-consciously "laying" down his pen (Stevenson 1979, 97). Even if we accept that both creator and created (categories which have by this time become so blurred as to be virtually indistinct) are dead, their legacy continues in the written records of what has taken place. The dynamic of concealment/revelation evident in Jekyll's repression and then unloosing of his insatiable creature of the id is transferred from the realm of the narrative to the textual. Therefore, if there is any "closure" to *Jekyll and Hyde* at all, it is an uncomfortable one in which a sense of continuation may be implied, if not a deeper, more threatening sense of ceaseless signifying. This "ceaseless signifying" refers to the way in which Hyde and the text itself resist definitive apprehension/comprehension. Their polysemic fugitivity is registered by the wide range of critical and analytical "rewritings" (to be) conducted. This "ceaseless signifying" is further evidenced by the continued intermittent production of new versions of the text within popular culture.

While a kind of narrative death is enacted by the suicide, the blurring between Jekyll and Hyde is passed into the textual realm of the assembled "account" of their dissolution. This "account" of the fragmented and indeterminate nature of identity, symbolised by the paradoxical
symbiosis of Jekyll and Hyde, points not towards a definitive closure of a strange case, but to an indefinite and possibly infinite play of the "figures" of Jekyll and Hyde as they signify in multiple and at times, contradictory ways. Certainly, the novel's ending is characterised by ambivalence on the part of Stevenson. By finishing with "Henry Jekyll's Full Statement of the Case", it is significant that he is allowing Jekyll a final word and also the words with which the narrative is to be "closed". This could be construed as an attempt to restore Jekyll as a coherent, unified self, a narratorial ego intact and free from the devastating ruptures of the polysemic id.

The way in which Stevenson sets out the narrative as a "case" adds to the impression: the novel is titled *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* and this is the last word with regard to it, "Henry Jekyll's Full Statement of The Case", its "fullness" apparently a guarantee of Jekyll's own wholeness perhaps.

The couching of these elements in a kind of scientific, legal or medical terminology serves to bring an uncanny series of episodes within social discourse. As Todorov (1975) notes in his structural analysis of the fantastic, the uncanny belongs to the pole of the fantastic which can be rationally explained even if these rational explanations are not immediately apparent. Indeed, his emphasis on rational explanation is problematic in terms of a discussion on fugitivity because it overlooks the way in which the "truth" behind/underlying the uncanny is made inaccessible through the overdetermination and ultimate indeterminacy of figuration. Indeed, the search for an "underlying" causal mechanism and the belief in the recuperative possibility of a "rational explanation" for this mechanism marks the structuralist trajectory Todorov follows. This trajectory however seeks to preserve binary oppositions which the narrative and textual fugitive figure thoroughly dissolve. Stevenson's use of rational terminology then, whether un-self-conscious or ironic, means that the self-deluding Jekyll will attempt to suppress the force
of dissolution the (textual) body of Hyde represents. Ultimately however, there is no "truth" behind or underlying Hyde's uncanny incarnations, only a perpetual irresolvable dissimulation and dissemination not arrested by the bodily demise/disappearance of Jekyll/Hyde, but guaranteed fluid and subversive continuation in the playful, erotic body of the text.

Stevenson proceeds according to a model where more information is accumulated in the Jekyll/Hyde mystery. It is not insignificant that Utterson is a lawyer, not only a person bound by the obligation of protecting the doctrines of the social order, but also someone who believes in a rational solution to mysteries, however "strange" or obscure, through logic and investigation. "Henry Jekyll's Full Statement of The Case" is the ultimate link in this logical chain. In fact, the presentation of the statement anticipates the reader accepting the case as being closed. Yet it might also be that Jekyll's statement is "full" - in the colloquial sense of being "drunk" and thus still intoxicated, made "heady", by Hyde - in that it falsely leads us to such a conclusion.

Throughout the novel, evidence has emerged of Jekyll not being able to control his unconscious urges. This leads the reader to question his supposed control of this "Statement" (the definite sound and significance of this word are all too little, all too late). By this stage, Jekyll apparently longs to repress Hyde forever. However, he is too much under Hyde's influence (in bondage to him). This is revealed by his unwitting (or unconscious) reanimation of the unconscionable creature by writing him into the fugitive body of textuality. Just as Hyde was never apprehended by the forces of law and order while he was in the narrative body of Jekyll, so too does his inscription into a body of texts guarantee his ultimate freedom. This inscription is the simultaneous signification of presence and absence and only that which is always present, that which yields itself up in a "full statement" of itself, is apprehensible or expressible. As Derrida argues in "Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences" (1988),
presence is always undermined in the text by play. The figure of Hyde, especially in his child-like desire to senselessly gratify all urges, embodies this playfulness. Jekyll unwittingly constructs a dualism between his patriarchal power and the selfish pleasure promised by Hyde. These "poles" are characterised by "presence" and "absence" and are made interchangeable by the transforming potion. However, as Derrida asserts, this dualism is rendered completely unstable by the dissolving fugitive agency of play:

Besides the tension between play and history, there is also the tension between play and presence. Play is the disruption of presence. The presence of an element is always a signifying and substitutive reference inscribed in a system of differences and the movement of a chain. Play is always play of absence and presence, but if it is to be thought radically, play must be conceived of before the alternative of presence and absence. Being must be conceived as presence or absence on the basis of the possibility of play and not the other way around. (Derrida 1988, 121)

Of course, as Derrida realises, nothing is ever fully present in this sense; there is no transcendental union between signifier and signified, only the continually negotiable interchange of sliding, colliding, playing signifiers. This is why the narrative bodies of Jekyll and Hyde can never appear together - they are blurred but not united - and ultimately, Utterson and Poole find the shrivelled Hyde in Jekyll's clothes. Jekyll/Hyde is overdetermined; there is no return to a final signified. The enmeshing of signifiers in textuality is mirrored here by the blurred signification of Hyde in Jekyll's clothes. This then is the ambivalence of Stevenson's "closure" - his attempt to allow Jekyll to repress Hyde once and for all and the unconscious unleashing of Hyde (or "Je-kyll"-as-Hyde) once again. Thus it could be said that what contemporary literary criticism allows us to see is that in a text such as this, before the famous term was ever coined by Barthes, "the death of the author" is suggested by the disappearance of the doctor, where the
author/Dr Jekyll is usurped from the position of (textual) authority by the text/Hyde. Jekyll's writing and his life are coterminous. The "death of the author" is literal here. Importantly, while Hyde takes over Jekyll's life and, ultimately, makes living impossible, he does not destroy (or "de-story") the story. People die, but the "story" is always passed on (evoking both Dracula and Frankenstein).

Stevenson's self-consciousness about his manner and means of representing the unrepresentable Hyde is emphasised by the images of "shifting, insubstantial mists", the "baffled" eye and his choice of the word "clothed". These are images repeated throughout the story. The mists are significant beyond their function of concealing Hyde and making of him a mystery. Stevenson's text is also implicitly self-referential, what poststructuralists might describe as the "shifting, insubstantial" nature of signification(s), and the way in which the text endlessly defers meaning through a play of presence and absence.

This dissolution has further implications because it is symptomatic of a widespread blurring of the figures of self and other in which it is impossible to extricate a coherent unified identity. This denial of unified identity at the narrative level corresponds to the impossibility of resolving the multiplicities and ambiguities of textual signification into a definitive singularity. Because Hyde cannot be made intelligible in the direct medium of speech, he has to be witnessed from the relatively safer distance of writing. As his lengthy and painful confession at the end of the novel suggests, Jekyll finds it easier to write than to talk about his alter-ego. This is presumably because of the authority and objectivity writing apparently entails/"entails" (although his writing is marked by important evasions, elisions and occlusions). This parallels Jonathan Harker's discussion of the Count in his journal. Writing is a last desperate attempt at self-control (and assertion). Just as Jekyll finds it impossible to confide in others about his
"strange" experiences, so too does Jonathan. (Indeed, when the latter returns to England, a form of trauma-induced amnesia has taken hold.) Textuality apparently distances the sublime experience. However, as Derrida notes, while criticizing Saussure in Of Grammatology, the relationship between the inside and the outside of the text is one in which one realizes that what was chased off limits, the wandering outcast of linguistics, has indeed never ceased to haunt language as its most primary and intimate possibility. Then something which was never spoken and which is nothing other than writing itself as the origin of language writes itself within Saussure's discourse. (1976, 44)

This breaking out describes Hyde's emergence: he, like Frankenstein's monster is, to use Moretti's term, "a metaphor [that] gets up and walks" (1983, 106).

Ultimately, neither Stevenson nor his protagonists are able to capture Hyde through their writings. Instead, the sublimity of his narrative appearances which prompt such an awestruck silence, becomes textual in the assembled "account" of the "strange case". This inscription of the sublime unspeakable has already been seen in The Vampire Chronicles and Dracula and will also be evidenced in Frankenstein. Writing, apparently more distant, seems a safe haven from the uncanny evasion of the fugitive figure. However this figure becomes more than narrative when it is inscribed. Lurking in the abyss of deferred signification is the textual fugitive figure. It not only threatens violence to the sensual process of witnessing the sublimity it embodies, but also to the textual process of making sense of this sublimity.

In Jekyll and Hyde, Stevenson seems to succumb to what claims the unfortunate Jekyll - the desire to distance himself from socially unacceptable desires, to "close" them out. Yet even the most elaborate attempts to re-assert the mastery of the ego, to provide a sense of closure or
cessation are undermined by the intriguing id which will not be h(id)den behind the mirror, but
insists on being in it, as "the other side" of the "self".
UNNAMEABLE MONSTERS:
FRANKENSTEIN'S FUGITIVE OTHER(NESS)

This thesis has looked at texts mainly from the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In order to "complete" the textual analysis however, it is necessary to return to the beginning of the nineteenth century. Specifically, Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* marks a significant moment in which the "Gothic" fugitive figure becomes distinguishable - if not entirely distinct - from the Romantic. Shelley wrote *Frankenstein* in 1816-17. At the narrative level, the novel presents the young scientist Victor Frankenstein's transgressive creation of a being from parts of corpses. The creature looks hideous and is rejected by his creator despite eloquently mastering the English language. Ultimately, the rage the creature feels at being abandoned leads him to murder Frankenstein's closest family members. Victor vindictively pursues his creature until both submit to the urge to die themselves. There are two important editions of the text, the "original" 1818 version and the standard 1831 edition referred to in this chapter. This edition incorporates some important changes noted wherever relevant.

Ever since its publication, *Frankenstein* has insinuated itself into the psyches/pens of Gothic horror writers. Its powerful mythic images have been reinscribed so numerous and "multifariously" that its connotative force is swirling and unattainable, "always already there" but tantalisingly beyond apprehension. Two texts exemplifying this process are Petrus Borel's "Andreas Vesalius The Anatomist" (1833) and Stephen King's *The Shining* (1977). The different historical and cultural conditions in which these texts were written indicate the pervasiveness and endurance of Shelley's mythic inscriptions. Indeed, one collection of critical essays on Shelley's text to which this chapter will refer is accordingly titled *The Endurance of Frankenstein* (Levine and Knoepflmacher 1974).
Frankenstein is positioned in this thesis as a powerful seminal "originary" text as it provides a mythic archetype out of which other myths are produced. However, the text denying the possibility of any transcendent (or numinous) revelation through its (dis)seminal power. It generates powerful mythic images of its own, but is, like the creature, constructed out of a mish-mash (or myth-mash) of even older myths. As Louis discovers in Interview with the Vampire, however powerful any mythic figure is, it has no apprehensible essence in and of itself. Ultimately, it is constituted of other, older, circumambient myths. Hence "meaning" is continually deferred. It is impossible to resolve the text into a coherent signifying unity. The image of the galvanised creature awakening is compellingly metaphorical of Shelley's own textual myth-making. It also evokes the continual remoulding the creature/text has been subject to ever since its rude awakening.

Shelley's much-discussed reference to the text as "my hideous progeny" (1980, 10) links a feeling of disgust towards and alienation from the creature/text (although "my... progeny" suggests the inseparability of creator/creature). The moment the creature becomes animated, Victor dis owns it. In other words, once it exists beyond his conceptual framework and assumes a life of its own, he abandons it. This refusal to accept the incomprehensible is a recognition of the creature/text's ultimate fugitivity. Later, Victor pursues the creature over vast distances without capturing his tormentor. Here, the creature's elusiveness suggests that he escapes Victor's desired apprehension of him, as throughout he has escaped his comprehension. The final pursuit is the ultimate statement of the creature/text's fugitivity and the extent of the creator/author's alienation from the creature/text.

Frankenstein's creature is the literal and metaphorical embodiment of these two processes. Victor himself can be read as a metaphor for the writer unable to cope with the realisation that
the text is no longer within his control. Instead of being a self-gratifying success expressing his
greatness, has become a hideous, monstrous deformity (or deformation). He finds that he cannot
accept the monster and love him as a father or mother would because he feels estranged from the
creature both as a narrative and textual body.

The psychobiographical circumstances of the text's production make explicable the
conflations arising here between Victor/author/mother and creature/text/child. Shelley was
pregnant when she wrote Frankenstein. As Mellor suggests, the novel expresses the author's
innermost doubts and fears, as a young woman, about childbirth and parenthood. In textual
terms, her exposure to the works of the great Romantic poets, especially those of her husband
Percy and Lord Byron, intersected with the emergence of the Gothic novel as well as the great
advances made by science. These factors combined in her production of a polysemic text whose
"floating signifier" is the creature, tenuously linking each of these vectors through his own
inexpressible fugitivity.

Unlike Stoker and Stevenson whose villains rarely speak (for) themselves, Shelley is
sympathetic towards the monstrous outsider and allows him to speak through its adversary.
Although the creature is kept distant from the reader through the interposition of narrative layers,
his direct speech empowers him. Indeed, Shelley not only endows the creature with eloquence,
but also situates his substantial speech at the novel's heart, thus moving the outsider to the centre
of the text. This sympathetic portrayal of the creature is another factor in the (narrative and
textual) figures of Victor and the creature becoming entangled. Regarding Shelley's personal
history, Knoepflmacher (1974) argues that her sympathy towards the creature is at least partly
attributable to her own position as an "outsider": a motherless child and pregnant young writer
influenced by renowned literary men in a deeply patriarchal society.
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At the time of its publication, readers were shocked that a young woman could write such a vividly terrifying novel. Furthermore, since its awakening, the "hideous progeny" of the text has resisted all attempts to definitively and finally apprehend it. Shelley's "waking dream" in which she saw a "hideous phantasm of a man... show signs of life, and stir with an uneasy, half vital motion" (1980, 9), suggests a surreal sense of nightmarish (per)mutation.

Shelley's novel has inspired scores of plays and films imitating or reworking her narrative. Levine and Knoepflmacher (1974) argue that the creature, like Dracula (the two have even joined forces in some productions), is a shifting signifier embodying a range of buried, culturally embedded fears specific to different social and historical milieux. This capacity to act as a shifting signifier reflects the textual fugitivity of the creature-figure in the novel. It also indicates that this capacity crosses not only history but different media.

This thesis does not have the scope to address in detail productions of Frankenstein other than the novel itself, but it acknowledges that the analysis of fugitivity is certainly possible in films which owe their conception to Mary Shelley's novel. For example, Branagh's recent film, titled Mary Shelley's Frankenstein, asserts a direct link to the "original" myth. Yet Branagh, like Victor, cannot control the filmic text/creature (because it is "fugitive"). Branagh's film simultaneously asserts authority by invoking "Mary Shelley" but also abdicates responsibility by ascribing originality to the author herself. This is a contrived attempt to claim credit for providing a wonderful and dramatic story, while offloading the inevitable questions about flaws in the film to an historical precedent.

This currently popular mode of titling films loosely based on novels - Bram's Stoker's Dracula being another case in point - disingenuously overlooks the (necessary) ways in which the novel is altered to suit the conventions of (commercial) film-making. Admittedly, Derrida
and Foucault have thoroughly undermined the notion of the author as "original" authority and the act of creatively "rewriting" texts is thus legitimated. However, Branagh's film utilises this right while still claiming to represent the concerns of Shelley herself. The movie is *Mary Shelley's Frankenstein* indicating that the film will engage more with the novel than with the subsequent cultural rewritings of it. Yet there is far more of "Kenneth Branagh" in it than "Mary Shelley". The film elides the radical and disturbing aspects of Shelley's writing and re-incorporates them into a conventional Hollywood love story. *Mary Shelley's Frankenstein* is concerned about the monster in the man (Victor) who needs to be loved by the man. Branagh's text shows the monster impeding the man who merely wants to be in love. This overlooks the crucial point that the monster becomes animated because Victor denies himself the "amiableness of domestic affections" (Marlow 1980, 14). In other words, in Mary Shelley's terms, the monster could not even be created if the scenario suggested by Branagh were prevailing. Thus, the implications of the creature's animation in Branagh's text are entirely different (and thus not Mary Shelley's). In fact, the material of Shelley's text is radically reshaped to fit into specific marketing strategies, such as the development of a passionate love affair between Victor (Branagh) and Elizabeth (Helena Bonham Carter); whereas in the novel, the only "ardent desires" Victor directly expresses are for his creation, his dead mother and dead bride. While Shelley emphasises Victor's fear of love and abandonment of Elizabeth - first for his studies, then to the hideous intentions of his creature - the film offers a form of closure through its development of a romantic theme. Not only is Victor enamoured of Elizabeth and attentive to her - thus derailing the novel's crucial idea that Victor is obsessed - but the creature loves her, rather than seeing her as a rival for Victor's affections. In the novel, the creature is "lost in darkness and distance" at the end. Paradoxically,
this tantalising refusal to resolve the narrative(s) proves far more satisfying than the film's attempts to use the romance narrative as a means of suturing the text.

Of course, there is much more to be said - by way of endorsement as well as reservation - about Branagh's film and indeed the many films which relate to *Frankenstein*, but as already stated, there is not space to do so in this thesis.

In the novel, fugitivity is evident in a number of different narrative and textual manifestations. Generally speaking, the creature figures itself in a manner comparable to the vampires of the texts already discussed. Indeed, although *Dracula* and *The Vampire Chronicles* are the only texts concerned explicitly with vampires and vampirism, *Frankenstein*, like *Jekyll and Hyde*, implicitly concerns itself with the same issues.

The creature embodies the inexpressible sublime. His appearances, like those of Hyde, are always accompanied by descriptions of his "unspeakable", alien deformity. Like Stevenson, Shelley articulates how inarticulate her characters feel before such enormity. Appropriately, the creature is often placed in remote, imposing landscapes, among impassable mountains and massive glaciers.

As Burke suggests, landscapes like these provoke awestruck silence. The creature arouses this as well, generating a paradoxical mixture of fear and wonder evading attempts to express it. As such, the creature is a figure of/for sublimity. The sublime is important in terms of how *Frankenstein* addresses issues of textuality as well as thematic or narrative concerns. The creature's "unspeakable" nature reflects the effacement of the signified by a radical play of signifiers because no unified signification is possible. The creature is a metaphor for the fugitive, ambivalent, recalcitrant word or sign in play with other polysemic signifiers.
In its preoccupation with the sublime unrepresentable, *Frankenstein* may be regarded as a fantastic novel. Certainly, it subverts the order of the real through the fugitive figure of the creature. As Jackson observes, subtly equivocal about what "the law" refers to:

fantastic literature points to or suggests the basis upon which cultural order rests, for it opens up, for a brief moment, on to disorder, on to illegality, on to that which lies outside the law, that which is outside dominant value systems. The fantastic traces the unsaid and the unseen of culture: that which has been silenced, made invisible, covered over and made "absent". (1981, 4)

At a general level, the fear generated by the creature is the fear of the other. It appals people, causing them to either attack him or flee. Like the peasants in Malouf's *An Imaginary Life* who expel Ovid and the Wild Child, a contaminated being is repressed because of a fear of contagion. The creature's monstrosity is a palpable reminder of the consequences (both physical and social) of gratifying forbidden desires. He also incites the fear of propagation of a new species threatening human primacy. Indeed, the creature provokes fear in virtually every person he encounters (the blind Mr De Lacey being a notable exception). His hideousness is threatening. Jackson theorises this fear of the other accordingly:

A stranger, a foreigner, an outsider, a social deviant, anyone speaking in an unfamiliar language or acting in unfamiliar ways, anyone whose origins are unknown or who has extraordinary powers, tends to be set apart as other, as evil. Strangeness precedes the naming of it as evil: the other is defined as evil precisely because of his/her difference and a possible power to disturb the familiar and the known. (1981, 52-53)

As already discussed, an important aspect of the fugitive figure is the threat it embodies to the social order. Indeed the creature, like Dracula and Hyde, is a powerful (if fluid) image of unhingeing. This unhingeing is simultaneously narrative and textual. The fugitive figure resists
and fundamentally undermines the potential for a final, determinate "meaning". However, the creature is not solely responsible for this embodied threat. Victor, like Van Helsing and Jekyll before him, is an individualistic and radical thinker whose ideas lead him into isolation. As Smith argues, "Victor would slip imperceptibly from his place in 'rational society' (exemplified both by his home and by his academic masters) into a state of enthusiasm, radicalism and even madness, a state that threatened the social order itself" (1994, 48-49).

Similarly, Jordanova observes how Victor's unconventional approach to learning directs him towards the marginal: "It is striking that he felt attracted to domains that were marginal, contentious or on the boundaries of what could be controlled, such as alchemy and electricity, and that he changed his mind so often about what interested him" (1994, 62). Discussing Shelley's reading of Davy's *Elements of Chemical Philosophy* in 1816, she argues that,

[for Davy, history helps to reveal the stable aspect of experiment, which 'is as it were the chain that binds down the Proteus of nature, and obliges it to confess its real form and divine origin'. For Frankenstein, history and experiment had released an aberrent [sic] form of nature, whose origins are profane (62).

This image of Proteus is important to a discussion of the fugitive figure's fundamental instability since it is an archetypal image of change and fluidity. Davy's use of it implies the pursuer's desire to arrest (chain) this figure. His assertion that this arresting "obliges it to confess its real form and divine origin" is blindly followed by Victor who desires, according to Professor Waldman's categories of excellence, to "penetrate into the recesses of nature, and show how she works in her hiding places" (Shelley 1980, 47).

This rationalist perspective is immediately destroyed once the creature comes to life since it is "aberrant" and "profane". The fugitive figure does not lead to the truth about origins. As
Victor later discovers, interrogation and pursuit of the fugitive figure only lead to an unsatisfactory and ambiguous dissolution. The fugitive figure is chained as Davy suggests, however: the truth it suggests cannot be extricated from the chain of signifiers it is both a part of and responsible for. It, like Proteus, assumes the form of the chained figure. This chaining suggests the continuing instability of the social order which desires its confinement and confession of its "real form and divine origin". In order to observe the specific ways in which Frankenstein's creature, through fugitive figuration, resists attempts to chain it, we must now turn to the text in more detail.

Creator/Mirror/Creature: Image of the Nameless

There's a word for it
Words don't mean a thing
There's a name for it
And names make all the difference in the world

Some things can never be spoken
Some things cannot be pronounced
That word does not exist in any language
It will never be uttered by a human mouth

Let X make a statement
Let breath pass through those cracked lips
That man was my hero
Now that word has been taken from us

Give me back my name
Give me back my name
Something has been changed in my life
Something has been changed in my life
Something must be returned to us
Something must be returned to us

- "(Give Me Back My) Name" (Talking Heads)
Frankenstein, like Jekyll, is absorbed by his experiments and becomes mastered by the creature he is responsible for unleashing and fallaciously believes he controls. The creature is intimately related to his civilised and socially respected counterpart as a repressed-and-erupting projection of his creator's psyche. This intimate relationship between creator and creature suggests a vampiric connection since a vampire sustains itself through a parasitic consumption of the victim's blood. Although Victor's creature is not a bloodsucker, he exists in a relationship of parasitic interdependence with his creator. This relationship engenders a series of fugitive representations through numerous important narrative incidents. Some of these incidents foreground the image of the mirror which, as already argued, is of vital importance to an understanding of fugitivity in Gothic texts. A striking instance involves Victor's creature witnessing its own reflection in a pool of water:

how was I terrified, when I viewed myself in a transparent pool! At first I started back, unable to believe that it was indeed I who was reflected in the mirror; and when I became fully convinced that I was in reality the monster that I am, I was filled with the bitterest sensations of despondence and mortification. Alas! I did not yet entirely know the fatal effects of this miserable deformity. (Shelley 1980, 114)

It is widely acknowledged that the distinction between Victor and his creature becomes increasingly arbitrary as the novel progresses. This blurring between the two is fundamental to narrative/textual figuration. Any attempt to "make sense" of the text dissolves into the pursuer/pursued relation in which Victor and his creature are inextricably figured. Indeed, this quote could be ascribed to Frankenstein himself since his creature is consciously articulating what Victor has repressed in his unconscious but inevitably (and continually) returns.
Moretti argues that the creature "is always described by negation: man is well proportioned, the monster is not; man is beautiful, the monster ugly; man is good, the monster evil. The monster is man turned upside-down, negated. He has no autonomous existence; he can never be really free or have a future. He lives only as the other side of that coin which is Frankenstein" (1983, 88, emphasis in original). Moretti's deployment of the coin metaphor indicates that the creature, although inextricably tied to his creator, exists outside the symbolic. He emerges from "the other side" that is Victor's unconscious. Like Dracula, Frankenstein's creature belongs to the paraxial.

The mirror symbolises the figuring of fugitivity through its blurring of creator and creature. In Frankenstein, Victor and his creature are indissolubly blurred. As Lacan suggests in "The Insistence of the Letter in the Unconscious",

If I have said elsewhere that the unconscious is the discourse of the Other (with a capital O), I meant by that to indicate the beyond in which the recognition of desire is bound up with the desire of recognition.

In other words this other is the Other which my lie invokes as a gage of the truth in which it thrives. (1988, 102)

The creature's too apparent deformity reflects Victor's own monstrosity. Lew, in a detailed discussion on differentiation, makes some important observations about the identification between Victor and his creature:

[T]he seas on which Victor and the creature tell their stories are also mirrors. They recall the liquid water in which the creature first saw his reflection - only they have been frozen, made rigid. The image one sees in this mirror will not waver or retreat at the touch; rather, contact with this mirror burns. One travels upon it, forgetting even that it is a mirror; when one encounters the Other upon it, one forgets that the Other is but a reflection of the Self, a reflection and even a creation of one's own desires. (1991, 270)
The mirror's importance to the text is ironic given that Victor fails to recognise or acknowledge the creature as his own otherness. In popular culture, Victor and his nameless creature are confused, the creature often being called "Frankenstein". Mellor attributes this mistake to the consumption of popular film versions of the novel which have often given the creature its creator's name. However, this common fallacy is not itself without justification because of the extent to which Shelley demonstrates the ultimate complicity of Victor and his creature. As Mellor notes, "both the media and the average person in the street have mistakenly assigned the name of Frankenstein not to the maker of the monster but to his creature. But... this 'mistake' derives from an intuitively correct reading of the novel" (1988, 38). Furthermore, "Frankenstein becomes the monster he names, just as in the popular imagination informed by the cinematic versions of Mary Shelley's novel, his name 'Frankenstein' becomes the monster." (134-35) Therefore, when literary critics refer to the nameless creature as either "Frankenstein's creature" or "Frankenstein's monster" they posit an inseparable link between the two, ambiguously implying that "Frankenstein is monster" as well as that the monster is Frankenstein's. They belong immutably to each other.

The fact that the creature remains unnamed in the novel not only (con)fuses him with his creator. The absence of a constant proper name for the monster is also a sign of its strangeness. It is an indication that it cannot be named; it is unnameable. Therefore, it is beyond the articulation that would render it no longer monstrous but within the control of the creator/author/reader. The creature's namelessness suggests his fugitivity and, due to Victor's abandonment of him, signals his exclusion from social and familial networks.

Alternative descriptions of the creature as a "monster", "fiend", "wretch" etc., reinforce his not being "fixed" by a single, recurring signifier. He floats between different derogatory
signifiers indicating his status as essentially unnameable. In a sense, he is a villain of language itself, existing within, but not contained by, and somehow escaping, signification. The creature is also referred to as a "daemon" (99). This is etymologically important because it denotes not only an "evil spirit", but one which is "attendant or indwelling" (Sykes 1987, 254), emphasising the complicity between creature and creator. This complicity becomes even more discernible when the scene of the creature's animation is addressed.

The creature's coming to life and Victor's reaction are vital to a discussion of the blurring between them. From the animation onwards, this blurring, complete by the novel's end, is already in evidence. Victor describes the moment of his creature's awakening in the following manner:

It was on a dreary night of November, that I beheld the accomplishment of my toils. With an anxiety that almost amounted to agony, I collected the instruments of life around me, that I might infuse a spark of being into the lifeless thing that lay at my feet. It was already one in the morning; the rain pattered dismally against the panes, and my candle was nearly burnt out, when, by the glimmer of the half-extinguished light, I saw the dull yellow eye of the creature open; it breathed hard, and a convulsive motion agitated its limbs.

How can I describe my emotions at this catastrophe, or how delineate the wretch whom with such infinite pains and care I had endeavoured to form? His limbs were in proportion, and I had selected his features as beautiful. Beautiful! - Great God! His yellow skin scarcely covered the work of muscles and arteries beneath; his hair was of a lustrous black, and flowing; his teeth of a pearly whiteness; but these luxuriances only formed a more horrid contrast with his watery eyes, that seemed almost of the same colour as the dun white sockets in which they were set, his shrivelled complexion and straight black lips. (Shelley 1980, 57)

When Victor rushes from his bed-chamber and the grinning creature above him, it is not just the appalling ugliness of his creature that causes him to flee. This ugliness is inescapably associated, through juxtaposition, with the nightmare immediately preceding the creature's appearance in his bed-chamber. Indeed, as he is waking from this dream, he sees his creature moving aside the
bed-curtain. In the nightmare, Victor kisses his fiancée Elizabeth and as he does so, she adopts the shrouded form of his dead mother:

I was disturbed by the wildest dreams. I thought I saw Elizabeth, in the bloom of health, walking in the streets of Ingolstadt. Delighted and surprised, I embraced her; but as I imprinted the first kiss on her lips, they became livid with the hue of death; her features appeared to change, and I thought that I held the corpse of my dead mother in my arms; a shroud enveloped her form, and I saw the graveworms crawling in the folds of the flannel. (Shelley 1980, 58)

In terms of the narrative itself, Victor's dream and his rude awakening from it are important in that they foreshadow the incident in which the monster murders Elizabeth (although the actual murder is not witnessed, only implied). Victor, hearing a scream, enters their bedroom to find his wife prone on the bed (the "bridal bier"). The monster looks in on this scene in a mocking, grinning pose, having committed the deadly act and then fleeing outside. Symbolically, the monster's parting of the bed-curtain may also represent Elizabeth's hymen which Victor is afraid of rupturing, as he associates it with the incestuous desire for his dead mother. It is left to the monstrous figure of the unconscious to finally couple Victor's erotic and thanatogenic urges in a bloody consummation which is too sublimely powerful for Victor/the reader to behold hic et nunc.

In particular, consummating his marriage to Elizabeth represents a sublimation of desire Victor cannot countenance. He is trapped in the Oedipal desire for his dead mother. The creature allows Victor to pursue this desire since he embodies it: he is composed of dead parts himself and has been produced by Frankenstein like a son from a mother. Ultimately, Victor engages in a masochistic pursuit of the physically superior creature in an unforgiving, extreme terrain that mirrors the terrain of his tormented psyche. The only possible outcome of this is death. Through
the creature, Victor has been seeking re-absorption into the maternal. Hence the creature's violence in the symbolic order: he must kill anything which may act as a surrogate for this lost maternity. The two go to the sea - as Lew (1991, 269) rightly indicates, "mer (sea)" is ambiguously also "mère (mother)" - as a final place to return, before being re-absorbed into the maternal abyss of death. In this context, Hogle's discussion of the abject is as relevant here as it was to *Jekyll and Hyde*. Frankenstein's creature, like Hyde, is the abject that Victor cannot "cast off".

This evocative description dramatically renders the momentous event, but also states the effect it has on Victor. Shortly afterwards, he hurries from the laboratory to his bed-chamber. He has a nightmare-filled sleep from which he awakes to behold the creature regarding him, with his yellow eye equated with the moon:

I started from my sleep with horror; a cold dew covered my forehead, my teeth chattered, and every limb became convulsed: when, by the dim and yellow light of the moon, as it forced its way through the window shutters, I beheld the wretch - the miserable monster whom I had created. He held up the curtain of the bed; and his eyes, if eyes they be called, were fixed on me. (58)

The homology between Victor and his creature is signified by the repetition of a sickly, yellow light in both incidents. Victor's limbs convulse as he wakes from his nightmare, just as in the animation scene, the creature's limbs convulse with the "spark of life" that has been imparted to his body.

This scene reverses the roles of creator and creature. Victor assumes the prone position previously adopted by his inanimate creature who now towers above him. The transfixed manner in which Victor regards his creature indicates his powerlessness. This contrasts with his earlier
dreams of omnipotence. Victor demonstrably lacks power, seeing his creature grinning at him from a position of authority and intimidation.

This positioning of the two and the circumstances of their interaction, represent the creature escaping its creator's control and usurping the latter's power. The creature forces "its way through the window shutters" and holds aside the bed-curtain. These images are sexual, implying Victor's helplessness and the creature's brute strength. The parting of the bed-curtain and the circumstances of the monster's interaction with Victor in this scene have homoerotic overtones. In this sense, the monster's parting of the curtain is a kind of violation, a penetration of Victor's defences. Here, Victor is feminised, and the images of the displaced shutters and bed-curtain simultaneously evoke the parting of the labia and the eruption of the figure of the id. In both senses, there is a violation depicted, the first of the feminine and the second of the symbolic. Victor wishes to repress all knowledge of his transgressive act, and by extension, the existence of the creature itself. Yet he cannot prevent the creature from maintaining contact with him, and ultimately, from doing as he pleases, as evidenced by his later acts of vengeance. Thus, the creature acts as a projection of Frankenstein's flaws. His appearances are generally concurrent with the eruption of illicit desires from within Victor's psyche. He is the fugitive embodiment of these desires, emerging and taunting Victor before acting out the most violent and transgressive of them. The creature comes to represent the anarchic projection of Victor's being, yet he continually resists Victor's most censorious attempts to capture and eradicate him.

The scene in Victor's bed-chamber is brief due to his response to the shock of the creature's appearance: "His jaws opened, and he muttered some inarticulate sounds, while a grin wrinkled his cheeks. He might have spoken, but I did not hear; one hand was stretched out, seemingly to detain me, but I escaped, and rushed down stairs" (58). The creature's desire to
detain his creator foreshadows Victor's later chase of him. Victor clings to the illusion later entertained by Henry Jekyll and Jonathan Harker that his creature (double) can be contained. His attempts to flee are futile because, as a projection of his repressed desires, the creature can no longer be contained once it has returned from a site of repression. Once the desire has erupted, its embodied form, while not always visible, is, in a manner of speaking, "on the loose". In other words, the creature's parting of the bed-curtain is symbolic of its capacity to return at will from behind/beyond the thin membrane separating the conscious from the unconscious. The constant possibility of this return allows the creature to participate in and figure narrative and textual fugitivity.

*Frankenstein* describes an obsession with the inexpressible. The horror the creature inspires and the "threat" he poses to humanity are declared on numerous occasions by its creator. In many instances, these articulations of horror, fear and loathing are negative, paradoxical acknowledgements of the inexpressible. At every opportunity, Shelley reveals the fleeing instinct evident in Victor's reaction to his creature's awakening. Justine Moritz, a family servant, is condemned to be executed for the creature's murder of Victor's brother, William. Victor intuitively realises that his creature committed the murder:

I cannot pretend to describe what I then felt. I had before experienced sensations of horror; and I have endeavoured to bestow upon them adequate expressions, but words cannot convey an idea of the heart-sickening despair that I then endured... instead of that serenity of conscience, which allowed me to look back on the past with self-satisfaction, and from thence to gather promise of new hopes, I was seized by remorse and the sense of guilt, which hurried me away to a hell of intense tortures, such as no language can describe. (85, 90)
Victor's claims that "words cannot convey an idea", "no language can describe", suggest that language is inadequate: it cannot really express the meaning of this particular experience in a finally satisfactory manner. At a literal level, Victor is trying in vain to express the inexpressible horror of his complicity in Justine's death. At a metaphorical level, this can be read as the author-function and by extension, language itself, being limited and only capable of expressing the extent to which it is limited. The fugitive figure then - whether literally, in this case, Victor's inexpressible guilt or, metaphorically, the writer/language itself - is that which renders us speechless. There are words to describe the inexpressible but these seem capable only of pointing with self-referential despair to their own inadequacy. Indeed, he encounters his creation in the Alps after Justine's execution and notes that the monster's "unearthly ugliness rendered it almost too horrible for human eyes" (99). Later, he states, "his face was wrinkled into contortions too horrible for human eyes to behold" (145).

Victor considers informing others about his monster. However, he rejects this option. His fear of the reactions of others apparently prevents him from revealing his dreadful secret: "I had unchained an enemy among them, whose joy it was to shed their blood, and to revel in their groans. How they would, each and all, abhor me, and hunt me from the world, did they know my unhallowed acts, and the crimes which had their source in me!" (185).

This is a rare moments of insight in which Victor realises that he is responsible for the creature's monstrous acts. Ironically, his image of the reception his confession would receive mirrors how, in fact, his creature is treated. Indeed, the creature is expelled from all the communities he encounters. He is suspected or accused of villainous crimes. For example, he saves a drowning child but, while trying to revive her, is beaten away by "a rustic" (141). Victor's image of being hunted thus effaces the distinction between himself and his creature. However,
his silence implies that he is incapable of speech because the creature is the unspeakable image of himself, an inexpressible signifier disconnected and sublimely dissociated from other signifiers. In this sense, the creature is the "unchained enemy" in the chain of signification. He is witnessed, but exists beyond apprehension both in the referential/narrative and conceptual/textual senses. Olorenshaw equates the "unseeability" of the monster with its unspeakability:

Victor Frankenstein also selects the finest features for his creature ("His limbs were in proportion, and I had selected his features as beautiful"), but his creature is so hideous that it cannot be seen: "Unable to endure the aspect of the being I had created, I rushed out of the room". The beauty has been transformed into hideousness because Frankenstein's raw materials have been infused with the principle of life. It is precisely this principle that cannot be represented in art, science or philosophy. The "unseeability" of the monster is a consequence of the impossibility of representing what he represents, "the deepest mysteries of creation". It also signifies... that in an important sense the monster cannot be narrated. (1994, 163-64, emphasis in original)

The creature cannot be "narrated" because he is a textual fugitive figure as well as a narrative one. He cannot be physically apprehended by Victor in the text, nor stopped from committing his violent crimes. Furthermore, he cannot be adequately signified by Victor or critics of the text itself. This is because he signifies what cannot be signified. He refuses to be neatly captured in narration and his physical escape from Victor is metaphorical for his figurative elusiveness. Victor is neither able to arrest him physically nor through signs. Extending the Lacanian observations of Brooks, Olorenshaw argues that the creature, despite his own mastery of language is, himself unnameable and thus "unnarratable":

The creature cannot cross over from an order determined by the specular to an order determined by language, that is, the creature cannot be recognized, identified or circulate as a proper name in the discourse of the Other because the creature is unnarratable. The monster is a monster not on account of his exclusion from the
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symbolic order of language *per se* but on account of his inability to enter and be accommodated within the syntagmatic order of narration...

The monster wishes to traverse simultaneously the threshold of the De Lacey's abode and of "narratability", but since the monster represents the unrepresentable this threshold can never be crossed by him. (167-68)

Olorenshaw's reference to the creature's desire to be "accommodated" in De Lacey's "abode", and the impossibility of this desire being fulfilled, reminds us that he is uncanny. Returning to the German origin of the word, this means that he is "unhomely". He cannot enter the world of domestic affection because he is perceived to be barbarous, uncivilised and thus dangerous. (Importantly, Victor, through the creature, denies himself the possibility of domestic affection). This is why the creature is rejected by all who encounter him (even his father/mother, Victor himself). This universal rejection of the creature figures at the narrative level the symbolic repression of desire at the textual level. Not only can he not be incorporated into the domestic, but he is "unhomely" in the textual sense. Thus it is impossible, as Olorenshaw evocatively suggests, for the creature "to enter and be accommodated within the syntagmatic order of narration". The creature figures disorder, the scrambling of sense, and thus cannot cross the "threshold" between domestic/wild, representable/unrepresentable, conscious/unconscious.

Thus, the creature, desiring to be a part of the society which fears and shuns it, is condemned to isolation. Olorenshaw details the creature's doomed attempt to play a part in the *conte héroïque* (adventure story) of the De Lacey family. Olorenshaw reads the family's rejection of the creature as being metaphorical for the disruptive nature of Shelley's text itself. In particular, this disruption relates to her incorporation of but eventual annihilation of the literary ideas of her own family: her mother, Mary Wollstonecraft; her father Godwin, and her husband, Percy. In terms of a discussion of fugitivity, the creature is unavoidably exiled because of his
disruptive nature. This may be linked to what I refer to as the fundamental instability of the fugitive figure. This instability leads to a narrative self-destruction mirrored at the textual level. As Olorenshaw argues:

The creature's function is to be the operator of a narrative anacoluthon, the destroyer of a dual code of verisimilitude and of motivation. By causing him to irrupt into the De Lacey abode Mary Shelley annihilates the ideals of the preceding revolutionary period, of her own mother, father and husband, and, at the same stroke, destroys a species of literature through which those ideals found an expression.

But, it could be argued, we do have *Frankenstein*. The monster is described and narrated. Nevertheless, the conditions in which this narration occurs strengthen rather than weaken the case for "unnarratability". (1994, 168, emphases in original)

Here, Olorenshaw identifies the creature as a disruptive force in relation to the specific historical context of preceding Shelley's writing. While I acknowledge the specificity of this argument, I would like to focus on the more general implications of the creature's destruction of verisimilitude. As this passage suggests, *Frankenstein* and Frankenstein's creature function to radically disrupt the notion of narrative coherence. Instead, the creature/text figures the unrepresentable monstrosity of textuality. Rather than supplying the text with a nexus to meaningful integration and coherence, the creature, as "operator of a narrative anacoluthon", threatens to unhinge meaning. This textual threat is symbolised at the narrative level by his strangulation of his victims. He strangles them because, symbolically, this means that they have no voice to articulate his monstrosity. Ultimately, he moves the text towards indeterminate silence rather than definitive enunciation. The link between these manifestations of the threat to unhinge meaning at the narrative and textual levels is the unconscious itself. This is why the monster is such a powerful image of the blurred and disintegrating self since it arises from the
unconscious, appearing and disappearing in its uncanny manner. These appearances are uncanny because they signal a return from repression of something simultaneously strange and familiar.

Dreary Night... Erotic Inscriptions... The Unspeakable Sublime

*It is not enough to know them [the passions] in general; to affect them after a delicate manner, or to judge properly of any work designed to affect them, we should know the exact boundaries of their several jurisdictions; we should pursue them through all their variety of operations, and pierce into the inmost, and what might appear inaccessible part, of our nature.* (Burke 1990, 48-49)

The creature promises to leave Victor and his family in peace if the scientist will make him a mate. Victor isolates himself in the Orkneys to complete this task, but tears up the pieces of the body and refuses to do it. Seeing this, the monster vows to be with him on his wedding-night (Shelley 1980, 168). Shortly afterwards, Victor becomes distraught: "tears, the first I had shed for many months, streamed from my eyes... the night passed away, and the sun rose from the ocean; my feelings became calmer, if it may be called calmness, when the violence of rage sinks into the depths of despair." (Shelley 1980, 169) This feeling of despair soon develops into a profound desire to die after his friend, Henry Clerval's murdered body is found and Victor is imprisoned:

Soon, oh! very soon, will death extinguish these throbings, and relieve me from the mighty weight of anguish that bears me to the dust; and in executing the award of justice, I shall also sink to rest. Then the appearance of death was distant, although the wish was ever present to my thoughts; and I often sat for hours motionless and speechless, wishing for some mighty revolution that might bury me and my destroyer in its ruins. (181-82)
Jonathan's premature ageing and Jekyll's changing into Hyde during sleep. In Victor's case, hysteria is the consequence of this repression. As Hobbs observes, whenever Victor is faced by evidence of his creature's murders, he becomes faint, convulsive, and/or loses consciousness (1993, 162). This is particularly so after Clerval's murder.

In this way, Victor is as culpable as the ineffectual Jonathan Harker and, indicating this culpability, experiences similar feelings to Jonathan. Like Jekyll, Victor's silent impotence while his creature is "running riot" indicates a kind of self-inflicted castration. Hobbs also draws our attention to the mist that forms before Victor's eyes. This is reminiscent of the mist in which Jekyll's Hyde is simultaneously revealed and concealed. In other words, all that separates Victor from the monster is a mist, an insubstantial thing which functions as a metaphor for the division between the conscious and unconscious mind. Victor defensively deploys the mist to deny the creature's existence, yet there are always partings in which the monster is glimpsed and Victor becomes hysterical. It seems that he must be limp for the monster to act, just as Jonathan is in a stupor while Dracula seduces Mina. This mist effect implies that the monster emerges from within and is inseparable from the self which attempts to be distanced from it.

Victor as "motionless and speechless" is one of numerous examples of his acknowledgement of the inexpressible. Another one is, "My rage is unspeakable, when I reflect that the murderer, whom I have turned loose upon society, still exists" (200). Of course, for all his rage, Victor never acts effectively. He never repairs the rift between himself and his creature, does not warn others about the dangers posed by the creature, refuses to make a mate for him, and cannot stop the violent intrusions of the monster into society. Ultimately, Victor's ineffectual character serves his narcissistic desire to be alone. In a sense, the monster is a projection of this anti-social desire, explaining the futile and pointless game of pursuit played by the two at the
novel's end: Victor is happiest when allowed to engage uninterruptedely with his monster. This is why he silently sanctions the creature's murder of his family: they are the only ones who can stand in the way of his Romantic solipsism.

Nor is the acknowledgement of the inexpressible restricted to Victor. Walton is similarly nonplussed as evidenced when the monster appears before him to look on his dead creator: "Over him hung a form which I cannot find words to describe... I approached this tremendous being; I dared not again raise my eyes to his face, there was something so scaring and unearthly in his ugliness. I attempted to speak, but the words died away on my lips" (218-19). Here, language not only becomes silent, it dies before the monster, like Victor himself has done, neither able to withstand its unspeakability.

Supplementing textual and psychoanalytic analyses, numerous important feminist readings have deconstructed *Frankenstein*. Mellor argues that the intensive labour Victor expends making his creature is due to his inability to relate to the feminine. She captures Victor's shock when his creature becomes animated in the following description:

rather than clasping his newborn child to his breast in a nurturing maternal gesture, he rushes out of the room, repulsed by the abnormality of his creation. And when his child follows him to his bedroom, uttering inarticulate sounds of desire and affection, smiling at him, reaching out to embrace him, Victor Frankenstein again flees in horror, abandoning his child completely. (1988, 41-2)

Victor "flees in horror" because the monster is unspeakably ugly. Yet this ugliness is metaphorical, the abject face of inefflable desire itself. The creature is a fugitive figure because it stands in for desire even as it seems impossible anything could. It is fugitive through its profound otherness. Yet it is so close to Victor, which is why its monstrosity is terrifying. This terrifying closeness is later reinforced when Victor reneges on the deal to create a mate for his creature.
Victor's ultimate refusal to keep his promise is ostensibly because he is worried the two may propagate and found a species of being which would threaten the human race. This reservation is flawed because Victor would presumably be capable of ensuring that the two could not reproduce. It hides the fact that he does not want to create the female because of his even greater fear of the female other. Throughout the novel, Victor flees the feminine represented by his mother, Elizabeth and his own nature as "mother" to the creature.

Victor is incapable of accepting that he can produce a female fugitive figure. He refuses because to do so would undermine the already unstable sense of rational masculine identity he has constructed for himself. Since he has already made a creature that is an unconscious projection of his own desires, a female creature would point to the radical androgyny of the self: Victor could not make such a being without fundamental elements of his own psyche being invested in it. Thus a female creature threatens his sense of being a "rational", integrated male. Furthermore, he fears the procreative potential of the female fugitive figure, but not, as he claims for the sake of humanity. He cannot tolerate the (unthinkable) thought of irrational female sexuality. As Hobbs argues, indicating the unwittingly foreboding nature of Elizabeth's words:

Shelley allows Elizabeth, the monster's final victim, to examine the human cost of remaining in one's "proper sphere". In her last moments, even Elizabeth seems to hear the hollowness in her instructions to "be calm, my dear Victor; I would sacrifice my life to your peace. We surely shall be happy: quiet in our native country, and not mingling in the world." Victor reports that Elizabeth weeps at her statement, "distrusting the very solace that she gave; but at the same time she smiled, that she might chase away the fiend that lurked in my heart". The fiend lurks in Elizabeth's heart as she altruistically attends to male discomfort, sacrificing her own desires in order to shore up men's emotional stability. It lurks in Victor's as he dutifully refuses to attend to the passionate, immoderate, "feminine" side of his nature. (1993, 165)
"The fiend that lurked in my heart" is at one level, the creature, but at another level, it is Victor as creature. Ultimately, Victor and the creature are inseparable because the fiend is, as Victor acknowledges, "in my heart". His reference to the organ traditionally associated with deep feelings of affection indicates his narcissistic self-absorption. Thus it is clear that Elizabeth has no chance of "chasing away" the fiend in Victor's heart. Her own unconscious prompts her to "distrust the very solace she gave" which is in a sense to herself. She has learned from bitter experience that despite all of his promises, Victor's "affections" are located elsewhere. In order to be left to attend to these illicit "affections" (which is one reason why he keeps quiet about them) Victor must "kill off" rival claims for love. Victor tries to repress the monster who remains paradoxically ever-present, lurking deep in his creator's psyche. The textuality of the creature's monstrosity is evident in the way in which Shelley represents Victor and Elizabeth in this situation. It is figurative as well as literal and Hobbs has drawn on this image of lurking - an act carried out by border beings simultaneously foregrounded (present) and in the background (absent) - to further her ideas on Victor's repressed nature. Elizabeth desires to "chase away the fiend in Victor's heart" because she recognises that Victor's emotions have been displaced into an obsessive configuration with himself. Ultimately, she wants to engage in the pursuit of desire with Victor but is unable to because her place in the dialectic of pursuit has been appropriated by Victor's creature, the "fiend" she will not be able to "chase away".

London argues that the novel is pervaded by an intense atmosphere of homoeroticism which necessarily excludes women. In a sense, Victor's fear of women and desire for meaningful interaction with male "doubles" spring from the same source: his desire for rational control and fear of irrational otherness. According to London,
the story's horror is dramatized in the experiences of men, in the exchange of sensations between male bodies. Thus when Walton testifies, in his appeal to his sister, to his own somatic sensations of horror ("do you not feel your blood congealed with horror, like that which even now curdles mine?"...), his representational practices bear the imprint of Frankenstein's body. (1993, 263)

Walton's "representational practices bear the imprint of Frankenstein's body" because they incorporate within them the remembered physical sensations of experiencing Frankenstein's tale of horror. Of course, it is not just the tale itself, but the subject matter: the homosocial pursuit of narcissistic desire with which Walton gladly and rapidly identifies. Learning of Frankenstein's submission to this homoerotic desire, Walton vicariously participates. Yet he is part of the tale that Victor is telling because the scientist is aboard Walton's ship after pursuing the creature across the frozen wastes. The monster's subsequent appearance makes him even more complicit in the inscription of male homosocial desire. Finally, his own hubristic quest to gamely and recklessly navigate an extremely dangerous body of water, makes him a mirror image of Frankenstein. The homoerotic atmosphere London describes is abundantly evident. Mellor suggests that Victor's obsessive labour is an indication of his repressed homosexual desires. Meanwhile, Lew (1991, 271) argues that Victor represses homosexual desires for Clerval.

Most important in this context is the homosocial exclusion of women which takes place in accordance with the desire to create life through means other than procreation. London states that "the 'tale of misery and terror' Frankenstein promises to confide to Elizabeth 'the day after [their] marriage shall take place' passes instead to Walton's pen in an act that stands as the thrilling consummation of confidential vows between men" (263). Furthermore,

For Walton - who lacks the signature of self-identity, who signs himself differently in each recorded instance - the text becomes the unnatural extension of
Frankenstein's hand writing. Writing to and from Frankenstein's body, Walton declares his work the paradigmatic autobiography: a vehicle for anticipating and replicating male self-bonding. (263-64)

This parallels the profoundly sexual atmosphere surrounding the interaction between the Count and Jonathan in the beginning of Dracula. As already discussed, this first part of Stoker's novel culminates in Jonathan signing the documents which grant the Count the right to property in England. There is also the situation in Jekyll and Hyde in which the former drafts his will in favour of the latter, literally signing it all away for Hyde. In the chapters on these texts, I argued that Hyde and Dracula function as doubles (or "duples") for Jekyll and Jonathan and that an alter ego status is conferred on them through this symbolic act of "signing".

Given that Victor, like Jekyll and Jonathan Harker, has created his own double through an intense labour of narcissism, the monster, like Hyde and Dracula, can be seen as a "forgery" in both senses of the term - the product of an intense and arduous act of labour and a bogus replica (mirror image) of an "original" thing. Victor obsessively spends all his time and energy on making the creature and very little time with Elizabeth. He devotes himself entirely to his work, isolating himself from domestic affection in order to complete it. He is more at home in the masculine world of self-assertion and tries to obliterate his feminine impulses. All of his meaningful relationships are with males (Clerval, Waldman, even the creature itself). In this sense, the monster is a figurative embodiment of Victor's intense homosocial nature.

The latent homoeroticism in these texts is important because it points towards more complex issues of representation and signification. As London states, "[p]utting the hand back into writing, the excavation of the text, as performed by modern critics, thus reactivates the novel's uneasy grappling with figuration." (260) While the pen is the "symbolic instrument of consummation", Victor's story is such that this consummation is highly unsatisfactory. As we
shall see, there is no consummation (or ultimate fulfilment) as such. Indeed, what London refers to as "the notorious slipperiness of Frankenstein's signature" (260), ensures that this is the case.

Dreadful Night: Forbidden Desire: Hideous Consummation

It could perhaps be said that the whole of philosophical conceptualization, which is systematic with the nature/culture opposition, is designed to leave in the domain of the unthinkable the very thing that makes this conceptualization possible: the origin of the prohibition of incest...
There is no unity or absolute source of the myth. The focus or the source of the myth are always shadows and virtualities which are elusive, unactualizable, and nonexistent in the first place. (Derrida 1988, 113-16)

Victor's flight from his creature can be seen as an escape from the fundamentally unspeakable Other. In his essay on figuring the unthinkable, Derrida argues that "in the very first page of the Elementary Structures Lévi-Strauss... encounters what he calls a scandal, that is to say something which no longer tolerates the nature/culture opposition he has accepted, something which simultaneously seems to require the predicates of nature and of culture. This scandal is the incest prohibition" (1988, 113, emphases in original). The incest prohibition transgresses (or scandalises) this binary opposition because it has characteristics of both. As Derrida states, "[t]he incest prohibition is universal; in this sense one could call it natural. But it is also a prohibition, a system of norms and interdicts; in this sense one could call it cultural" (113). Thus the incest prohibition makes a mockery of the fundamental categories of the theoretical trajectory Lévi-Strauss adopts.
In other words, Lévi-Strauss meets something his categories cannot account for, an unnameable (and "unthinkable") "scandal". The impasse he encounters is anticipated in Frankenstein as Victor's creature is a mockery (or travesty) of his ideas and ideals. The creature is a figure for Victor's unresolved Oedipal complex, his desire to incestuously possess his (dead) mother. In attempting to "pierce the inmost secrets of nature", Victor has also pierced the inmost secrets of his own consciousness ("the fiend lurking in his heart"). His seeing the creature as "scandalous" explains his refusal to discuss it with anyone and when it does not go away, he seeks to silence it forever, return it to its origins - dead matter. Yet through his insistence on seeing the creature as "scandalous", Victor falls prey to the conceptual "stumbling-block" that Derrida claims Lévi-Strauss trips over:

Obviously there is no scandal except within a system of concepts which accredits the difference between nature and culture. By commencing his work with the factum of the incest prohibition, Lévi-Strauss thus places himself at the point at which this difference, which has always been assumed to be self-evident, finds itself erased or questioned. For from the moment when the incest prohibition can no longer be conceived within the nature/culture opposition, it can no longer be said to be a scandalous fact, a nucleus of opacity within a network of transparent significations. The incest prohibition is no longer a scandal one meets with or comes up against in the domain of traditional concepts; it is something which escapes these concepts and certainly precedes them - probably as the condition of their possibility. (113, emphasis in original)

Derrida concludes his observations with the image of childbearing referred to in the discussion of Jekyll and Hyde. This image also evocatively recalls the scene of the creature's awakening in Frankenstein. In this context, it seems important to reiterate the image, with an awareness of how it applies to both of these Gothic texts. According to Derrida, we turn
[our] eyes away when faced by the as yet unnamable which is proclaiming itself and which can do so, as is necessary whenever a birth is in the offing, only under the species of the nonspecies, in the formless, mute, infant and terrifying form of monstrosity. (122)

The inexpressible is "terrifying" because it obscurely figures the strange otherness residing in the self witnessing it. Victor's labour is akin to childbirth not only because it leads to the animation of a new being but because the process consumes him entirely, ravaging and convulsing his body. The creature stands in, historically speaking, as an anticipatory metaphor for the "nonspecies" Derrida refers to because it has emerged from dead matter. Meanwhile, Victor turns his "eyes away", unable to face the unnameable. He has collected the (finest) parts and tried to put them together to make the whole. He does not realise the excess of meaning, the surplus, or supplementarity of signification that Derrida, in another context, would later observe.

The manner of Elizabeth's murder and the event's narration are similar to Count Dracula's (implied) penetration of Mina Harker and Mina's "baptism of blood". This is suggested by several images including "The murderous mark of the fiend's grasp was on her neck" (196). The monster, like the Count, leaves a tell-tale mark on all his victims. In this case, the earlier reference made by Victor to the monster as his vampire (77) is entirely appropriate, as the monster has acted in accordance with Victor's secret desires. The monster's killing of Elizabeth is highly erotic as "her bloodless arms and relaxed form flung by the murderer on its bridal bier" (195) indicates. The murder represents the consummation that Victor finds monstrous as his "necrophilic" dream suggests. He can only embrace Elizabeth "with ardour" after her death, and when he draws his phallic pistol out to belatedly shoot the monster he predictably misses his elusive enemy.
In *Dracula*, Jonathan desires the Count's sexual power, but cannot admit this without losing consciousness, both in Transylvania and when he is in a stupor while the Count is forcing Jonathan's new wife to drink blood from his breast. Similarly, when Victor hears his bride's scream, "my arms dropped, the motion of every muscle and fibre was suspended" (195), and when he finds Elizabeth lifeless, he "[loses] recollection; I fell senseless on the ground" (195). Yet again, this is the once powerful scientist shown to be limp and useless, a rag doll tossed by his own vengeful creature. Victor's absence while his wife is being murdered parallels the convenient absence of the Crew of Light while the Count is penetrating Mina (and their falling asleep while Lucy is being penetrated).

The murder of Elizabeth by the monster is crucial in that it is the most dramatic example of the unconscious complicity between Victor and his creature. At the level of the ego, Elizabeth's murder is Victor's worst fear. However, at the level of the id (from which the monster, once repressed, is projected) this murder is what he most profoundly (or "ardently") desires.

The monster easily kills Elizabeth - even after issuing Victor with numerous warnings which hinted at such a murder. It is the same ease he has in pushing aside Victor's bed-curtain, a flimsy impediment between the world of "the amiableness of domestic affection" and the monstrous. The chilling discovery Victor and the reader make after Elizabeth's murder is that these two worlds are not separated by even such a penetrable membrane, but coexist in a kind of (vampiric) symbiosis in which desires are repressed and sublimated. Victor's inability to sublimate his desire for his dead mother through union with Elizabeth causes the dangerous desires to rear their proverbially ugly heads. The eruption/irruption of these desires has disastrous consequences for the Frankenstein family.
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Desire takes its ultimate form in the desire for death. As Freud famously observes in *Civilisation and its Discontents*, the erotic and thanatogenic instincts coexist. Both are diverted into manifestations of aggression, but *thanatos* directs this aggression inwards. Indeed, "besides the instinct to preserve living substance and join it into ever larger units, there must exist another, contrary instinct seeking to dissolve those units and to bring them back to their primaeval, inorganic state" (1985, 309-10).

The events of the novel indicate that Victor has not adequately resolved his Oedipal complex. As Mellor argues, referring to the moment in which Victor "embraced" his dead wife Elizabeth with "ardour":

Victor most ardently desires his bride when he knows she is dead. The conflation with his earlier dream, when he thought to embrace the living Elizabeth but instead held in his arms the corpse of his mother, signals Victor's most profound erotic desire, a necrophiliac and incestuous desire to possess the dead female, the lost mother. (1988, 121)

Victor's desire to die after his creature's killing spree can be related to this strong "necrophiliac and incestuous desire" as returning to the earth can be symbolic of returning to the womb. The fact that he transforms dead matter into the monster indicates his fixation on death, as Mellor suggests (121-22). Victor perceives his work (as Walton perceives his own work) as an attempt to progress, to advance the world, but it is in fact motivated by a desire for regression to his unresolved Oedipal crisis. This is important to understanding why Victor instantly rejects the creature on whom he has toiled so obsessively for so long. He cannot accept the creature because it is *animate*. His most intense and truest desire, as suggested by his dream, is for the inorganic, thus providing a symbolic reason for his construction of the creature out of corpses. Once the
corpus of corpses comes to life though, its very vitality threatens and disgusts the unconscious necrophiliac.

Hobbs (1993, 192-93) also explores the theme of the incest taboo in Frankenstein. The taboo itself is not violated, but the novel moves inevitably towards the marriage of Victor and Elizabeth, the consummation of which would ensure this violation. If the monster is seen to represent the hideous unspeakable, then it can metaphorically represent Victor's fear of sexuality and guilt that his future sexual partner is related to him. It is important that the 1831 edition considerably softens the incestuous overtones of the 1818 "original" through making Elizabeth an adopted orphan rather than a sister to Victor. He does not transgress the incest taboo and as Hobbs points out (163), Shelley makes it quite clear that Elizabeth's virginity is intact when she is killed on her wedding-night. However, the motif of taboo and transgression is still prevalent given that Victor has produced life out of inorganic matter and done so without procreating with a female. Here, nature and the life/death dichotomy are usurped in a manner structurally parallel to Dracula. In Stoker's novel, the Count usurps life/death through embodying both and neither and, like Victor, has the means at his disposal to create a new kind of being. The consequences of Victor's transgressive, unnatural act of creation are stated by Oates:

Since Frankenstein's creature is made up of parts collected from charnel houses and graves and his creator acknowledges that he "disturbed, with profane fingers, the tremendous secrets of the human frame," it is inevitable that the creature be a profane thing. He cannot be blessed or loved: he springs not from a natural union but has been forged in what Frankenstein calls a "workshop of filthy creation." (1984, 550, emphasis in original)
The monster emerges on Victor's wedding-night as a symbol that he cannot be united with Elizabeth because the fugitive figure denies any such unity. Even though it is an apparently inexorable event foreshadowed many times in the novel, it cannot take place. If it did, it would undermine the presence of the monstrous and suggest that the wild flow of desire embodied by the monster-figure could be repressed and a successful, domestic relationship founded. The monster, a figure for desire, impedes such a neat closure.

Importantly, it is also the path plotted for Victor by his parents, a "destiny" against which he unconsciously rebels. His father dies when learning of Elizabeth's murder thus releasing Victor from the constraints of the life planned for him but at the same time sending him into a meaningless spiral that can only end in oblivion.

Victor neglects his familial relations while creating the monster and can then continue this isolation when the monster begins killing his family. All too conveniently, his bride is killed on their wedding night, thus allowing the monomaniacal Victor to continue his obsession with his creature. While the monster does all the killing, Victor has, in a sense, been metaphorically doing this all along, hence his realisation of culpability. As Brooks observes:

The necrophilic embrace which is all that Frankenstein obtains follows the logic of his creative project, which has usurped the power to make life from the dead. Fulfillment with Elizabeth would mark Frankenstein's achievement of a full signified in his life, accession to plenitude of being - which would leave no place in creation for his daemonic projection, the Monster. That projection must act out Frankenstein's sadistic impulses in destruction of the being who would bring rest, and arrest, to Frankenstein's movement of desire, must maintain the lack that led to the Monster's creation in the first place. (1974, 214)

Bronfen argues that Shelley "compellingly impresses upon us... that the urge for artistic creativity is always irrevocably intertwined with the urge to destroy" (1994, 34, emphasis in
original). This creation/destruction dynamic, emphasised through the fact that the creature is animated out of dead body parts, mirrors Shelley's hopeful and anxious process of writing. The conflation between the desires for life and death is embodied in the creature who represents Victor's hope for creation and secret desire for destruction.

In this context, it is ironic that a kind of "death-wish" provides the previously lethargic and procrastinating Victor with a raison d'être: "I had formed in my own heart a resolution to pursue my destroyer to death; and this purpose quieted my agony, and for an interval reconciled me to life" (Shelley 1980, 199). The paradox inherent in this statement reinforces the idea of Victor being locked into a process of pursuit he cannot escape, except by dying.

Pursuing Degree Zero: Blurring in Wasteland

[Even when material is plentiful, but especially when it is not, there exists the danger that the writer will enter the narrative, inflated and indulged behind the fluctuating presence of the subject. It is inevitable that some vestiges of the narrating self will invade the notionally objective record. This is not necessarily a bad thing if properly and consciously controlled. Indeed, the metaphor for the biographer might be Victor Frankenstein's pursuit of his strange brain-child across the wastes of ice: what face will turn at last towards him, and will he find there, with an awful dismay, some of his own features fleetingly caught? (Matthews 1988, 7)

Desire is the link between the creature as a narrative fugitive figure and as a textual one because it is present in both cases, underlying the pursuits which take place simultaneously at these levels. At the narrative level, Victor's pursuit of the monster corresponds to the desire to return it to a state of repression. In other words, it is a desperate, egotistical attempt to re-establish the illusory sense of control the creature has destroyed. Yet at the same time, the creature desires Victor's pursuit because it lacks others to help it mean or make sense. This is why he desires a
mate so intensely and, when Victor refuses to comply, makes his creator the object of his vengeance, desiring to assert himself, to signify in any way, even if destructively, rather than to be meaningless and alone.

At the textual level, the changing state of pursuit between Victor and his creature mirrors the very process of signification itself. As observed in relation to the other texts discussed, signification is driven by desire. This makes the creature a fugitive figure in the textual as well as the narrative sense. He is responsible for the signification that takes place in the novel through ongoing pursuit and by resisting the attempts of Victor (or the reader) to arrest (and repress) him once and for all.

The monster's murderous acts never take place when Victor is convalescing or in prison. Instead, they all occur while he is travelling. This suggests the monster's mockery of his creator as well as serving to blur the creator with his creature once again through associating the former's movements with the latter. This leads to Victor's guilt by association and reinforces that the monster is a metaphorical projection of Victor's repressed urges.

After the murders of Clerval and Elizabeth and his grief-stricken father's death, Victor expresses a strong desire to die. He earlier contemplated suicide and his death seems unavoidable given his state of mind, especially before the final pursuit:

The deep grief which this scene had at first excited quickly gave way to rage and despair. They were dead, and I lived; their murderer also lived, and to destroy him I must drag out my weary existence. I knelt on the grass, and kissed the earth, and with quivering lips exclaimed, "By the sacred earth on which I kneel, by the shades that wander near me, by the deep and eternal grief that I feel, I swear; and by thee, O Night, and the spirits that preside over thee, to pursue the daemon, who caused this misery, until he or I shall perish in mortal conflict. For this purpose I will preserve my life: to execute this dear revenge, will I again behold the sun, and tread the green herbage of earth, which otherwise should vanish from my eyes for ever. And I call on you, spirits
of the dead; and on you, wandering ministers of vengeance, to aid and conduct me in my work. Let the cursed and hellish monster drink deep of agony; let him feel the despair that now torments me." (Shelley 1980, 202)

Earlier, Victor realises the futility of pursuing the monster when he states that "a creature who could exist in the ice-caves of the glaciers, and hide himself from pursuit among the ridges of inaccessible precipices, was a being possessing faculties it would be vain to cope with" (148).

Despite this, Victor does pursue his creature in an attempt to apprehend what is, by definition, beyond apprehension. The monster invites pursuit but denies the possibility of being captured (i.e. resolved into a coherent, definite meaning). Victor irrationally pursues the creature because he has no choice - he is driven by desire causing the blurring of self/other, creator/created, pursuer/pursued. At the narrative level, the figures of Victor and his creature move towards their deaths. This movement is paralleled by indeterminate signification at the textual level. In the pursuit across the frozen wastes, it is amply evident that the creature is in control of proceedings, Victor powerless. However, the former also moves towards the abyss of death by stating his intention to ascend his funeral pile (Shelley 1980, 223) after Victor has died.

When pursuit begins, the pursuer desires and imagines a harmonious union with the pursued. This is represented at first by Victor's desire to create a being which would honour him:

No one can conceive the variety of feelings which bore me onwards, like a hurricane, in the first enthusiasm of success. Life and death appeared to me ideal bounds, which I should first break through, and pour a torrent of light into our dark world. A new species would bless me as its creator and source; many happy and excellent natures would owe their being to me. No father could claim the gratitude of his child so completely as I should deserve theirs. Pursuing these reflections, I thought, that if I could bestow animation upon lifeless matter, I might in process of time (although I now found it impossible) renew life where death had apparently devoted the body to corruption. (Shelley 1980, 54)
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Following Victor's rejection of the creature, the pursuer's desire for the pursued is represented by the latter's desire for its creator's recognition and esteem. However, this desire is denied by the frustratingly persistent evasion of the pursued. Through this process of pursuit, a (con)fusion between pursuer and pursued occurs that continues to defer and displace the desire which generated the pursuit in the first place.

At the novel's climax, although Victor pursues the monster intent on revenge, he is only ostensibly the pursuer. The monster controls the situation. He determines where the pursuit leads - ever closer to the North Pole where the extreme climatic conditions favour his survival and his creator's debilitation. He also leaves traces of his path to encourage Victor's pursuit, realising that it is physically impossible for Victor to capture him, but that he will, literally, die trying. This allows the monster to manipulate the situation so that he can cause his creator to suffer greatly both physically and in the knowledge that despite his desperate attempts to capture him, the creature is still "on the loose" and evading his plans for revenge:

What his feelings were whom I pursued I cannot know. Sometimes, indeed, he left marks in writing on the barks of the trees, or cut in stone, that guided me and instigated my fury. "My reign is not yet over" (these words were legible in one of these inscriptions); "you live, and my power is complete. Follow me; I seek the everlasting ices of the north, where you will feel the misery of cold and frost to which I am impassive. You will find near this place, if you follow not too tardily, a dead hare; eat and be refreshed. Come on, my enemy; we have yet to wrestle for our lives; but many hard and miserable hours must you endure until that period shall arrive." (204-5)

The creature completes his emergence into the symbolic order by becoming articulate through listening to the language lessons Felix gives Safie and through his reading of Plutarch, Volney, Goethe and Milton. Indeed, he becomes acutely aware of his strangeness through reading. He becomes "other" to himself. This is another point where narrative and textual
fugitivity can be seen to intersect. His status as a fugitive figure is made evident in the use of images of evanescence in the following: "Increase of knowledge only discovered to me more clearly what a wretched outcast I was. I cherished hope, it is true; but it vanished, when I beheld my person reflected in water, or my shadow in the moonshine, even as that frail image and that inconstant shade" (131).

While the monster's first experience of language is in its own attempts to mimic the songs of birds in the woods, it soon becomes aware that language has more to do with the absence than the presence of things. For example, when listening to the conversations of Felix, Safie and Agatha,

I perceived that the words they spoke sometimes produced pleasure or pain, smiles or sadness, in the minds and countenances of the hearers. This was indeed a godlike science, and I ardently desired to become acquainted with it. But I was baffled in every attempt I made for this purpose. Their pronunciation was quick; and the words they uttered, not having any apparent connection with visible objects, I was unable to discover any clue by which I could unravel the mystery of their reference. (112)

The monster's realisation that language is more than a form of mimesis and in fact relies on differentiation and the substitution of signs for things which are absent, implies a depth of knowledge about language which empowers it considerably as it operates in the symbolic world of its creator. This empowerment is evidenced in the chase at the novel's end in which the creature, through textual traces, manipulates its pursuing creator and causes the chase to be prolonged, literally to the ultimate extreme of the North Pole.

The monster reveals this empowerment by "writing" clues in stone and on bark for Victor to follow. This demonstrates that he is leading the pursuit in the direction and according to the conditions of his choice, forcing Victor to take a certain course. It is also important because the
monster is now an educated being. Victor is unable to achieve control of his creature because of the latter's acquisition of language.

This apprehension and application of linguistic codes is synonymous with the conscious expression of independent thoughts and motives. The creature displays the capacity to consider alternatives and the difference between the actual and the ideal. He exhibits these characteristics as he acquires language. This symbolises his transition from dependent infant to independent individual, making him the adult equal of his creator. It enables the creature to make sense of his emotions and use reason to help him articulate and fully comprehend the injustice done to him by his creator and others.

The acquisition of language also allows the creature to feel hope. Although his reading alerts him to his isolation and often creates in him moods of "despondency", he thinks that he may be made less hideous by his eloquence: "when I contemplated the virtues of the cottagers, their amiable and benevolent dispositions, I persuaded myself that when they should be acquainted with my admiration of their virtues, they would compassionate me, and overlook my personal deformity" (Shelley 1980, 130). This hope is severely blighted by Felix beating him away from Mr De Lacey (135). Later, it is savagely annihilated during Victor's tearing up of the body parts designed to constitute the creature's mate. From this point, the monster's eloquence is reserved for the exclusive expression of his despair, anger and desire for revenge on his creator. The creature's writing represents its simultaneous presence and absence as a repressed-and-erupting *figure* of desire.

The extent to which Victor and his creature have exchanged roles by the novel's end of the novel is expressed by Mellor:
During their final chase across the frozen Arctic wastes, Frankenstein and his creature are indistinguishable. Hunter and hunted blur into one consciousness, one spirit of revenge, one despair, one victim... Victor both pursues and is pursued by his creature... Finally, both Frankenstein and his creature are lost in darkness among the frozen Arctic wastes. By the end of the novel, we cannot separate the wretched, solitary Frankenstein from the wretched, solitary monster... The creature has become his creator, the creator has become his creature. (1988, 135-6)

The only possible outcome of the chase which concludes the novel is the death of the two protagonists. The extent of Victor's despair, his capitulation to the death-instinct is evident in the words he utters before his death: "That he should live to be an instrument of mischief disturbs me; in other respects, this hour when I momentarily expect my release, is the only happy one which I have enjoyed for several years. The forms of the beloved dead flit before me, and I hasten to their arms" (Shelley 1980, 217). The irony of this statement is that the monster no longer has the desire to "be an instrument of mischief" as Victor puts it. With the death of his creator, the monster has no other against which to "define" itself. Indeed, he now longs for his own death. Like his creator, he is consumed by thanatos:

I shall die. I shall no longer feel the agonies which now consume me, or be the prey of feelings unsatisfied, yet unquenched. He is dead who called me into being; and when I shall be no more, the very remembrance of us both will speedily vanish. I shall no longer see the sun or stars, or feel the winds play on my cheeks. Light, feeling and sense will pass away; and in this condition must I find my happiness... where can I find rest but in death? (222-3)

The monstrous unnameable that is Frankenstein's monster is in fact, the monstrous textual "progeny" of Mary Shelley's: *Frankenstein* itself. Ultimately, this monstrous overflowing of irrational desire, not only denies the determination of a single meaning, but actually strains towards entropy, the zero-signification of complete and utter meaninglessness, a kind of
linguistic embodiment of the death-instinct in which, as Brooks observes, Victor and his creature are the narrative pawns:

Frankenstein and his Monster are in fact by now engaged in an exacerbated dialectic of desire, in which each needs the other because the other represents for each the lack or gap within himself. Frankenstein sets out in pursuit of the Monster intending to destroy him, but also with a firm intuition that the Monster's death will be his own death - that in destroying the daemonic side of himself, he will also destroy the whole of self... The Monster flees from Frankenstein, yet never escapes completely, intent that Frankenstein maintain his pursuit, the only form of recognition by his creator that he can exact, his last tenuous link to the signifying chain... The pursuit finally leads toward the very heart of non-meaning, toward the lifeless pole, the immaculate icecap. (1974, 214)

When Brooks states that "in destroying the daemonic side of himself, he will also destroy the whole of self", one is reminded of the way in which Jekyll dies, sacrificing himself in order to prevent Hyde from attaining complete mastery of his being. He too is described (by Utterson) as a "self-destroyer" (Stevenson 1979, 70), an interesting term which encapsulates the paradoxical mixture of civility-barbarism embodied by Jekyll-Hyde.

In Frankenstein, blurring begins the moment the monster opens its "dull, watery, yellow" eyes. Its most obvious incarnation is in the tense pursuit across the frozen wastes which concludes the novel, but throughout, Victor is confused with the monstrous and the monster assumes genuine human qualities of intelligence and feeling. The important part of the blurring is, as with the other two texts, the fact that it problematises any notion of coherent identity. The process of blurring indicates indeterminacy, epistemological and textual uncertainty which is the fugitive process of signification. Even though Victor perishes after the harrowing pursuit, the fugitive figure of the creature survives through the "darkness and distance" into which it leads the text.
Representing The Unrepresentable: Sublime "Darkness and Distance"

The genre has always in all genres been able to play the role of order's principle: resemblance, analogy, identity and difference, taxonomic classification, organization and genealogical tree, order of reason, order of reasons, sense of sense, truth of truth, natural light and sense of history. Now... Madness has given birth to and thrown light on the genre in the most dazzling, most blinding sense of the word. (Derrida 1981, 77)

Stoker and Shelley's texts can be described as "narrative patchworks". They are both a mishmash of intersecting, overlapping genres. This patchwork mirrors Victor's assemblage of the creature that enables the narrative to actually take place. Frankenstein is intertextual, with numerous references by its characters to works of other writers, for instance, the monster's reference [1980, 136] to the "hell within me" recalling Paradise Lost. It also alludes to Coleridge and the Promethean myths, among others. These references remind the reader of the text's artifice, its elaborate collection of representations. This is important because it indicates that these representations, through the deferment of signifiers, are only ever partially successful.

The monsters are also metaphors for the text out of control. It is not merely coincidental that Shelley (1980, 10) referred to the text as "my hideous progeny". Just as Hyde and the Count with his "child-brain" are like aberrant children, so too is Frankenstein's monster. Once again, this reading of the monstrous figures in these texts has important textual implications. If the monsters "run riot" in each of the three narratives, this out-of-control behaviour is a mirror for the recalcitrant running of signifiers toward the abyss. All three novels end in death, yet amazingly, none of the monsters are ultimately killed in a satisfactory manner; deferment is suggested even in "closure".
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Importantly, a written record accumulates on Frankenstein's monster. The story is not mediated through an omniscient narrator but is instead presented to the reader through a series of narrators who tell stories within each others' stories. Victor's story is told in Walton's letters to his sister, Margaret Saville, and the monster tells his own story within Victor's story. Walton is the frame narrator, but is not granted the space or authority Utterson ostensibly enjoys in *Jekyll and Hyde* because he figures less prominently than Victor and his creature. This technique distances the reader from "what actually happened". Not only is the story told by different characters using different forms (letters, description, dialogues etc.) but each of these characters provides their own perspective on happenings and the fugitive (creature) figure seems to move ever further from the reader.

This indicates the profound ambiguity of the text and assists in the blurring between Victor, his monster and Walton, who plays the role in *Frankenstein* that Utterson assumes in *Jekyll and Hyde*, except that in the latter text there is an overarching third-person narrator. Walton's role is to relate to the reader the experiences of the ill-fated Victor. It is also implied that he might fall into the same trap that captures the hubristic Victor. This is similar to *Jekyll and Hyde*, where Utterson reflects that there are things hidden in his past which he would not like to come to light (Stevenson 1979, 42).

The complex narrative structure also problematises the notion of truth. It suggests the epistemological problem the reader faces - what can we know of what "really" happened given the complex means through which we learn of the incidents detailed in the book? It reminds us that we are limited by our language even as language "creates" us. The blurring between the characters, especially between Victor and his monster, reinforces this sense that the "self" is
never totally realised: it is always infiltrated by proliferating otherness. Language can only begin
to approach this identity rather than fully and finally apprehending it.

This means that although the monster slips off into "darkness and distance" at the end of
the novel after the death of its creator, it can always be glimpsed through examining the textual
evidence of its appearance-and-disappearance. Stevenson and Stoker, in their texts more than
half a century later, also emphasise this textual evidence by having records of their h(id)eous
villains kept. These records provide testimony to their textual as well as narrative fugitivity and
serve to foreground this fugitivity as a dominant trope of the novels.

The way in which the story of Frankenstein is told through the different forms of
narrative in the text and ultimately preserved in Walton's journal signals the attempt to arrest the
fugitive monstrosity in a manner beyond the despair-stricken Victor. Yet, as the numerous
readings of the text suggest, the apprehension of the textual fugitive figure is no more possible
than that of the narrative fugitive figure. As Noble argues, "Writing involves ambiguity; it has a
permanency but distances the relation between writer and reader, perhaps never to be
consummated... The written word becomes a monster, devoid of a guarantee of human
association and out of control of the creator" (1992, 89-90).

The story of Victor Frankenstein and his monster is told in a manner bearing important
similarities to the other texts already discussed, in particular Dracula. The structure of Shelley's
novel and the way in which it is narrated contribute to the permeation of the text by fugitivity. As
Sterrenburg notes:
The messianic struggles of the hero are presented subjectively, in an autobiographical confession we cannot fully trust, and surrounded by equally subjective editors, interlocutors, and interpreters, whose presence further complicates our hope of finding a simple ideological meaning. (1974, 145)

Sterrenburg could almost be talking about \textit{Dracula} in making such an assertion. Indeed, this argument has a similar tone to that characterising Jonathan Harker's disclaimer at the end of Stoker's novel:

We were struck with the fact, that in all the mass of material of which the record is composed, there is hardly one authentic document; nothing but a mass of type-writing, except the later notebooks of Mina and Seward and myself, and Van Helsing's memorandum. We could hardly ask anyone, even did we wish to, to accept these as proofs of so wild a story. (1993, 486)

In neither text is there the possibility of finding what Sterrenburg refers to as "a simple ideological meaning". The emergence of the Count and Frankenstein's monster symbolise a devastating rupture of the everyday, domestic, civilised world by submerged unnameable forces.

This rupture parallels that between signifier and signified, an irremediable breach allowing no single "meaning" or resolution to emerge. The Count, Edward Hyde and Frankenstein's monster are irrational figures representing the desire inherent in signification, a desire passing from signifier to signifier at both the textual and narrative levels. The desire for monstrosity, abomination and aberration passes from the monster to Victor (who comes to see himself as the murderer of his family) from the Count to Lucy and from Hyde to Jekyll to Utterson. According to Noble, "[a]t its heart, the novel has the monster retell the stories of the cottagers overheard... These stories contain the recount of lessons in French given to a Turkish Arab in a German-speaking region, and the whole rendered in English" (1992, 88). Thus Shelley
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undermines the possibility of ever finding a simple ultimate "truth" underlying the events described. Just as a series of narrators create a distancing effect of story-within-story, the language-within-language structure generated also contributes to this sense of fugitivity.

In a sense, *Frankenstein* is the account of the unrepresentable represented through narrative layers and patchwork. The combination of the distancing effect of the narrative layers and the anti-authenticating effect of having numerous voices and narrative genres, serves to simulate the response to encountering the sublime unknowable (and inexpressible) represented by the fugitive figure of Frankenstein's monster. This fugitivity is guaranteed by the novel's ending in which the monster disappears in "darkness and distance" (an opacity and non-proximity replicated by the structures of the text), promising to kill itself. But this is something the reader never witnesses. In other words, the narrative signification of the creature's promise, once again, is important at the textual level. The important issue of "closure" as it relates to fugitivity will be addressed a little later in this discussion.

Brooks discusses the monster's interaction with Walton, the last person to encounter the embodiment of monstrosity in the text. Walton has the unenviable task of "closing" the narrative. Brooks makes more explicit his concern with the interaction between signification and monstrosity and the very *textuality* of this monstrosity. He argues that Frankenstein's creature recognises the ultimate futility of pursuing a social relationship and that his failure to do so "states his recognition that his effort to enter the signifying chain is at an end" (1974, 218). Furthermore,

The ostensible recipient of Walton's letters (and hence of the interpolated manuscript of Frankenstein, itself containing the Monster's narrative) is Margaret Saville, Walton's sister... But she has no more existence in the novel than a postal address. She is 273
inscribed as a kind of lack of being, leaving us with only a text, a narrative tissue that
never wholly conceals its lack of ultimate reference and its interminable projection
forward to no destination... [T]he text remains as [an] indelible record of the monstrous,
emblem of language's murderous lack of transcendent reference. (1974, 219-20)

The monster, like the "truth" of the matter as it is expressed through the narrative acts of
signification is, in that aptly tantalising (dis)figuration, "lost in darkness and distance". In
exorcising the demonic monster, Victor/Shelley loses his/her voice and the narrative itself meets
its death, leaving only a final statement of indeterminacy, an (in)articulate acknowledgement of
the fugitive (and monstrous) unnameable.

The Metonymic Fluidity of the Fugitive Figure

And the enigmas which desire seems to pose for a "natural philosophy" - its frenzy
mocking the abyss of the infinite, the secret collusion by which it obscures the pleasure
of knowing and of joyful domination, these amount to nothing more than that
derangement of the instincts that comes from being caught on the rails - eternally
stretching forth towards the desire for something else - of metonymy. (Lacan 1988, 97)

The monster is a metaphor for a range of different possible things. It has been seen to represent
the revolting proletarian masses (Moretti 1988), as a figure for the the Oriental Other (Lew 1991)
and a "fallen angel" (Oates 1984), to cite just a few. However, the key point is that the fluid
nature of the creature - as it does for the Count in Dracula - serves to indicate the polysemic
fugitivity of the narrative/textual figure and of figuration itself. The creature is never physically
apprehended by Victor in the novel - from the moment it is animated, it is "on the loose", a
"fugitive" in the popular sense of the term. This narrative elusiveness is paralleled by the
creature's textually figurative nature. The great range of critical debate about it and the text itself
and the many and varied ways of seeing the creature-figure point to its polysemy, its epistemological evasion and indeterminacy. This evasion is a function of its simultaneous narrative and textual fugitivity. As James argues,

In the course of writing this essay I became aware that I was pursuing, and was being pursued by, a Monster of fearsome proportions and indistinct shape. If Mary Shelley's Monster has no name, paradoxically, in recent decades it has been given more identities than Melville's great white whale, and indeed, Frankenstein's Monster has been compared to Moby Dick. A recent bibliography includes some 300 books and essays on Frankenstein, but it is not comprehensive. Monstrous indeed. (1994, 77, emphasis in original)

Clearly, Frankenstein's monster is metaphorically flexible, capable of standing in for a wide range of other things. Yet it cannot be limited to the metaphoric pole. The fugitive figure metaphorically represents the projection of desires, but its movement is a sliding one. Its capacity to metamorphose into different metaphorical shapes occurs because it is a shifting signifier. It slides liquidly between variant readings. This sliding is arrested by the reader and a congealed metaphor is imposed on the text, but the metaphor is not universal or absolute. It is only one of many formed by this process of metamorphosis due to a metonymic sliding. This conflation occurs through the figure's capacity to meta(phor)morphose at any moment.

In the passage above, James self-consciously evokes the sense of the metonymic fluidity of the fugitive figure as Frankenstein's creature inscribes it. He does so through the image of pursuer-pursued and suggests the different textual contexts in which this dialectic of pursuit is manifest. It is clear that every writer pursues a self-begotten monster which continually invites pursuit and yet remains inescapably elusive (allusive). The blurring of Victor and his creature metonymically represents the process by which signs mutate into different connotative and
denotative meanings. As Jackson argues regarding the fantastic, "[o]ther persons and objects are no longer distinctly other: the limit between subject and object is effaced, things slide into one another, in a metonymical action of replacement" (1981, 50).

Although Frankenstein's monster can learn about himself through reading his creator's diaries, the fact remains that he is composed of a patchwork of parts from different bodies and has been produced by an unnatural act. The monster desperately tries to make sense of himself, but, as his rhetorical questions (in both senses of the term) suggest, he is as existentially vulnerable as any other being, unable to retrace his origins. If he is to be seen as a figure of language, then this situation can be likened to signifiers never settling on a determinate signified.

In the novel, Shelley's characters cover a lot of ground. There is an emphasis on movement. This is important because movement is a fundamentally fugitive process. It involves transience and evanescence and denies the possibility of stasis, the settling in or fixing upon one spot. Once again, this movement is metaphorical for the fluidity of signification. Therefore, in the following, Victor's observation about the "traveller's life" is applicable on the textual as well as narrative level to indicate the fugitivity of signification as well as human experience:

But he found that a traveller's life is one that includes much pain amidst its enjoyments. His feelings are forever on the stretch; and when he begins to sink into repose, he finds himself obliged to quit that on which he rests in pleasure for something new, which again engages his attention, and which also he forsakes for other novelties. (1980, 161)

This passage, with its emphasis on movement and the restlessness of attention, anticipates the modern figure of the flâneur. Yet, Victor is certainly not a "man of the crowd" despite this restlessness. This image is ironic since it precedes his departure from Clerval to travel to the
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Orkneys to complete his "wild work" of making a mate for the creature. Once again, he is about to engage with his narcissistic desire in almost absolute isolation.

Frankenstein, like Dracula and Jekyll and Hyde, preoccupies itself with the search for an "origin". This is not surprising when the subtitle "The Modern Prometheus" is considered, as both Promethean myths incorporate the ideas of origin or creation within them. In one myth, Prometheus steals fire from Zeus. In another, Zeus chains the immortal Prometheus to a rock for an eagle to eat his liver each day. Shelley's text also refers quite explicitly to Milton's Paradise Lost which is, of course, a poetic representation of the Fall of Lucifer and humanity's Fall from the Garden of Eden, archetypal myths of origin.

In Frankenstein, there is a tension between the old and the modern. The old is represented by Victor's reading of discarded alchemists, his use of dead bodies, and the presence of patriarchal families. The modern, as in Dracula, is represented by the role of new technology. The monster is, after all, created by galvanism, a scientific phenomenon of the time. Also, Walton's voyage represents a bold new exploratory conquest. While Stoker can be seen to unreservedly praise modern inventions (when allied with Van Helsing's superstition and lore), Shelley is much more reticent about their virtues as Victor's fate suggests. She indicates the potentially negative social ramifications of ill-considered uses of technological advancements. Indeed, one way in which the creature has been metaphorically (allegorically) read is as a figure for "science gone wrong", the latent threat of catastrophe posed by innovation. Easlea, for example, invests Frankenstein's creature with contemporary concerns about science in "Fathering the Unthinkable, Masculinity, Scientists and the Nuclear Arms Race" (1983).

This movement from inorganic to organic and back to inorganic, is punctuated by the search for meaning, the transcendental signifier. This movement veils a set of underlying motives
and is supplemented by the main protagonists' use of metaphors of self-justification. While ultimately, at the most fundamental level, the actions of Victor and his creature are the manifestations of their battling instincts (both with each other and within themselves), these actions are rationalised by grand narrative-of-self metaphors. These "grand narratives" are best represented in capital letters to indicate their forceful, dramatic justification. Thus, Victor makes his new creature "To Pour a Torrent of Light into Our Dark World" (1980, 54). His creature kills all those close to Victor who vows to pursue the creature and "Let Him Feel The Despair that Now Torments Me" (202). Victor pursues the creature despite the latter's enormous supernatural advantage because "I Was Reserved for Vengeance" (202). These motivations provide a context for the ongoing game of pursuit which is hypostatised into something apparently transcendent. Comments like "I was reserved for vengeance" betray a belief in a higher power and a succumbing to that power, whether imagined or real. This is the transcendental signifier Victor feels is compelling his own acts. If there is any "truth" to the pursuit scenario though, it is simply that the two are sado-masochistically (or narcissistically, if we consider the creature a metaphorical projection of Victor's self) entwined in a game which excludes all others. This process of exclusion began with Victor's self-imposed isolation from his family, an isolation taken to its logical extreme - the murder of all these people. Once all his family are no longer alive to influence his actions, he is free to be as self-indulgent as he likes. His visit to the magistrate to elicit support to capture the creature is a hypocritical one because he knows that no one will believe his story, but he goes anyway to provide him with another Grand Motivation: "You Refuse My Just Demand: I Have But One Resource; And I Devote Myself, Either in My Life or Death, To His Destruction" (200). These words are all too appropriate, because the creature is, in many senses, all of Victor's life and death. This can be related to Burke's sublime
in which the fear of death as it is embodied by the inexpressible is paradoxically aligned with the
desire for it. In other words, as Freud suggested, eros and thanatos are always "alloyed" and
inseparable (1985, 309-10).

Ultimately, the only thing to survive is the story passed on by Walton. In other words, the
text itself survives, complex, polysemic and resistant to a unilateral, definitive interpretation. The
two most important tellers of this story, its two key protagonists, Victor and his monster, are both
vanquished within and outlived by it.

Frankenstein's monster, as well as being a fugitive in the popular sense of the term, is a
metaphor for the process of fugitivity in which meaning flees from language. All attempts to
apprehend it result in a theoretically infinite chain of signification along which each only
partially, superficially adequate signifier is deferred. The creature rebels against his creator and
the text is no longer under the control of the author. The creature describes him as "the author at
once of my existence and of its unspeakable torments" (220). Given these references to
authorship and the revulsion with which Victor responds to the animation of his creature, it can
be said that what he experiences is analogous to the author's alienation from the disseminating
text. This alienation is evident in Victor's initial shocked reaction to his creation and his
creature's building hatred of him.

As in The Vampire Chronicles, Jekyll and Hyde and Dracula, the monster in
Frankenstein is an erupting projection of the self's hidden illicit desires. The monstrous figure
functions in the text in order to simultaneously disrupt perceptions of subjectivity and
signification. Just as the self is, through the uncanny workings of the unconscious, intimately and
irrevocably other, so too is language invested with the exploding otherness of overdetermination,
the rampant sprawl of aberrant signifiers. The monster-figure and its symbolic deployment
throughout the text evidences this subjective otherness and overdetermined signification. This occurs through a process of fugitivity in which the narrative evocation of self-as-other is paralleled by a metaphorical or textual layer of the text which works at a deeper level to indicate the monstrous unnameable desire and our inability to either kill it off or live with it.
CONCLUSION:

ENDLESS (PER)MUTATIONS:

MONSTROUS FUGITIVITY AND (INTER)TEXTUAL SELF-BEGETTING

_The confinement of the scientific object is the same as that of the insane and the dead. And just as the whole of the society is hopelessly contaminated by that mirror of madness it has held out for itself, so science can only die contaminated by the death of the object which is its inverse mirror. It is science which ostensibly masters the object, but it is the latter which deeply invests the former, following an unconscious reversion, giving only dead and circular replies to a dead and circular interrogation._

(Baudrillard, 1988, 258)

At the outset of this thesis, it was suggested that any attempt to provide a definition of fugitivity would be futile. Instead, an exploration of instances of fugitivity in their (literary) contexts would be most amenable to gaining an understanding of it. It was emphasised that fugitivity is implicated in the impossibility of arresting meaning. Thus any critical pursuit of it would be inherently paradoxical, producing an outcome to the pursuit other than the desired capture of the traditionally pursued object. This different "outcome" is in fact a misnomer: there is no "outcome" as such. Gothic fugitivity radically disavows notions of closure, completion, restoration of order/sense. Consequently, any attempt to "conclude" a discussion on fugitivity necessitates several important qualifying remarks.

The analyses comprising this thesis suggest that Gothic texts avoid the traditionally desired closure of a final, satisfactory (and satisfying/gratifying) meaning. This avoidance occurs through the rampant dissemination of the signifier at both narrative and textual levels. Dissemination, the irresolvable deferral and deferment observed by Derrida and Barthes, takes place through the mobilisation of the fugitive figure. Here, "mobilisation" suggests movement that is simultaneously narrative and textual.
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Examples of this mobilisation and its narrative, textual and cultural implications have been provided through an exploration of seminal and contemporary Gothic texts. To "conclude" this exploration, this pursuit of the fugitive figure through mobilisation of that same elusive figure, I will discuss in greater detail a text to which I have alluded at numerous points, Poe's "The Purloined Letter".

The Gothic Detective Narrative: "The Purloined Letter" of Fugitive Desire

I'd rather see you dead little girl than to be with another man
You better hide your head little girl
or I won't know where I am
You better run for your life if you can little girl
Hide your head in the sand little girl
Catch you with another man
That's the end -
Little girl...

- "Run for your Life" (The Beatles)

Poe wrote many Gothic tales, perhaps most famously "The Fall of the House of Usher". Yet, "The Purloined Letter" does not "belong" to this genre, but that of detective fiction. The familial connection between Gothic and detective fiction is discernible in this short story through the traditional use of heroes, villains and a victimised heroine, all in a confined sphere of action. Detective fiction, as Day (1985) notes, grows out of the Gothic and its representation of irrationality. This irrationality, typically characterised as feminine, is decoded and understood by the detective who combines intellect and intuition in a masterful manner to solve the baffling mysteries at hand.
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In the case of "The Purloined Letter", Dupin, as the detective, fulfils his pre-designated role as the restorer of order. If Gothic fiction provides the reader with anxiety or terror about the chaotic madness of the world, then detective fiction, which adopts many of the conventions of Gothic fiction, provides a new heroic figure. As Day argues:

The characteristic narrative form of the Gothic fantasy is designed to create a sense of formlessness and refuses to obey our assumptions about narrative as a meaningful sequence of action or to serve as an analogue to the world outside the text. The closure and logic essential to the realistic or romance form are avoided to create a narrative whose order appears arbitrary and chaotic...

The implication is that we can trust neither the teller nor the tale. Out of the need to halt this tendency toward absolute instability evolves the figure of the detective and the genre that responds to the instabilities of the Gothic fantasy, the detective story. (1985, 49-50)

The detective resolves the apparently inexplicable into what Todorov calls the "uncanny". In Todorov's terms (1975), he approaches the supposedly irresolvable or unsolvable and gives it a scientific, rational, everyday, logical explanation. This is what is expected of Dupin. Compared to the graphic fantasies of Gothic fiction, "The Purloined Letter" is "tame", but this is not to say that it does not exhibit typically Gothic traits.

The main reason for incorporating Poe's short story into this conclusion is because it explores narrative and textual issues through their interaction with desire. In other words, it deploys textual fugitive figures to investigate, through the narrative fugitive figure of that masterly reader, Dupin, the intersection between desire and representation. At stake, as in the Gothic novels analysed, is the status of identity and the radical dissolution of self and other. Also, this identity crisis as it is enacted in the narrative and textual figurations of the short story produces an epistemological uncertainty. Therefore, the decision to analyse this short story is based on its capacity to reveal these simultaneous figurations of the narrative and the textual -
even as it tries to control them through the demystifying force of the rational, yet intuitive, Dupin.

This discussion of "The Purloined Letter" will concern itself as much with the meta-textual readings (writings) as with the "primary" text which the former circumnavigate. In particular, it will foreground the debate between Lacan and Derrida. Ultimately, their engagement within the terms of the letter's circulation does nothing to arrest the letter nor cause it to arrive, but continues to prolong this desired arrival indefinitely. Lacan and Derrida both use textual fugitive figures to signify this prolonging of the letter's circulation.

In "The Purloined Letter", the Prefect of the Parisian police provides the narrator and his friend, the detective Auguste Dupin, with an apparently intriguing case. A private document of the Queen's ("a personage of most exalted station") is stolen from the royal boudoir by Minister D-, whose "lynx eye" perceives the document's importance. The contents of this document would compromise the Queen's honour were they to be viewed by the King ("the other exalted personage from whom especially it was her wish to conceal it"). The Queen witnesses the Minister's appropriation of the document (but cannot challenge this appropriation because the King is present). The Minister uses the Queen's knowledge of his possession of this document as a political lever. The Queen enlists the aid of the Prefect who conducts an exhaustive search of the Minister's premises, knowing that the Minister must have the document close at hand to be expedient. However, this search proves fruitless. Dupin decides to visit the Minister to confirm his belief that the document is indeed in the Minister's room, but that it is "all too self-evident" for the Prefect to see. He observes the letter, crumpled, torn and marked, in the Minister's card rack and shortly after, departs, leaving behind a gold snuff-box for which he calls on the Minister the following day. He pays a man to cause a disturbance in the street below the Minister's
window so that while the Minister is distracted, he can replace the letter in question with a "facsimile". This allows the Queen to know he no longer has the incriminating letter, but the Minister will presumably continue acting as if he did, thus leading to his demise. Dupin leaves a message for the Minister in the facsimile cryptically referring in French, to "So baleful a plan, if unworthy of Atreus, is worthy of Thyestes" (Mabbott 1988, 27).

Poe's story is famously read by Lacan in his "Seminar on 'The Purloined Letter'" where he uses Poe's story to demonstrate his psychoanalytic theories. In particular, he argues that the letter functions as a signifier which orients (and re-orients) the intersubjective relationships in the tale. Lacan represents these relationships as triangles. The characters in this tale, like ostriches with their heads in the sand, delude themselves into believing that they are in control of the letter and the power that it confers while in reality they are merely following the letter's own itinerary. Indeed, as Muller and Richardson explain, "[i]t is the traversing of the subjects by the signifying chain that constitutes them precisely as the kind of subjects that they are" (1988, 62).

Through fugitive figuration, the polysemic disseminations of a text like "The Purloined Letter" together constitute a fugitive figure (the "text") which is then pursued by its would-be apprehenders. In this case, the fugitive figure of "The Purloined Letter" is self-consciously pursued by Lacan whose meta-textual "reading" then becomes the fugitive figure for Derrida's own meta-textual figurations. As Chambers explains, Derrida criticises "Lacan's reading for its supposed imposition on the text of a psychoanalytic 'meaning' (the interpretation of the story in terms of castration - the letter as that which 'manque à sa place'" (1984, 54). Yet each pursuer (including Chambers), through the act of pursuing the fugitive figure, leaves behind themselves a network of traces that renders them as "fugitive" as the figure which they pursued. The outcome of this process through which the pursuer becomes the pursued at the very moment pursuit
begins is best symbolised by Derrida's image of the ostrich presenting its tail feathers to be plucked. Derrida argues that Lacan identifies through the "success of the psychoanalyst" (1988a, 190) with Dupin's triumphant withdrawal to an apparent position of objectivity after stealing the letter from the minister. However, Dupin cannot escape the circuit so easily:

As the signifier has but one proper place, fundamentally there is but one place for the letter, and this place is occupied successively by all those who possess it. It must be recognized, then, that Dupin, once he has entered into the circuit, having identified with the minister in order to take the letter back from him and to put it back on its "proper course", can no longer depart from this course. He must go through it in its entirety... from the outset, Dupin acts with his sights set on the letter, on possessing it in order to return it to its rightful owner (neither the King, nor the Queen, but the Law which binds them), and thus finds himself preferable to his (brother) enemy, his younger or twin brother (Atreus/Thyestes), to the minister who fundamentally pursues the same aims, with the same gestures... There are only ostriches, no one can avoid being plucked, and the more one is master, the more one presents one's rear. Which will be the case for whoever identifies with Dupin. (1988a, 189-91)

As "[t]here are only ostriches, no one can avoid being plucked" suggests, even Dupin gets "plucked". This occurs because he enters into the circuit and "can no longer depart from this course. He must go through it in its entirety." His apparent logical/intuitive mastery of the situation does not preclude him from the system's symbolic implications.

As well as his triumphant identification with Dupin, Derrida observes how Lacan "blindly" refuses to problematise Dupin's friend, the narrator of "The Purloined Letter":

Once the narrator is distinguished from the author and then the "scriptor," he is no longer the formal condition of the narration that might symmetrically be opposed to the content, as the narrating to the narrated, for example. He intervenes in a specific fashion, is simultaneously too self-evident and invisible in a triangle, and therefore in a triangle that touches the other triangle at one of its "angles," touching both "intersubjective" triangles. Which singularly complicates the "intersubjective" structure, and this time from within the framed, the twice-framed scenes, from within the represented content...
By framing in this violent way, by cutting the narrated figure itself from a fourth side in order to see only triangles, one evades perhaps a certain complication, perhaps of the Oedipal structure, which is announced in the scene of writing. (1988, 181, emphasis in original)

Derrida's use of "too self evident" recalls Dupin's assessment that the Prefect cannot find the Minister's letter because it is, in a manner of speaking, "right under his nose". Indeed, when the Prefect visits Dupin and the narrator to explain the particulars of the case, he says:

"The fact is, we have all been a good deal puzzled because the affair is so simple, and yet baffles us altogether."
"Perhaps it is the very simplicity of the thing which puts you at fault," said my friend.
"What nonsense you do talk!" replied the Prefect, laughing heartily.
"Perhaps the mystery is a little too plain," said Dupin.
"Oh, good heavens! who ever heard of such an idea?"
"A little too self-evident." (Poe 1988, 7, emphases in original)

Intriguingly, this word, "baffle", "turns up" again. In a sense, it is apt that it makes an appearance in Poe's story since it indicates that the Prefect's being perplexed, bewildered, occurs not only at the narrative level, but at what Chambers refers to as the level of "narratorial authority" (1984, 50-71). In other words, just as Hyde and Dracula "baffle" their enemies physically and in terms of their unnarratability, so too does the Minister and the purloined letter baffle the Prefect. Ultimately, though, it is Dupin who will really baffle the Prefect by procuring the letter and not revealing to the unfortunate "functionary" how he achieves this. As Chambers argues, the reader, through the narrator, is "shown" how Dupin manages to out-fox (or "out-lynx") the Minister, but his "account" is itself enigmatic or "duplicitious": it, like the Minister, conceals at the same time that it reveals. According to Chambers, "the phenomenon of artistic duplicity as a mode of 'narratorial' success, combin[es] concealment with openness, disclosure with covertness" (55).
Chambers proceeds to argue that the narration of "The Purloined Letter" stifles the Prefect's narrative while giving free reign to Dupin's. He rightly asserts that the Prefect surrenders authority to Dupin by confessing all the details of the case and his being "baffled" by them. Thus

the Prefect's narrative cannot advance (it cannot move toward a culminating "point," since its only point is that he cannot see the point); it can only repeat itself, just as he is condemned to repeat, unproductively, his search... [H]is final loss of authority, or admission of defeat, when Dupin produces the purloined letter and claims his reward, is therefore most appropriately signaled by his speechlessness. Without authority, one has nothing to say and no right to speak; and in a text such as this, which is so fundamentally concerned with illocutionary relationships and constructed of two opposed narrative situations (the Prefect's failed narrative about his failure, Dupin's successful narrative about his success), to be deprived of that form of power that is the power to disclose (or the right to narrate) is to disappear from the text.3 (1984, 57)

Similarly, Lacan overlooks the role of framing-narrating because the unobtrusive narrator (who specialises in appearing natural-neutral) is, as it were, in his epistemological blind spot.

Significantly, Derrida describes a chain linking the Prefect, Lacan and the ostrich. For not only is the proverbial ostrich blinded by its own self-limiting approach, it is also flightless. Derrida's use of a flightless bird as a fugitive figure reflects his own attempts as the pursuer to assume mastery over the pursued. That this is an effort to apprehend and control is inescapable the moment Derrida begins reading/rewriting "The Purloined Letter" and Lacan's "reading" of it. Derrida is intensely self-conscious in his own "reading", attempting to avoid the traps of would-be objective criticism, but he still, especially through the figure of the flightless ostrich, imposes his (the subject's) desire for possession of the (lost) object/other.

However, his image of the flightless ostrich also signals the difference between narrative and textual fugitivity. Derrida's narrative fugitive figure - in the shapes of the Prefect, Lacan, and
the "estrich" whose place both of these unsuspecting figures is taking - can potentially be mastered (or apprehended) by the critical pursuer. However, the means through which this apprehension is supposed to take place, the signifiers, are, unlike the ostrich, not only capable of flight, but continually flying. This refusal of the textual fugitive figure - i.e. the disseminating chain of signifiers - to be static steals the pursued object (narrative fugitive figure) from "under the noses" of the Prefect, Lacan, ostrich, Derrida (ostrich). For in the flight of the signifiers mobilised by Derrida in his quest for mastery over the texts of Lacan and Poe, his own text becomes as "fugitive". Derrida realises this in his observation that while Lacan sees the letter as always arriving, it always has the possibility of not doing so. Not only is it impossible to cite a "true origin" for the circulating letter, but its arrival is also indefinite as Derrida argues: "a letter does not always arrive at its destination, and from the moment that this possibility belongs to its structure one can say that it never truly arrives, that when it does arrive its capacity not to arrive torments it with an internal drifting" (1988:201).

Similarly, the fugitive figure, both narrative and textual, is continually elusive - its imagined apprehension is never quite realised. In Derrida's own words, "too self-evidently" mocking Lacan's terminology, "At the very moment one believes that by drawing triangles and circles, and by wielding the opposition imaginary-symbolic one grasps "The Purloined Letter", at the very moment one reconstitutes the truth, the proper adequation, "The Purloined Letter" escapes [like a fugitive?] through a too self-evident opening" (1988:186).

In this context, Derrida's criticism of Lacan as a "semanticist psychoanalyst" is consistent with his intellectual/textual assault on the metaphysics of presence per se. His focus on the unobserved narrator is evidence of his preoccupation with the absence within presence, the outside already permeating the inside.
Both Derrida and Lacan draw attention to this immediate fusion of the pursuer and pursued, this incapacity to assert autonomous selfhood and control over the objectified desired other. The other is invested with the self in the moment of its objectification, thus mirroring the "mirror-stage" itself. If Derrida takes the place of Lacan as an "ostrich", this then indicates that anyone writing on Derrida's text replaces, or displaces him, from the place of the ostrich.

The only alternative to this self-imposed "ostracism" is to remain silent, not utilising the potential to speak. This option is exercised ("or not") by the Minister through his withholding of the letter. However, this places him in a passive position awaiting its discovery. In other words, traditional masculine/feminine, passive/active dichotomies are played with and undermined in (the critical deconstructions of) Poe's story. The masculine, assertive Minister attempts to compromise the passive, vulnerable Queen who is unable to solicit the King's assistance. However, he unwittingly places himself in the Queen's (traditionally feminine) position of passive vulnerability.

In fact, the Minister is an ostrich before the Prefect, Dupin, Lacan, Derrida or any other critic. Not that he is the "first" ostrich and neither, for that matter, is the Queen. The notion of an "original" dupe or victim is thoroughly subverted by this story and its invited deconstruction. The place of the ostrich is, to again redeploy the familiar Derridean trope, always already there. In this instance, the Minister, in attempting to unsettle the Queen from her settled place, displaces her in the place of the unwitting (too self evident) ostrich, whose (noms de) plumes, like the letter itself, are ready to be plucked from its "hiding" place. Yet even this oversimplifies the power relations at work (engendered) by the circulating/withheld letter because the Minister is both masculine and feminine at once. His androgynous quality is underlined by the air of artificial languor he evokes when Dupin visits him. As Dupin states, "I found D- at home, yawning,
lounging, and dawdling, as usual, and pretending to be in the last extremity of ennui. He is, perhaps, the most really energetic human being now alive - but that is only when nobody sees him" (1988, 21). Lacan explores the mixture of masculinity and femininity the Minister embodies:

[W]e first learn that the Minister in turn has turned the letter over, not, of course, as in the Queen's hasty gesture, but, more assiduously, as one turns a garment inside out. So he must proceed, according to the methods of the day for folding and sealing a letter, in order to free the virgin space on which to inscribe a new address.

That address becomes his own. Whether it be in his hand or another, it will appear in an extremely delicate feminine script, and, the seal changing from the red of passion to the black of its mirrors, he will imprint his stamp upon it.

Thus the aura of apathy, verging at times on an affectation of effeminacy; the display of an ennui bordering on disgust in his conversation; the mood the author of the philosophy of furniture can elicit from virtually impalpable details (like that of the musical instrument on the table), everything seems intended for a character, all of whose utterances have revealed the most virile traits, to exude the oddest odor di femina when he appears. (1988, 47-8, emphasis in original)

While the Minister displaces the Queen in the position of passive vulnerability, he still has the potential to undermine her. In this sense he is (potentially) both a villain and a victim if these terms are understood as archetypal literary embodiments of the narcissistic pursuit of sadomasochism. Day (1985) discusses how the "heroes" and "heroines" of Gothic novels are simultaneously sadists and masochists through being largely influenced by the nightmarishly uncontrollable Gothic (under)world into which they have stumbled. Yet this world is not "real"; it is an alternative textual world growing out of the chain of signifiers mobilised by the author. It comes into existence at the moment that the "letter" is put into circulation. The characters in these novels then (themselves composed of "characters") are circumscribed by the unarrestable movements of the letter(s) beyond their control. Of course, this is not to say that they are fully, consciously and unambiguously controlled by the author, for this is clearly not the case. Authors
have generated their "hideous progeny", but the text has a life of its own. In Gothic novels, the authors are inadvertently (through an irrupting/erupting "return of the repressed") the "authors of unalterable evil".

The point here is that Poe represents Dupin as all-seeing and all-knowing, an impossibly adept reader of the confusing and bewildering network of signs mobilised in the modern world. However, as Lacan, Derrida and others have shown, Dupin is not in control at all, only projecting the illusion of being so just as the Minister has nowhere to hide the letter and can only provide the illusion of it being hidden. As "The Case of the Infinite Regression of Mirrored Image Ostriches" shows, no one controls the text or its metonymic embodiment, the letter. There is a moment in which the pursuer believes that he has captured the pursued, a moment of power, self-actualisation and gratification. However, as Day (1985, 7) observes, Gothic narratives oppose themselves to the Romantic tradition. The Romantic goal of finding a deeper or transcendent identity is subverted by the Gothic fragmentation of identity.

In other words, Dupin, the detective set the task of restoring order to the Gothic, nightmarish world into which the characters around him have plunged, is not the heroic rescuer of the Queen at all. Instead, he is, like everybody else, as much a "dupe" as his name suggests. Indeed, the moment the pursuer believes the case is "closed", that the pursued has been finally apprehended, the "truth" of the matter as embodied by the fugitive figure, remains elusive. Poe's story ostensibly ends with the resolution of Dupin's solving of the case. However, in so doing, it figures, through Dupin, an enigma. The reader is led to assume that Dupin returns the letter to the Queen, for Dupin refers to her now having the Minister in her power (1988, 23). However, Dupin does not explicitly state that the Queen possesses the letter, only that "the letter is not in his [the Minister's] possession" (23). He infers that the Queen is aware of this, but how do we know who
has the letter? This is curious, another "surprise in the economy of a work whose meticulous rigour is evident", to re-contextualise Lacan's observation (1988, 48). The reader is distracted from this intriguing omission of an important detail by Dupin's emphasis on the "fac-simile" with which he replaces (displaces) the letter. When Dupin's narrator-friend questions him about the contents of this bogus letter, he cryptically replies:

"D-, at Vienna once, did me an evil turn, which I told him, quite good-humoredly, that I should remember. So, as I knew he would feel some curiosity in regard to the identity of the person who had outwitted him, I thought it a pity not to give him a clue. He is well acquainted with my MS., and I just copied into the middle of the blank sheet the words -
- _Un dessein si funeste,
S'il n'est digne d'Atée, est digne de Thyeste.
They are to be found in Crébillon's _Atée._" (Poe 1988, 23)

Rather than "closing" the case then, Dupin introduces an element unfamiliar to the reader - that he and the Minister have a history of rivalry. The story begins with the narrator and Dupin discussing the "Rue Morgue murders" when the Prefect walks in with a new mystery (thus intertextually meshing with another famous Poe story). Similarly, it "ends" by alluding to an obscure incident in Dupin's past. No sooner is a mystery solved than another enigma is disclosed. In a sense, this mirrors the unarrestable circulation of the (purloined) letter itself.

This foreclosure of the possibility of closure mirrors what has been observed of the Gothic texts analysed in earlier chapters. In _Jekyll and Hyde_, Utterson and Poole discover Hyde's body but Jekyll disappears. Similarly, at the end of Shelley's novel, Frankenstein's monster disappears into "darkness and distance". Dracula is vanquished and "the whole body crumbled into dust". Rice's vampires' search for an all-explaining "origin" simply leads them to other vampires and new adventures. All of these images are unsatisfactory means of closure, each of
them reminiscent, to use an exhausted signifier, of the illusionist's "puff of smoke". In fact, the cliché is so replete with meaning(lessness) that it reflects the exhausted state of the destroyed "villains" at the end of the respective narratives in which they are incarnated (and then "killed off").

Therefore, Utterson, Walton, the Crew of Light and Dupin cannot claim to stand in a position of objective understanding and detachment outside the happenings they relate to the reader. Lestat intuitively realises this and self-consciously incorporates himself into the novel's narration. They are ostensibly figures of/for the restoration of order, the "closers of the case" hammering in the "last nails in the coffin". They appear to exude sanity and control, yet this appearance is only the projection of illusion (allusion/elusion). What is in control is the letter (i.e. the Gothic fugitive figure as signifier) itself, which will not allow the full text (if that in fact exists) to be assembled and accessed by one individual or group. Thus, despite the "meticulous rigour" displayed by all these authors and detective figures in order to provide the "whole" story, there is a significant measure of self-delusion occurring. This is hinted at in the signifiers of inexpressibility numerous deployed in each of these texts. It is confirmed in the final (witnessed) manoeuvrings of the fugitive figure in the midst of apparent death, a twist and turn that signifies, however inadequately, the uncontainable excess of the fugitive figure in both narrative and textual senses.

Hyde, Dracula and Frankenstein's monster are all apparently vanquished, but not satisfactorily. The possibility of their return is foregrounded by the inconclusive ways in which they "die". At the end of each of these novels, the narrative fugitive figures are ostensibly killed, but what really takes place is a final emphatic blurring of the narrative and textual which has
been implicit throughout. Meanwhile, Rice bypasses this issue altogether by representing Lestat as virtually immortal.

More accurately, it is not even the letter itself that is in control, but the system into which the letter is inserted. As Derrida suggests, there is no escaping this system; it has no outside to it. In this case, the letter is sent, we assume, by the Queen's lover, but this fact of the story is solely an arbitrary starting point and by no means a "true" point of "origin". It resembles the meaninglessly customary opening move of the pawn (and not the knight) in chess. It serves no other function than beginning for the reader this particular game of desire.

Poe is Everywhere: Stoker's Gothic Inscription of Purloined Desire

*I am he as you are he as you are me and we are all together
*See how they run like pigs from a gun see how they fly,
*I'm crying...
*City policeman sitting pretty little policeman in a row...
*man
*you should have seen them kicking
*Edgar Allen POE
*I am the eggman, they are the eggmen - I am the walrus GOO GOO GOO JOOB
*GOO GOO GOO JOOB GOO
*GOOGOOOOOOOOOOOOJOOOOOB

- "I am the Walrus" (The Beatles)

There are several important links here with Dracula in which the Count empowers himself through Mina's weakness and is then disempowered by Van Helsing. The connecting (t)issues are the symbolic control of the place of the Woman and the changing dynamics of pursuer and
pursued. Indeed, it is interesting what "The Purloined Letter" may be seen to "dig up": not just a dirty past, but clues to the fugitivity of Gothic figures such as the Count.

Indeed, Poe's text is preoccupied with gender (and engendering), identity and, importantly, the existence of a passive and inherently good female figure. The Queen is a symbolic, archetypal figure of goodness like Mina in Dracula. (Of course, Poe's text conveniently overlooks her implied infidelity. More scandalously, the Queen may have thoroughly enjoyed escaping the constrictions of her set place at the table, in bed or on the chessboard; in fact she's probably rather tired of her place.) She is menaced by the shadowy and evil figure of the Minister, who really is quite cowardly and, like Dracula, keeps a low profile when pursued by a band of self-righteous men.

Dupin somehow knows more about the tricks of the Minister than anyone else does. In this, he resembles Van Helsing who understands and anticipates Dracula's manoeuvres. Chambers, in his chapter on "Narratorial Authority and 'The Purloined Letter'", argues that "Dupin does not use his acumen merely to grasp the Minister's maneuvers (as his friend understands his argument); he uses it also to penetrate the Minister's duplicity and to reveal the fraudulence of his techniques" (1984, 61, emphases in original). Chambers' italicised use of "grasp" and "penetrate", works as a fugitive figuration because it inscribes significance at different levels. At the narrative level, these words indicate the productivity of Dupin's acumen, enabling him to outwit the Minister. Yet, Chambers is aware that Dupin's victory is not merely narrative, but also "narratorial" (or textual). His apprehension of the purloined letter parallels his textual apprehension of the fugitive figure of the Minister. "Grasp... penetrate" also suggests an apprehension that is bodily and homoerotic. Indeed, Dupin's pursuit of the Minister, his attempt to outwit him, recalls the earlier discussion of the game-playing Utterson indulges in, being "Mr
Seek" to Jekyll's "Mr Hyde". Dupin's numerous references to games in this story accentuates this idea. Importantly, Chambers ends this sentence with the appropriately ambiguous "fraudulence of his techniques", suggesting perhaps that Dupin's techniques are as fraudulent as the Minister's. Like Jekyll/ Hyde, Utterson/ Hyde, the Minister/ Dupin are intimately allied. Indeed, the hero has more in common with the villain than he would care to admit. Certainly, there is "more to him than meets the 'lynx' eye". He is engaged to solve the mystery and, like a priest figure, to exorcise the evil. Through discovering the letter, he disempowers the villain. Dracula, like the Minister, is strongest when known only to his victims. He is disempowered when discovered because he is vulnerable during the light of day and has no means of protection other than concealing himself. Similarly, the Minister, once discovered, is compromised by needing the letter nearby but also having to hide this letter from his pursuers.

Dupin returns the Queen to her imagined rightful place by the King's side where she can engender his heirs without being discredited through such a scandal as threatened by the letter. This is of course the concern with Dracula. Van Helsing, who seems more troubled by the Count than the passive, effeminate Jonathan, is the archetypal father figure. A priest as incongruous as Dracula himself, he restores Mina to her "rightful" place beside Jonathan. The roles Van Helsing and Dupin play as the restorers of order are conducted at both narrative and narratorial levels. In other words, not only do they save the "virtuous heroines" from the villains, but they also claim the right to speak of their victories in the text. They not only stop their enemies, but silence them as well. The narrative battle between the Count and Van Helsing over Mina's body is significant at the textual level as well. Chambers describes the process of narration as one involving intimate interdependence:
It is plausible to assume, then, that at bottom the narrator's motivation is like that of the narratee and rests on the assumption of exchanging a gain for a loss. Where the narratee offers attention in exchange for information, the narrator sacrifices the information for some form of attention. Consequently, there is a sense in which the maintenance of narrative authority implies an act of seduction (1984, 51).

Here, Chambers is "setting the scene" for his analysis of the duplicitous narrator/narratee relationships figured in Poe's story. However, given the connections between "The Purloined Letter" and Dracula, it seems especially apt to the "baptism of blood" scene already discussed in Chapter 3. In other words, the fluid exchange of blood between Mina and the Count, acts as a metaphor for the narrator/narratee configuration. One of the strengths of the scene is that who is "gaining" and who is "losing" is undecidable. As already observed, the Count, by slashing a wound in his chest as a nourishing source for Mina, effaces his own gender and appears androgynous. Meanwhile, Mina is simultaneously submissive and willingly engaging with the Count's punctured body (as the contradictory "readings" of the scene attest). This means that Chambers' categories of information and attention are thoroughly mixed in this scene. There is a seduction taking place, but Mina's role in it is not restricted to passive feminine "narratee". She "tells" as much as she is "told". Thus the narrative authority in Stoker's scene is fragmented by the "queer" intercourse Mina and the Count engage in. The significance of Mina's activity in the "seduction" is emphasised by the fact that the Crew of Light later capture the Count utilising Mina's telepathic link to him, established through their "intercourse". This telepathic link is juxtaposed with her "male brain" mastery of modern technologies to form a web of documents enclosing/enfolding the fluid figure of the Count. Wicke (1992) and Pope (1990) in particular, link these aspects of Mina's empowerment. This returns us to Gelder's idea of "productive consumption". In other words, "reading is (re)writing". This is the unavoidable axiom Derrida's
ostrich image encapsulates: it is not possible to speak authoritatively about a text like "The Purloined Letter" without incorporating a set of figurations as fugitive as those "mastered". This "explains" Dupin's enigmatic inscription in the letter's "fac-simile": he attempts to retain narratorial mastery by inscribing a "new" set of fugitive figures. Therefore, Chambers' analysis of the agents in the reading/writing process enables us to see what is "at stake" in the fugitive figure's figuration of the fugitive figure, whether in Poe's text, Stoker's, Lacan's, Derrida's, the ostrich's... It is not coincidental that Dracula ends with Mina bearing a son for Jonathan, although it is not unthinkable, at least metaphorically, that her husband might not have even conceived the child.

This notion of returning Woman to her "natural" place is more explicitly evidenced in the men's staking of Lucy. That seeing is integral to phallogocentrism is clear in this scene,7 the most chilling in the novel. It is the climax buried in the middle ("dark heart") of the book so its importance can be underestimated in deference to the conservative ending Stoker foists upon the reader. The staking, in the most physical of senses, returns Lucy to her "rightful" place. Another significant aspect of this scene is the beheading of Lucy (a fate Stoker spares the Count). This symbolises her (forced) acceptance of the place in patriarchal society to which she has been assigned, i.e. either dependent bearer of children or dead, no "in between".

While such graphic symbolism is absent in "The Purloined Letter," the senses of place, patriarchy and desire are as emphatically figured. Indeed, like Lucy, the Queen has done something unforgiveable and succumbed to her (repressed) urges. Now, in order to save her virtue and place, she needs the priest-like figure of Dupin to "minister" the solution and the Minister is the catalyst for this process. Dupin's discovery of the concealed letter disempowers
the villain who, like Dracula, is merely acting on something *already there*, not something he induced in the Queen.

The point is that the Queen has no choice as to whether she is scandalised or sanctified - it is a battle between "good men and evil men". As for Lucy and Mina, there is no real autonomous decision made by the females who occupy the passive stereotypes handed down through (literary) convention. In a sense, the scandal is needed to reinforce the place of these women - knowledge of the threat the other poses (the "dread of wild bulls") keeps them in line.

As observed of Poe's story, the male, as in Gothic narratives, can be as passive, helpless and vulnerable as the sentimental heroine - like an ostrich with its head in the sand waiting for the next predator to see it and enact a flawed (phal)logocentric act upon it. The men in these narratives seek to retain autonomous control over the objectified other, naturalised as feminine. However, the moment they attempt to exercise this control, they put themselves into positions of vulnerability and their identities are shown to be radically unstable. The agent of this transience and instability is the monster, the fugitive figure subverting illusory notions of permanence and internal coherence. The pursuer is always already and irrevocably the pursued. Once again, Derrida's caveat is recalled: "[t]here are only ostriches, no one can avoid being plucked, and the more one is the master, the more one presents one's rear - which will be the case for whoever identifies with Dupin" (1988, 191). Far from obliterating the scandal, Dupin inscribes others with his (textual) intervention in the case of "The Purloined Letter". In order to better understand the textual implications of his *telling* intervention, it is necessary to consider Derrida's ideas on the incorporation of scandal in genre formation.
The Scandal of The "Gothic": (Dis)closure of The Madness of The Law(less)

[4]s soon as genre announces itself, one must respect a norm, one must not cross a line of demarcation, one must not risk impurity, anomaly or monstrosity...

[1]t comes as no surprise that, in nature and art, genre, a concept that is essentially classificatory and genealogico-taxonomic, itself engenders so many classificatory vertigines when it goes about classifying itself and situating the classificatory principle or instrument within a set. As with the class itself, the principle of genre is unclassifiable; it tolls the knell of the knell (glas), in other words, of classicum, of what permits one to call out (calare) orders and to order the manifold within a nomenclature. (Derrida 1981, 53-7)

The "Gothic" designates a range of texts which are particularly powerful in their deployment and evocation of the fugitive figure. However, this genre does not circumscribe the fugitive figure. This figure is fundamentally a symbolic marker of desire, a paradoxical presence-in-absence within the multi-layered literary text. Therefore, its movements are detectable in an enormous range of texts. All writing is desire-driven, the act of textual signification mirroring the subject's quest for wholeness in replacement of the lost (m)other. Thus a fugitive figure, the (symbolic) embodiment of this desire, is discernible in many texts of various "genres". Indeed, the very existence of the fugitive figure points to the paradoxical limitations of genre formation as exposed by Derrida in "The Law of Genre" (1981). In this essay, Derrida links the foundation of genres with the desire for categorical "purity". Genres exist as an apparent guarantee of this purity and in order to preserve it. He asserts that the "law" of genre, making imperative this preservation of purity, unavoidably contains within itself traces of contamination ("madness"). As argued in Of Grammatology (1976), the inside always already figures the outside within itself. As such, the law is not antithetical to, but incorporates madness. Derrida deconstructs Blanchot's genre-disrupting La Folie du Jour (The Madness of the Day) to emphasise this point.
An analysis of "The Purloined Letter" therefore indicates that the Gothic genre can in no way limit the fugitive figure. Nevertheless, since "The Purloined Letter" concerns itself with the signifier's incapacity to arrive, it is an apt text with which to end an analytical series. Indeed, it begets many more issues than can be resolved. The very possibility of closure is, from the beginning, foreclosed. Indeed, as Derrida observes of La Folie du Jour:

There is only content without edge - without boundary or frame - and there is only edge without content. The inclusion (or occlusion, inconclusive invagination) is interminable: it is an analysis of the account that can only turn in circles in an unarrestable... and insatiably recurring manner - but one terrible for those who, in the name of the law, require that order reign in the account, for those who want to know, with all the required competence, "exactly" how this happens. (1981, 66)

Here, Derrida's "account" of Blanchot's text recognises the duplicity of "account" given its pretence of knowing a beginning, ending and a causal tie connecting them. Derrida thoroughly undermines this fallacy throughout his oeuvre. An image presents itself when reading his "account". It is a picture of the writer as a narrative fugitive figure before the court (of law, the Law, or lore) unable to give an "account" of the event. The writer, silent before the boundary-less excesses of figuration, the end-less deferment of textually fugitive signification, embodies the foreclosure of the possibility of narrative/textual closure. This perhaps parallels Foucault's notion of the historical "author-function" as a control over meaning (1988). 8

This paralysed state of speechlessness before the abyss has been observed in the mute, hysterical reactions, at different times in their respective texts, of Frankenstein, Jonathan Harker, Jekyll and the vampire Lestat. The pervasive presence of the fugitive figure in Blanchot's text and Derrida's "reading" of it, is evoked through paradoxical absence. The strange palpability of the intangible, is attested to by such suitably elusive (anti-)signifiers (all "giving nothing away")
as "interminable", "unarrestable" and "insatiably". Derrida's rhetorical deployment of these signifiers evokes a sense of circularity, further suggested by his diagrammatic representation of this textual indeterminacy (1981, 67). This circularity is part of and wholly (responsible for) "beginning" and "end" being indistinguishable in the chain of signification. The signifier inserts itself into this chain both as the narrative figure of the desiring subject and as the textual figure of the subject's desire.

In *La Folie du Jour* a sense of end-less beginning and ending is inscribed, thus disrupting any notion of closure, indeed displacing the narrative and textual telos. Similarly, "The Purloined Letter" thoroughly undermines the senses of departure, destination and arrival traditionally associated with the writing, postage, delivery and reading of a letter. Indeed, as shall be seen, the letter is purloined not merely from its immediate physical environment as the title of the story would initially suggest. It is also "purloined" from its *symbolic* place, an imaginary point at which it can never arrive because it is in continuous *circulation*. Derrida, in "The Law of Genre" (1981), foregrounds the impossibility of the writer capturing the pursued object. There is no definitive, conclusive accounting for anything which would arrest the fugitive figure once and for all. Instead, any attempt is profoundly indefinite, it is "an account" and suggests the madness rather than reason of pursuit. Each participant in the pursuit is condemned to its paradoxical laws and limits:

I have let myself be commanded by the law of our encounter, by the convention of our subject, notably the genre, the law of genre. This law, articulated as an I/we which is more or less autonomous in its movements, assigned us places and limits. Even though I have launched an appeal against this law, it was she who turned my appeal into a confirmation of her own glory. But she also desires ours insatiably. Submitting myself to the subject of our colloquium, as well as to its law, I sifted "An Account," *La Folie du jour*. I isolated a type, if not a genre, of reading from an infinite series of trajectories.
or possible courses. I have pointed out the generative principle of these courses, beginnings and new beginnings in every sense: but from a certain point of view. Elsewhere - in accordance with other subjects, other colloquia and lectures, other I/we drawn together in one place - other trajectories could have, and have, come to light. (Derrida 1981, 76-7)

Importantly, through its fragmented narration, its largely epistolary form, Dracula emphasises the role of the letter in a similar narrative/textual conflation to that which characterises Poe's text. Ultimately, "The Purloined Letter" is what Stoker tries to make Dracula - a detective story, the moral triumph order restored by Van Helsing, an outsider-hero. However, while both occupy traditionally different genres - at least given standard notions about these genres - neither Stoker's nor Poe's text allows a full and final restoration of order. This is consistent with the "Gothic" in general. Its hybridity, coupled with its thematic consideration of (im)purity, gives it a self-consciousness about the incorporation of "madness" within the "law". In both Gothic and detective narratives, a full and final restoration of order is denied through the unstable supplementarity of either text. This supplementarity is produced by/reflected in the fugitive figurations in each. At both narrative and textual levels, these figures are inscribed and an indeterminate play of significations generated. There is also the excessive narrative/textual desire evoked by Stoker's figuring of Dracula who in himself is a kind of "purloined letter" in that he is lost from the symbolic time and space of his life. He is anachronistic, an anacoluthon in the repressed sentence of Victorian England. What he represents, like the (unspecifiable) contents of the purloined letter, is subversive, profoundly challenging the sovereignty of the (head of) state.

Jekyll and Hyde inscribes an attempt to "break down the door" and rescue what's inside (from itself). The limp, weak, passive Jekyll is thus characterised as feminine and associated with the inside vulnerable to penetration from the outside. In relation to this, it is necessary to
consider, in their respective contexts, Van Helsing and Frankenstein bursting in and witnessing the most feared (and secretly desired) scenes. They - like Lucy's mother putting garlic on the sash - will not acknowledge that the horror is already inside: self is already other.

Many of the narrative and textual preoccupations of "The Purloined Letter" surface in the main texts discussed in this thesis. The crucial connections between these texts in relation to a theory of fugitivity are made through the simultaneous concealing and revealing, repressing and erupting, of desire. Each of these texts is profoundly paradoxical, collapsing the self/other, interior/ exterior dichotomies through the blurring flow of desire. In all of the earlier texts, the authors "close" their respective texts ambivalently, providing sudden and anti-climactic deaths to the villains yet describing these deaths in tantalisingly vague and open-ended ways. In Rice's novels, the vampires are self-consciously aware of the insatiable nature of desire and the impossibility of arresting it. For Lestat, the ultimate expression of the instinct to arrest the flow constituting the self, thanatos, is rendered redundant by his uncertainty as to whether he can die.

Thus desire is disruptive, mobile and continually changing, transforming the subjects it constitutes. However, the desire to arrest desire remains constant, leading to the uncanny proliferation of the fugitive figure, the feared and desired, the monstrous but ineffably beautiful. These Gothic novels, in their representation of this sublimity, provide very powerful evocations of the fugitivity of subjectivity and signification through desire.

The Gothic is very much alive and well in the 1990s. Perhaps when discussing the relation of vampire figures to their contemporary textual mobilisation, it is more accurate to say that the Gothic is "Undead and well". Another expression of this state of affairs is astutely made in the title of the recent Mel Brooks film, Dracula: Dead and Loving it. Both in its title and
content, this film aptly and self-reflexively points to the continuation of ambivalence in response to the archetypal figure of horror, the vampire.

The vampire is both feared and desired. It is feared because it is dead, the embodiment of decay promised to each being. It is also morally dead which is socially subversive and threatening to the individual. However, it is desired because of its capacity to "love", not in a sublimated manner, but in the most direct form of parasitic interdependence. As already mentioned, Day characterises this as the sadomasochistic nature of the villain-victim relationships figured in Gothic literary works.

This is the nature of desire itself which the vampire incorporates, possessing the means through which the Deleuzoguattarian machinic flow of desire, schizoid, other and profoundly subversive, is set in motion. The fangs literalise the possibility of the most direct and directly confronting form of intercourse imaginable, a tidal commingling of bodily fluids. Subjective relations blur in the fluidity (and flux) of the self/other relation as it is configured in a state of irrevocable dissolution. This dissolution may also be seen as decadence or degradation, to employ two abstract nouns more pejorative in their connotations. Certainly, such signifiers appropriately recall the Victorian repression of the "decadent" and startling works of Stevenson, Stoker and Wilde. With this moral and public censorship and condemnation comes secretive pleasure and titillation representing the paradox of simultaneous fear and desire evoked in the books themselves. Indeed, the Gothic is far from "dead and buried". The potential for perverse and parodic resurrections seems to be continually fulfilled in countless popular reworkings or reincarnations of the mythic archetypes.

Chambers articulates the fugitive figure in terms of its political oppositionality. This provides another reason for this conclusion to remain inconclusive, or at least point to the
inconclusive search for the fugitive figure. It is necessary to indicate the subversive potential of even the most "conservative" of these Gothic texts. It is also important to consider how the least voluble "villains" are also heroes from whom much can be learned. The key is knowing how to explore the sense-scrambled irruptions into the text of society made by these desire-driven figures.

Where Chambers focuses on oppositionality, the fugitive figure, especially in its textual sense, seems more bound up with psychoanalytic projections of the subject, especially as figured by the irresolvable figure. Chambers' oppositionality occurs at the textual level of signification as opposed to the literal or narrative. The fugitive figure's simultaneous existence at both textual and narrative levels points to the paradoxical lack of a "defining" point of "origin". This explains the project of a poststructuralist genealogy: to indicate the absence of an origin or telos. To that extent, with no origin, there can be no end, only trajectories through time and space (both in the experiential world and in the world of the printed text). These trajectories we try to make linear. However, as Carter (1992) argues in terms of spatial history, we provide this arbitrary linearity, not "history" itself, and textuality works against this as deconstruction shows us. Therefore, a conclusion must fight against being conclusive and remain inconclusive from both textual and political perspectives.

A conclusion is paradoxical for several reasons: firstly, fugitivity is ongoing, irresolvable, like desire. Secondly, no genealogy can be traced right back to a telos explaining all. Also, like any conclusion, my end-point is arbitrary - it exists because there has to be an end-point. It can work as a point of departure for future forays, whether my own or others', as much as it acts as a point of (temporary) termination to the thesis itself. Of course, these Gothic texts, fugitivity, desire or genealogy, given their "multifarious" aspects, could be discussed ad infinitum. A theory
of fugitivity necessarily mocks and exposes the limitations of the "moment of arresting" signified by this conclusion. Yet it is impossible to avoid being "caught up in" such an arresting moment.

This last section of the thesis is by convention referred to as a "conclusion", but as indicated by the introduction to the thesis, it is really only the formal requirements of a conclusion that are fulfilled here. A set of expectations are fulfilled by resolving the arguments already made into a neat, "unified" picture at a pre-designated point. The analyses of each novel in question (especially Stoker's and Stevenson's) show an attempt to close off/out the desires represented by the most powerful figures in these texts, the (ostensible) villains. That these closures are fundamentally undermined is testimony to the ongoing evocation of fugitivity occurring throughout the texts.

Yet this fugitivity not only resists closure, but in fact never actually began. The figuration of fugitivity is simultaneous with the act of figuration or written representation itself. Indeed, it is like a second skin that is impossible to shed, much as Jekyll, despite his most intense efforts, cannot shrug off Hyde. Furthermore, the figuration of fugitivity and the fugitivity of figuration are flipsides of the same coin. Like the coin (with connotations of currency foregrounded here, given the symbolic nature of written representation), these processes are circular. They deny the desire of rational analysis for a discernible beginning and end-point.

A conclusion presumes a culmination, a resolution or arrival at a point of self-realisation. In terms of the dominant metaphor of this thesis, what is demanded is, in both senses of the term, a critical apprehension of the fugitive figure. Yet this apprehension is always only imagined, being as it is, the manifestation of desire. The capture of the fugitive figure is a momentary apprehension of nothing other than an objet petit a; the Desire represented by the fugitive figure is ultimately illusory. Even in its "capture", it leaves its pursuer profoundly dissatisfied.
Given that the aim of capturing the fugitive figure is the final satisfaction of an insatiable desire, then if the capture is not satisfying, the quest can be seen to be doomed from the start. However, as suggested by the unnameable creature of Frankenstein's experiment and Dracula and Hyde's textual escapes from society's "civilised" and severe retributions, the figure's arresting is only a self-deception on the part of the author or reader. These continue the self-deception of the main characters such as Louis, Frankenstein, Jonathan Harker and Jekyll when they believe that they can rescue their situation, control their desires and preserve things "as they are".
In Room for Maneuver: Reading (the) Oppositional (in) Narratives, Chambers argues:

Oppositional behavior consists of individual or group survival tactics that do not challenge the power in place, but make use of circumstances set up by that power for purposes the power may ignore or deny... Although it derives its power initially from preexisting power relationships (the right to speak is itself such a derived power), and although it seems never to challenge them openly, "oppositional authority," once gained, has the extremely tricky ability to erode, insidiously and almost invisibly, the very power from which it derives. It seems almost that power needs, or at least produces, oppositional discourse and so authorizes it, whereas the latter relies in its turn for its genuine oppositional effectiveness on the power it undermines. (1991, 1-2)

The mutual interdependence Chambers refers to here shall be seen in relation to the fugitive figures in each of the Gothic texts to be analysed. The power of the ego is "insidiously eroded" and "undermined" by these intriguing figures of the id.

According to Barthes,

From an initial non-existence in which thought, by a happy miracle, seemed to stand out against the backdrop of words, writing thus passed through all the stages of a progressive solidification; it was first the object of a gaze, then of creative action, finally of murder, and has reached in our time a last metamorphosis, absence: in those neutral modes of writing, called here "the zero degree of writing", we can easily discern a negative momentum, and an inability to maintain it within time's flow, as if Literature, having tended for a hundred years now to transmute its surface into a form with no antecedents, could no longer find purity anywhere but in the absence of all signs, finally proposing the realization of this Orphean dream: a writer without Literature. (1967, 11)
NOTES - CHAPTER 2

1 See, for instance, Hodges and Doane's (1991) "Undoing Feminism in Anne Rice's Vampire Chronicles". Also, see Fasolino's (1992) article "Lestat of the Art - The Dark Gift Discussed".

2 According to Jackson,

   A paraxial region is an area in which light rays seem to unite at a point after refraction. In this area, object and image seem to collide, but in fact neither object nor reconstituted image genuinely reside there: nothing does. This paraxial area could be taken to represent the spectral region of the fantastic, whose imaginary world is neither entirely "real" (object), nor entirely "unreal" (image), but is located somewhere indeterminately between the two. (1991, 19, emphasis in original)

3 As Kirkpatrick notes:

   Ultimately Bohemia lives in symbiosis with bourgeois society. Each needs the other - the one for money to finance its visions, the other for high cultural products to adorn or sanctify its leisure - which is a further reason why Bohemians are rarely politically active. High art must have an audience, and who else is it going to be? A healthy status quo of middle-class cognoscenti is absolutely necessary to encourage and financially support Bohemian life, and the point of sale represents the point of compromise: it is the unwritten clause in any ambitious artist's contract. (1992, 27-8)

4 This has already been observed in the discussion on Lestat's autobiographical style and playful elaboration on his "image" as a writer/rock star.

5 After becoming a vampire, Nicolas's playing of the violin for Lestat provides another example of the sublimely inexpressible. Lestat, the showman who "takes everything in his stride", is seen to be overwhelmed once again:

   The music was a lamentation, a fugue or terror looping itself into hypnotic dance rhythms, jerking Nicki even more wildly from side to side. His hair was a glistening mop against the footlights. The blood sweat had broken out on him. I could smell the blood.

   But I too was doubling over; I was backing away from him, slumping down on the bench as if to cower from it, as once before in this house terrified mortals had cowered from me...

   The music reached impossible peaks, the sound throttled for an instant and then released again. The mixture of feeling and pure logic drove it past the limits of the bearable. And yet it went on and on. (Rice 1985, 284-5)

6 Rice's emphasis on the artifice of the vampires echoes the fin de siècle Decadent movement that valued artifice above nature. In a sense, vampires act as figures for this aesthetic, especially given their intimate knowledge of decay.
In particular, this orality is reminiscent of Conrad's scene of the gravely ill Kurtz being carried on a stretcher. It presents Marlow with a hideous image of abjection:

I could see the cage of his ribs all astir, the bones of his arm waving. It was as though an animated image of death carved out of old ivory had been shaking its hand with menaces at a motionless crowd of men made of dark and glittering bronze. I saw him open his mouth wide - it gave him a weirdly voracious aspect, as though he had wanted to swallow all the air, all the earth, all the men before him. (1989, 99)

The term "animated image of death" is especially resonant in relation to Rice's texts and her orally insatiable vampires.
Throughout this chapter, I will be referring to Jonathan Harker as "Jonathan". He is generally known as "Harker" in critical analyses of Dracula, yet to designate him with this signifier while calling his wife Mina Harker "Mina" is to undermine her significance. Of course, the referential ambiguity of "Harker" is traditionally (and unacceptably) overlooked and it is automatically assumed that the name belongs to the male. A similar issue arises in analyses of Frankenstein, many of which refer to Mary Shelley as "Mary" and Percy Shelley as "Shelley" even though the former is more relevant in the context of these analyses. This is not a mere point of "political correctness" because Gothic texts in general and Dracula in particular incorporate within them an engagement with issues of patriarchy, the family, male/female relationships, obedience/deviance etc. In other words, rather than "making something out of nothing" as the derogatory term "political correctness" implies, it would be remiss to not address this issue (and yet all too easy, especially as a male writer, to do just that). This chapter referred to Jonathan Harker as "Harker" until quite late in the drafting process when I realised that this was a dubious and odious social convention which I was unwittingly, compulsively perpetuating. Although Mina Harker is a figure of "feminine" loyalty, maternity, immobility and domestic subservience in the novel, she is also a figure of "masculine" sexual transgression, intelligence, technological mastery and resistance (Gelder [1994] provides a useful summary of the contradictory aspects/readings of Mina Harker). Therefore, the use of the diminutive cannot even be justified thematically. As a result of these (after)thoughts, I decided to use the Christian names for both Harkers. Despite the resonance of the surname, it seemed an appropriate thing to do since what Dracula threatens so forcefully is the symbolic itself, the means of (self)-representation. My omission of the paternal surname also perhaps indicates the child-like vulnerability of the protagonists when confronted by the sheer irrational semiotic force of the Count. (Of course, Dracula's own violation of the symbolic is indicated by the absence of another name to qualify him). All of the other characters will be referred to by their surnames as there is no ambiguity between them and they are not the primary sites of Dracula's attentions. The only exception to this will be my designation of Lucy Westenra as "Lucy". I do this for thematic reasons: the name evokes her demonisation by the Count in a "lucid" way which "Westenra" does not (unless the latter is read to be a figure for the invasion of the Western by the Oriental). Also, her marital status is profoundly problematised in the text: she is proposed to by three suitors, becomes engaged to Lord Godalming, Arthur Holmwood and then is "taken" by him, Dr Seward and Dr Van Helsing in a series of sexually symbolic blood transfusions. As a virtual polygamist, she loses her surname altogether. This is appropriate because she is thoroughly claimed by Dracula for the semiotic - the "Crew of Light" can only save her soul not her body.

Of course, the heterosexual nature of Dracula's ravishings by no means makes them "normal" or normative. As Gelder (1994, 72) observes, the Count's "intercourse" with Mina assumes perverse characteristics, blurring genders and positions of dominance and submission. Most of all, Dracula's disruptions of the everyday symbolic order are not merely violent and aggressive; they are also subtly subversive and radical.

This sharing of homoerotic pleasure involving the "taking" of a virgin and the resistance to an infiltrating evil is revisited by King in his novel It (1986). This is set in an imaginary American town in the 1950s/early 80s. A group of children are haunted by strange incarnations of their worst fears (these incarnations take various forms making "It" an ideal title, evoking the
NOTES - CHAPTER 3

sublime inexpressible already observed in this chapter). Eventually, they are driven into the sewers under their town, where they resolve to go to the source of these evil emanations and confront it. They vanquish the enormous preternatural spider they find here in a scene reminiscent of Sam and Frodo doing battle with Shelob in Tolkien’s *The Lord of The Rings*. It also connects with the *Alien* films - fighting huge spidery creatures in confined spaces. In the second *Alien* film, *Aliens*, the queen creature is referred to as a "bitch", revealing a desire to eradicate the aggressive female. This is where It, which reworks so many of the motifs of *Dracula*, recalls Lucy’s staking. Like Lucy, "It" vampirically preys on children to nourish itself, is entombed beneath the town and embodies an intolerable threat which must be dispelled. As they approach the spider’s lair, the children feel “that they had progressed over the edge of the world and into some queer nothingness. Bill felt (although he did not have the vocabulary to express what he knew) that they were approaching Derry’s [the town’s] dark and ruined heart” (825). Lucy similarly embodies a "queer nothingness", she is the sublime abyss of perversion the Crew of Light cannot describe, fear and secretly desire. They plunge a stake into her "dark and ruined heart". King’s seven children (six boys and one girl) metaphorically do the same in a manner befitting a true rite of passage. These figures resemble Stoker’s "heroes" (five men and one woman). After the spider is killed, still in the sewers, Beverly Marsh, the girl in the story, undresses and persuades each of the six boys in turn to have sexual intercourse with her (866–871). This ritual recalls the symbolism of Lucy’s staking and her earlier blood transfusions - the men link with each other through the body of the sanctified woman. Yet Beverly also possesses characteristics of Mina in that she is the force which brings the boys together and keeps the darkness at bay. Interestingly, she has an abusive father whose image she deliberately, triumphantly defies while losing her virginity. This ritual "love, desire" (i.e. the erotic instinct in its boldest manifestation) enables the children to escape the darkness of "It" - the powerfully figured idea of death. However, like the rituals in *Dracula*, the perverse permeates the "normal": an affirmation of heterosexual desire is inscribed which, through its homoerotic dimension, incorporates already within its own structures, the "queer nothingness" which the conservative "rational" phallocentric wishes dispelled.

4 In this context, it is worthwhile noting that in many stage and film versions of the text, Renfield moves from being a "marginal" figure to occupying a central role. His characteristics have even been combined with Harker’s to form a powerful hybrid figure. A notable example is the famous 1931 Universal production starring Bela Lugosi as the Count. According to Skal:

The means for melding the novel and stage play was now the substitution of Renfield as the real estate agent who travels to Transylvania...

As for Renfield, Lew Ayres was right in recognizing the film’s plum role. The part went to New York stage actor Dwight Frye... The role of Renfield, with its shifting moods and explosive outbursts, would be an ideal showcase for Frye’s versatility. (1990, 122-7)

5 Gelder foregrounds the differing opinions on the position *Dracula* occupies with regard to gender politics:
Feminist critics have thus analysed the ways in which women are both unleashed and contained, or constrained, in Dracula...

A number of critics have suggested that, at any rate, Stoker enables us to see 'patriarchal ideology' acting itself out in Dracula - and by seeing it, we are allowed to critique it, determine its limits, comprehend its 'lack of moral vision' (Senf 1988, 96), its vulnerability (Byers 1988, 150), and so on. (1994, 77-8)

He synthesises these opposing opinions by providing his own perspective on the issue:

My own view is that although the novel does resolve itself to some degree at the end, there are crucial spaces in the text... in which irresolution and ambiguity (or, indeed, 'queerness') prevail. Mina herself may be one of these unresolved or ambiguous 'spaces': she can be maternal (as Roth has it), passive and submissive (as Cranny-Francis reads her) and yet also sexually independent and 'in touch' with feminist thinking. (79)

6 At least, this is the case in this reading of the incident, provided by Dr Seward. As Gelder observes, this scene "is reported three times: twice by Dr Seward and once by Mina. Van Helsing also offers a commentary on certain aspects of the scene. And, together, these various reports are in themselves enough to make what is happening at the very least ambiguous" (1994, 71). The idea that Mina is a willing participant in this "obscene" act is registered by Seward's later observation that both of the Count's hands are playing with Mina's hair. Thus, they cannot be forcing her mouth to his wound. Gelder argues that the ambiguities generated by these conflicting accounts add to (supplement) the perverse indeterminacy of the incident. Ultimately, this perversity dissolves the traditionally polarised agents of author/reader: "The novel is 'like' a vampire in that it folds the productive author and the consuming reader into each other; the 'perversity' of Dracula lies precisely in the mingling of their fluids" (85). Mina is shown in a posture of kneeling. She is, in a sense, genuflecting, and, as in Rice's texts, the carnal and the spiritual collapse into each other in the moment of vampiric feeding. Importantly, as Gelder emphasises, her drinking of his (textual) body fluids does not make her a passive "reader" in the traditionally polarised sense of that term. She is a "reader" in the poststructuralist sense of supplying a rewriting of what she reads (ingests). Furthermore, Gelder states that Mina is "a hybrid figure who comes to confuse the two [producer/consumer, author/reader] together" (1994, 84). Mina's hybridity mirrors the Count's.

7 Wicke (1992), points to the important part Mina plays in capturing Dracula. Mina's involvement in thwarting the Count makes her role as a hypnotic "pawn" surplus and excessive. Indeed, as Gelder reminds us, "in the hypnosis scene in Dracula, Mina is by no means under Van Helsing's control - quite the opposite. She is in possession of events, speaking of what she sees to Van Helsing - who is otherwise ignorant of Dracula's whereabouts." Ultimately, it is "through Mina [that] the novel traces a more complicated relationship between consumption and production than has hitherto been noted" (1994, 84). It is only appropriate that there is a tension between control/subordination and production/consumption in Van Helsing's hypnosis of Mina since it brings her into contact with the Count once again. As we witnessed in the "bedroom scene", this contact profoundly blurs and collapses such dichotomies.
The specific implications of Dracula's threat are obvious, and he figures it using the image of the sheep. He realises he can seduce the men as he has seduced Mina and this is the deep, dark unspoken "truth" of the bedroom scene, leading us to wonder about Jonathan's stupor. Also, the Count's threat unleashes itself at the textual level and thus out of the text to its "readers". Here, the designation of "baffle", can be the noun's rather than the verb's: "a screen preventing the passage of sound etc." (Godfrey-Smith et al. 1991, 55). He warns that he will seduce any reader attempting to "baffle" him until the two (producer/consumer) blur in dissolution symptomatic of the textual excess he figures. Thus, any reader who, like the Crew of Light, but at the textual rather than the narrative level, attempts to limit (or circumscribe) his immense (potential) disseminating force will become incorporated into his proliferating otherness. This apparently limitless dissemination is signified by the indeterminacy of "et cetera". That "baffle" has an unknown origin makes this narrative/textual situation even more tantalising - it is a signifier all too appropriate for the Count to use since it, like him, cannot really be grasped and made, with recourse to a point of origin, single and definite. Also, the Count's use of the word "baffle" is ironic because it recognises the attempts of the Crew of Light (again both narrative and textual) to "frustrate" him. Thus he reminds them that he too can "baffle", but in an ineluctable dissimulation: his use of the signifier ironically foregrounds his capacity to continue to be evasive, to "perplex, to bewilder" (Godfrey-Smith et al. 1991, 55). Ultimately, as the Count in this defiant moment is all too aware, the "reader" cannot baffle him nor silence (screen out) his polyvocity. Moreover, the "reader" cannot stop being baffled by the Count whether or not the Count's hands force the mouth towards the body of the text. While the Count, like all vampires, is an outrageous fiction, the "truth" of his (dismembering, dissimulating, disseminating) impact refuses to not be believed. In this matter, the consumer/reader of his fluids/fluidity is sheep-like. The Count as a "shepherd" (and yet a "butcher") is somehow simultaneously messianic and diabolical (Stoker 1993, 394-5). His ending with the comical, dismissive "Bah!" is perhaps consistent with his mockery of their sheep-like qualities. Significantly, it is a nonsensical and crude utterance which underscores his textual mockery of "readers" seeking to imprison him within the confining parameters of a masterly symbolic logic. This nonsensical ejaculation indicates his figurative capacity to avoid such readerly (writerly) attempts to arrest him through reminding the reader of his pre-(or extra-)symbolic primacy.

After her encounter with the Count, Van Helsing places a wafer on Mina's head which sears the "tainted" flesh, leaving a mark the Crew of Light regard as the sign of a "curse". Thus Dracula forcibly enters the symbolic through this trace of his presence (and absence).
Technically speaking, the brevity of Stevenson's text (dis)figures it as a "novella". Yet to un-self-consciously designate it as such is to diminish its importance. It must be acknowledged that terms like "novella" may signify an idea of diminution referring not only to the book's size, but also, implicitly, its perceived literary worth. The classification suggests "something less than a novel" where an imaginary space between "less" and "than" awaits for the insertion of adjectives like "rigorous", "important", "profound" etc. This designation in this case overlooks Stevenson's stylistic economy. Indeed his concision, as Henry James, the great stylist, once observed, is not a deficiency of the book, but one of its great strengths. (Incidentally, James' own Gothic tale, The Turn of the Screw, is comparable here for its own brevity but tight, compelling concision.) Veeder rightly alludes to this (1988, xii). As already discussed, the Gothic, both thematically and generically, challenges ideas of authority. With this in mind, the issue of the literary establishment's trouble with classifying Stevenson's text adds another subversive layer to it. For the remainder of this chapter I will refer to the text as a "novel", while aware that this term itself signifies a range of things which neither satisfactorily delimit nor limit the signifying potential of Jekyll and Hyde. Certainly, whatever its limitations, the term "novel" seems more apt for Jekyll and Hyde given its twin designation as "a fictitious prose story" and "a new kind, strange, hitherto unknown" (Godfrey-Smith et al. 1991, 542). "Novella" meanwhile limits (belittles) the subversive (strange) textual force Hyde paradoxically embodies.

According to Veeder, "[l]ike many of his cultural peers, Stevenson was disturbed by what seemed to be a lowering of taste to the standards or the appetites of millions of new readers, yet he was willing to write for this audience and to accept wealth and adulation from it" (1988, xv-xvi).

Garrett in "Cries and Voices: Reading Jekyll and Hyde (1988), utilises the textual codes outlined by Barthes in S/Z (1974). Garrett argues that Stevenson's repeated references through different characters to Hyde's indescribability form a process in which "[a]ll of these passages can be read as components of a hermeneutic sequence" (65). This sequence is meant to end, according to Garrett, with Jekyll's "neat" resolution. He explains that this prevalence of the hermeneutic code marks the classic readerly text because it works to "constrain possibilities of reading" (61). However, as he indicates through an analysis of the "cries and voices" in Stevenson's text, the novel escapes the constrained readerly to assume, as we shall see, a sprawling, indeterminate plurality. The text ceases to be readerly and enters the domain of the writerly. Garrett situates this indeterminacy as "Gothic" (71).

The title of the chapter, "Story of the Door", refers to the dilapidated door Hyde uses to gain access to Jekyll's abode. Yet the chapter is concerned with introducing Utterson/the reader to the hideous nature of Hyde. In a sense, the relationship between Jekyll and Hyde is figured at this early point by the chapter's name: Hyde is a door through which Jekyll passes (absents himself) to gain access to unrestrained gratification of desires. It is fitting that the first chapter should be thus titled since it also refers to Stevenson's formal method of presentation of the narrative. The "story" is told in a series of incidents and perspectives through which we catch glimpses of Hyde and his enigmatic relationship with Jekyll. Hyde's strange otherness is always encountered behind, near or through literal doors or the metaphorical "doors" of related incidents. As Cadnum observes, the "novel is about doors, and the interiors that doors preserve. Doors
NOTES - CHAPTER 4

protect secrets, but they also betray them. It is the nature of doors to allow entry as well as forbid it... But when we draw close to a locked door we feel enthralled by what is forbidden to us, enchanted by the necessity of imagining what lies within" (1995, 54).

5 Thomas, in "The Strange Voices in the Strange Case: Dr. Jekyll, Mr. Hyde, and the Voices of Modern Fiction" (1988), argues that Stevenson's text, thematically and in the manner of its narration, anticipates such modernist writers as Conrad, Joyce and Beckett (74). Indeed, he has explored the connection between Stevenson and Beckett's writing in his article, "In the Company of Strangers: Absent Voices in Stevenson's Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde and Beckett's Company (1986).

6 A powerful modern image as fantastic as the ridiculous Hyde in the doctor's oversized clothes, is of the suit worn by Talking Heads guitarist and lead vocalist David Byrne during a rock concert at the Pantages Theatre in Hollywood in December 1983. Byrne, a tall man, enters moving convulsively in a suit several sizes too large for him. One might expect this to be comic but it is, in fact, disturbingly grotesque. Something "hideous" and awful, something "monstrous" characterises it. This is emphasised in lyrics Byrne performs, in "Girlfriend is Better": "Down, down in the basement/we hear the sounds of machines/and I/no need to worry/everything is under control/Stop making sense/Stop making sense/Stop making sense/Stop making sense." This mirrors the voice of irrational desire (Hyde) speaking up and trying to drown out the (super)ego.

7 According to Strickland,

Stevenson even doubles his work with that of other writers. The opening of Dickens's Bleak House is reflected in Utterson's and Newcomen's journey through the fog in quest of Hyde; the opening description of Utterson echoes that of Ebeneezer Scrooge; Utterson's dream of Hyde parting Jekyll's bed curtains mirrors the central dream-born scene of Mary Shelley's Frankenstein (1995, 70).

8 In his edition of the novel Wolf (1995, 264-6) includes a contemporary Punch parody titled "The Strange Case of Dr. T. and Mr. H." and suggestively sub-titled "or Two Single Gentlemen rolled into one!"

9 Veeder (1988) suggests Utterson's own complicity in these homoerotic innuendoes. Incidentally, Wolf's description of Fuselli's "The Nightmare" itself evokes images from Peter Shaffer's play Equus (1985) in which a disturbed young man, Alan Strang, blinds several horses when forced to face repressed fears. The play generates strong homoerotic currents between Alan and his psychotherapist, Martin Dysart.

10 Veeder (1988) also suspects homoerotic envy, foregrounding Utterson's fear of Hyde being at Jekyll's bedside and the doctor's parenthetic comment about Utterson often referring to his "large, firm, white and comely" hand (145-6).

11 Generally speaking, Hyde's murders and imagined sexual sorties are not accounted for in detail (with two memorable exceptions). The novel's historical circumstances partly explain this.
The delicate subject matter endangered Stevenson's reputation without totally violating the strictures of literary decorum imposed by the Victorian mindset. However, historical circumstance does not account entirely for the sparsity of gruesome details of Hyde's activities. Stevenson, like Stoker, skilfully (evasively) mobilised the trope of the inexpressible.

"Ken" perhaps betrays Stevenson's Scottish heritage, but it is also peculiar ("uncanny"?) that he should use a word relating to an older sense of "can" meaning to "know". This connects it, subliminally at least, with the "uncanny", reinforcing Hyde's "place" in the unconscious "out of the ken" of his conscious pursuers.

As Barthes asserts in *The Pleasure of the Text*, bliss is always lost as soon as it is produced. Thus

[i]he bliss of the text is not precarious, it is worse: precocious; it does not come in its own good time, it does not depend on any ripening. Everything is wrought to a transport at one and the same moment. This transport is evident in painting, today's painting: as soon as it is understood, the principle of loss becomes ineffective, one must go on to something else. Everything comes about; indeed in every sense everything comes - at first glance. (1975, 52-3, emphases in original)

Veeder (1988) alerts the reader to the evocative signification of "Messrs Maw". Certainly, Jekyll/Hyde could almost be referring to himself since "maw" (and fittingly it is pluralised here) means "the jaws or throat of a voracious animal" (Godfrey-Smith *et al*. 1991, 487). As noted elsewhere in this chapter, Hyde is often associated through vivid imagery with various animals. According to Veeder, he is "conceived" in old Dr Denman's (den-man's) laboratory. Veeder connects the patriarchal practice of passing on property between males with the savagery residing in the interstices of the world of hypocritical Victorian propriety.

Ironically, as Jekyll himself observes in his "Full Statement of the Case", it is not that the second sample forwarded by the pharmacists is impure: its purity renders it ineffectual. The key ingredient allowing Jekyll to transform himself into Hyde was a contaminating unknown impurity. This fact allows Stevenson to follow the convention of "explaining the unexplainable with an unexplainable". It also means that Jekyll's disappearance is irreversible: Hyde's death signifies his full and final incorporation, while Jekyll is trapped (eternally repressed) in the inorganic, insubstantial of "trembling immateriality" (Stevenson 1979, 82).

This "eruption" anticipates the extraordinary report made by Kurtz in *Heart of Darkness* for the "International Society for the Supression of Savage Customs" (an ominous title which also evokes the phallogocentric fear of the Other in Stevenson's text). The "missionary" is praised for providing a "beautiful piece of writing" (Conrad 1989, 86) but this is tempered by an anomalous marginal figuring which I reproduce here to provide a sense of "déjà lu":

This was the unbounded power of eloquence - of words - of burning noble words. There were no practical hints to interrupt the magic current of phrases, unless a kind of note at the foot of the last page, scrawled evidently much later, in an unsteady
hand, may be regarded as the exposition of a method. It was very simple, and at the end
of that moving appeal to every altruistic sentiment it blazed at you, luminous and
terrifying, like a flash of lightning in a serene sky: "Exterminate all the brutes!" (87)

As for Jekyll, the "flash of lightning" soon constitutes the sky: he cannot escape it. The
irony in both texts is that the symbolic imperative to repress the forbidden, "brutal" desires of the
id is acted upon so forcefully as to create an even more hideous form of brutality. Hogle (1988),
in "The Struggle for a Dichotomy: Abjection in Jekyll and His Interpreters", recognises this
doubly enacted abjection, describing Jekyll's motivations for summoning Hyde thus:

He attaches the "incongruity" he fears to an "other" of himself, a signified from
which he wants to become utterly separate. He then covers that abjection more by
making the other itself a figure with a class and meaning supposedly different from
anything Jekyll might visibly reflect. The image thus thrown forth, naturally, responds
in kind with an effort to divide itself from what is consigned to it by imitating, rivaling,
and even redoubling the divisive/repressive violence of its "father"-figure. (178)

Interestingly, indicating the allusively apt title of King's novel, Hogle (1988), claims that
Jekyll "names that figure 'Hyde,' ostensibly because this 'double,' resembling those in previous
gothic tales by Stevenson and other writers, conceals 'like a thick cloak'... Jekyll's connection
with uncivilized lawlessness and his attempt to divorce his daylight awareness from the dark half
of the duplicity that supposedly inhabits everyone" (163, my emphasis).

The very name "Stark" could have come directly from the pages of Stevenson's text. Its
monosyllabic crudity - its bareness, to use a pun - resembles "Hyde", "Guest", "Gaunt Street",
"Poole" etc. It also connects with the colloquial term "starkers" to mean "mad, insane". Its
homoerotic designation of stiffness or rigidity has textual resonances as well. Importantly, it
aptly counterbalances the nonchalant privilege and blissful ignorance suggested by the banal
"Beaumont".

In a moment of black humour, King announced in one of his books that Bachman had
died of "cancer of the pseudonym". However, this attempt to write Bachman off has not been
successful as King's writing of novels like The Dark Half bear witness. In retrospect, he is
probably not surprised at this situation since it parallels Jekyll's inability to dispose of Hyde
when the doctor is finished with his alter-ego. Clearly, King's self-conscious mobilisation of
figures such as those in the novels of Gothic writers like Stevenson (and Stoker and Shelley)
extends to the "texts" of these texts' production. Here, King follows Strickland's observation of
Jekyll and Hyde in which the "doubling continues outside the book's covers" (1995, 70).

Poole's metaphor here is not merely trite. Moreover, it polyvalently blurs, self and other.
It does so through animal imagery (whether birds, porcupines or hedgehogs). As already noted,
Stevenson links the animal with Hyde (in this passage alone, Jekyll/Hyde "slips out", "whipped
upstairs" and cries out "like a rat"), so Poole's reference to his own hair standing up like "quills"
makes him implicitly like Hyde. Of course, the question which Veeder (1988) asks about many
of the other characters in the book is relevant here: what was Poole doing in the theatre and why
did he enter there suddenly? Certainly, an image of fugitivity attaches itself to him in his own description. Yet with "quill", this fugitivity is not merely the narrative or thematic nexus between he and Hyde: the two are also linked textually. This occurs through an alternative designation of "quill" as a writing tool, indicating once again, Hyde's emergence in the written and his very literary effects (i.e. his status as a fugitive figure). It also alerts us to the very textuality of Stevenson's writing at this point.

The usage of the word "tissue" here refers to Barthes' ideas on the etymology of "text" in The Pleasure of The Text (1975):

"Text means Tissue; but whereas hitherto we have always taken this tissue as a product, a ready-made veil, behind which lies, more or less hidden, meaning (truth), we are now emphasizing, in the tissue, the generative idea that the text is made, is worked out in a perpetual interweaving; lost in this tissue - this texture the subject unmakes himself, like a spider dissolving in the constructive secretions of its web. Were we fond of neologisms, we might define the theory of the text as an hyphology (hyphos is the tissue and the spider's web). (64, emphases in original)

Hogle (1988) observes that this "rhetoric can be reinforced, as Stevenson well knew, by late-Victorian variants on the theory of evolution that picture modern man as struggling to separate the fully civilized from the still-primitive tendencies in himself" (163). He also alerts the reader to Stevenson's "frequent talks with the evolutionary psychologist James Sully... More than Sully, Stevenson saw evolutionary thought as an increasingly popular style, which a progressive scientist, notwithstanding the incompatibilities, would probably try to blend with the rhetoric of a dualistic religion" (202, emphasis in original).

However, it must be noted that Hyde spontaneously usurps Jekyll's body when he becomes increasingly violent and lawless. Indeed, as Jekyll's statement reveals, any attempt to separate the two is futile anyhow since Hyde has always already infected Jekyll.

This terminology again alludes to Barthes' "double" entendre linking the written figure with orgasmic bliss. Here Hyde represents, especially for Jekyll, an ultimately overpowering force embodying not only the "pleasure of the text", but also its sublime, unspeakable terror.

Veeder (1988) makes an intriguing play on (dis)solution and Hyde's fluid figuration in Jekyll's unconscious.

This fundamental element of fugitivity is reproduced in the "case" of Odetta Holmes/Detta Walker in The Drawing of The Three (1987), the second volume of King's fantasy novel series, The Dark Tower. Here, the house or home (Holmes) becomes associated with propriety (Odetta), roaming from it (Walker), with the sordid and unspeakable (Detta). Holmes is wheelchair-bound. She is a doubled personality; neither she nor her alter ego, the active Walker, are aware of each other. They are Jekyll/Hyde figures through being, as their names suggest, two diametrically opposed personalities cohabiting one body. They have an equally tenuous hold on this captive (hide-bound) body. In traditional psychoanalytic terms, Odetta represents the
(super)ego while Detta represents the unruly id (Hyde). Ultimately, the two, seeing each other for
the first time in a mirror, are startled and, after a short psychic battle, accept each other to
become a new individual called Susannah. This is a resolution impossible for Jekyll/Hyde: their
becoming indistinguishable signals the end of the novel tracing Hyde's life. It leads only to a
state of agony, death (murder/suicide) and physical and textual disappearance.

27 Strickland uses Jekyll's language to allude to the self-fulfilling prophecy of differential
otherness the doctor evokes. Strickland states:

Twos multiply twos into infinity, finally resulting in what Jekyll feared, "mere polity"
and dissolution. That has happened with differing interpretations of the story.
Approaches vary from the feminist to the deconstructionist, from Marxist to New
Critical. A strange case, indeed, that such a short work can support the heavy weight of
such multifarious interpretation. (1995, 70)

28 Again, King reworks an important image from Jekyll and Hyde in The Drawing of The
Three with his description of the villainous Jack Mort:

There ensued a short, violent struggle. The gunslinger won, but it was a
surprisingly hard go. In his way, Jack Mort was as divided as Odetta. He was not a
schizophrenic as she was; he knew well enough what he did from time to time. But he
kept his secret self - the part of him that was The Pusher - as carefully locked away as an
embezzler might lock away his secret skim. (1989, 380)

29 Jekyll's use of this term may remind the reader of Armand's coven's identical designation
of Lestat and Gabrielle in The Vampire Lestat.

30 Wilde's novel The Picture of Dorian Gray, published just four years after Jekyll and Hyde
shares with Stevenson's text a preoccupation with "doubleness" or duplicity. Dorian's portrait
bears the marks of all his decadent and sinful doings while his own visage remains untainted and
eternally youthful. The portrait, appropriately enough (given the connotations arising from the
name Hyde and the "back-door" manner of his comings and goings) hidden away, is Dorian's
secret dark side. Like Jekyll's potion, it is the means through which Dorian manages to retain a
hypocritical separation between social prestige and dark unspeakable desire. The child/adult
distinction is also an issue in these texts since Hyde is a figure of infantile regression both in
terms of his behaviour and his physical stature. Also, Dorian's portrait enables him to retain a
semblance of youth despite partaking in the most sordid of activities. The uncanny figures of
Hyde and the portrait enable this child/adult distinction to blur. Importantly, neither Dorian nor
Jekyll can maintain the separation of their doubled selves. In remarkably similar endings, both
Wilde and Stevenson show the protagonists being consumed by their own productions, the
process of consumption so overwhelming that it leaves the two prone, lifeless dolls glutted to
terminal excess.

31 The "true" cause and sequence of events is "hidden" from us, shrouded in as much
mystery as Hyde himself. Veeder (1988) points to a puritanical influence on Stevenson exerted
by wife Fanny and father, Thomas. Indeed, as he states, "certain questions about the novella's genesis and Stevenson's intentions can never be answered" (3). This then inscribes the text and Stevenson himself as fugitive figures before the text's publication. Even in its "prenativity", the text embodies fugitive characteristics. As Shelley did in her writing of *Frankenstein*, Stevenson claims to have been influenced by vivid dreams, indicating a "return of the repressed" from his own unconscious which Hyde in the text enacts. In a sense, the "truth" of how the creator (author) of the monster (text) came to create the aberration (and abomination) is unknowable at both the narrative and textual levels. A set of fugitive figures are mobilised in a complex network of significations to ensure this. In this case, "fugitive figures" evokes the sense of signifiers ostensibly defining the "truth" of the "origin" while evasively dissembling or disseminating from this "truth". The stories of the text's "origins" become inseparable from the narrative itself - both are part of a wider text, one that is fugitive and beyond definitive apprehension.

32 Like Hyde himself: he refuses to be silenced; his primitive whimperings over(id)es Jekyll's dramatic, "civilised" pronouncements. Despite his small, "dwarfish" stature, Hyde's assured position in Jekyll's psyche is obvious. He may be miniature, senseless, and bestially regressive, but the disruptive force he embodies is too strong for Jekyll (or any of his colleagues) to ignore. These characteristics act as precursors for Dinesen's "The Monkey", originally published in 1934. As in *Jekyll and Hyde*, the distinction between the civilised and barbarous is scandalously effaced through metamorphosis. In Dinesen's story, a prioress in a European convent is grotesquely transformed into a monkey:

... the glass of the window fell crashing to the floor and the monkey jumped into the room.

Instantly, without looking around, as if escaping from the flames of an advancing fire, the Prioress... ran, threw herself, towards the door... But the monkey followed her... It jumped upon her, got hold of her lace cap, and tore it from her head. The face which she turned towards the young people was already transformed, shrivelled and wrinkled, and of dark-brown colour. There were a few moments' wild whirling fight... before their eyes, a change, a metamorphosis, was taking place and was consummated.

The old woman with whom they had been talking was, writhing and dishevelled, forced to the floor; she was scratched and changed. Where she had been, a monkey was now crouching and whimpering, altogether beaten, trying to take refuge in a corner of the room. And where the monkey had been jumping about, rose, a little out of breath from the effort, her face still a deep rose, the true Prioress of Cloister Seven.

The monkey crawled into the shade of the back of the room and for a little while continued its whimpering and twitching. Then, shaking off its misfortunes, it jumped in a light and graceful leap on to a pedestal, which supported the marble head of the philosopher Immanuel Kant, and from there it watched, with its glittering eyes, the behaviour of the three people in the room. (1993, 384)
NOTES - CHAPTER 5

1 As Lew argues, Victor's father marries Caroline two years after the death of her father leaves her orphaned. Indeed,

The novel links Caroline iconographically with death. Her story springs almost casually from her proximity to death... Caroline herself dies when Victor is seventeen, due to a suicidal, but more importantly, irrationally misplaced act of "maternal" instinct towards Elizabeth...
Caroline dies after nursing Elizabeth through scarlet fever. (1991, 264-8)

2 This recalls Chambers' concept of the "suicide tactic" employed by writers like Nerval and Aquin who he identifies as being "socially minoritized" (1991, 106). According to Chambers,

such texts as those of Nerval and Aquin foreground their own situation of enunciation - or more accurately, they foreground themselves as constituted by an enunciatory situation - and invite the reader to interpret the relations of narrativity that they produce, or of which they furnish a mimesis, as a function, precisely, of their oppositional status. What I shall call the "melancholic" or "suicidal" text is thus a form of textuality in which a certain "loss" of narrative identity is enacted as a "gain" in oppositional impact, subject to their "appeal" for reading encountering an appropriate response. (106, emphasis in original)

3 Olorenshaw's use of this technical word designating "a sentence or construction that lacks a proper grammatical sequence" (Godfrey et al. 1991, 24) suggests the figural nature of the creature. It is a term that unites the narrative and textual elements of the creature. At the narrative level, he is Victor's "construction". At the textual, he is the "sentence" expressing what Victor/Shelley has repressed. However, the creature will never be accepted by society (here, Shelley's fear about how her "ghost story" would be received surfaces) because as a figure of the unconscious it inescapably "lacks a proper grammatical sequence". In other words, it "lacks", through its overwhelming otherness, the "proper" characteristics to assume a recognisable, acceptable identity. Here "proper" assumes a meaning as close as possible to its etymological root of the Latin proprius - "one's own" (Godfrey-Smith et al. 1991, 627). At the narrative level, he seeks inclusion in the lives of others because recognition by others is a sign and realisation of an identity of "one's own" linked to but distinguishable from these others. He needs a context in which to signify himself through his newly acquired linguistic skills. Indeed, as Hogle reminds us, "the emergent figure, though tending in multiple directions, reaches out for some kind of dictionary to provide some fairly consistent terms and analogues for the self. The confused and diffuse subject-in-language starts feeling a need to know itself in discourse as a "self" separate from other selves, albeit in relation to them, and from the welter that could reabsorb it if it did not become distinct" (1988, 195, emphasis in original). This quest for inclusion is incorporated in the definition of "anacoluthon" with its textual sense of the impossibility of inclusion in "a proper grammatical sequence". This means that the textual figure of the creature cannot be comfortably accommodated within the narrative because of a fundamental ungrammatical lack. His fate is to be disruptive and to remain the membra disjecta out of which he has been fashioned. He is to remain a "welter", "a state of turmoil; a disorderly mixture" (Godfrey-Smith
et al. 1991, 874). At the narrative level he is to be abjected as the embodied threat to domestic harmony. This is mirrored by the textual figure of the creature as a disseminating force disrupting the coherent generic “form” of narrative itself. Olorenshaw provides a specific context for this textual disruption: Shelley's own positioning of herself/her text within/outside the context of her progenitors (in a strictly literal and literary sense). My own use of the De Lacey scenes here is more general, or as it relates to Gothic fugitivity, "generic". Thus "anacoluthon", with its figural emphases is a most apt term to convey the simultaneously narrative and textual rejection (abjection) of the creature-figure of uncanny (unhomely) disruption.
NOTES - CONCLUSION

1 Given the discussion on animal imagery in *Jekyll and Hyde*, Poe's use of "lynx" is interesting, suggesting feline stealth and cunning. Our experience of this kind of imagery in Stevenson's text already alerts us to the villainous qualities of the Minister. However, Jekyll and his associates are implicated, through this imagery, in Hyde's regressive bestiality. Likewise, as shall be seen in Poe's story, the figures who attempt to solve the case (particularly Dupin) are implicated in the Minister's duplicity, as the self is inscribed through its own other(ness).

2 According to Barthes in "The Death of the Author", the reader as "scriptor" will supplant the "Author":

   [t]he Author is thought to nourish the book, which is to say that he exists before it, thinks, suffers, lives for it, is in the same relation of antecedence to his work as a father to his child. In complete contrast, the modern scriptor is born simultaneously with the text, is in no way equipped with a being preceding or exceeding the writing, is not the subject with the book as predicate; there is no other time than that of the enunciation and every text is eternally written here and now. (1988, 170, emphases in original)

3 This idea about the Prefect disappearing from the text resonates with significant disappearances in *Jekyll and Hyde*. After his murder of Carew, Hyde "disappear[s] out of the ken of the police as though he had never existed". Since Hyde is not granted narratorial freedom in the text (this right rests, as the names suggest, with Utterson instead), he signifies himself with his brutal acts which represent the disorder the orderly Utterson is attempting to dispel. Importantly, Hyde's disappearance is repeated by Lanyon, Jekyll and Utterson in dramatic succession. In Jekyll's cabinet, Utterson finds the body of Hyde (the self-destroyer) and the notes left by the doctor. This disturbing discovery is followed in the novel by the simple unqualified, unfocalised presentation of Lanyon's portentous encounter with Hyde: the shock of his seeing the transformation from Hyde to Jekyll so distresses him, he dies several days later. This narrative is followed by Jekyll's own statement which significantly ends with the words, "I bring the life of that unhappy Henry Jekyll to an end." Then, the novel itself ends. As Veecher (1988) notes, there is no analysis of these narratives, nor summary of their implications by Utterson, the man who has led the reader through the maze of Jekyll/Hyde's secret life so far. In a sense, he "disappears", losing his authority through his silence, just as Lanyon and Jekyll did before him. These three men "disappear" (more dramatically than the Prefect, but with the same effect) because they no longer have the "right" to narrate: the power that is Hyde is unnarratable, it is too baffling. Utterson, with some help from Lanyon and Jekyll, like the Prefect, assembles all the relevant details, but details are not enough to arrest Hyde (either physically or textually). It is pertinent here to draw attention to "Prefect" which can signify one "authorised to maintain discipline" (Godfrey-Smith *et al.* 1991, 619). In Poe's text, the "Prefect" realises that he does not have the capacity to fulfil his authorised role. Thus he withdraws, relinquishing his right to narrate. Similarly, Lanyon, Jekyll and Utterson, those "authorised to maintain discipline", are sent stumbling by the scandalous, unruly Hyde. They are "authorised" as figures of order by Stevenson, but fail. Like Poe's text, *Jekyll and Hyde* "ends" (as it started) with an enigma: where has Jekyll disappeared to and what will Utterson "make" of it all?

4 Once again, Chambers acknowledges this inconsistency attaching itself to the figure of
NOTES - CONCLUSION

Dupin. He argues that

Dupin's alleged "explanations" are often closer to being enigmatic pronouncements, and they have as much the character of nondisclosure as of disclosure. From the beginning of the story, he has been portrayed not just as a pipe smoker (his friend and the Prefect both puff on meerschaums, also) but more specifically as one who uses clouds of pipe smoke as a measure of concealment (1984, 59, emphasis in original).

Chambers' assertion that pipe smoke is a sign of the inherent concealment in Dupin's "disclosure" recalls the use by Stevenson and Shelley in their texts of a concealing mist. Like the smoke, this mist works at two levels. It simultaneously reveals and conceals the fugitive figures of Hyde and Frankenstein's creature and the complicity of Jekyll, Utterson, Frankenstein and Walton with these "villains". At the level of narration itself (the "textual" level), the mist reveals and conceals the textual mobilisation of fugitive figures to reveal/conceal the "truth" embodied by the narrative fugitive figures. Ultimately, of course, this "truth" is elusive, as "insubstantial" and "immaterial" as the enigmatic "account" Dupin gives of his own success. Once again then, Poe's "detective story" engages with themes and anticipates motifs of Gothic narratives written approximately half a century later.

5 As Hindle notes in his introduction to the 1993 Penguin Classics edition of Dracula, upon its publication, Bram's mother Charlotte lavished on it the following praise: "No book since Mrs Shelley's Frankenstein or indeed any other at all has come near yours in originality, or terror - Poe is nowhere..." (vii, originally cited in Ludlam 1962, 109). As this conclusion aims to show, Charlotte Stoker's reference to Poe is, in retrospect, unwittingly ironic. She no doubt is alluding to Poe's renowned skill in rendering tales of the macabre. Yet, the author of the first detective novels infiltrates, like a fugitive figure, the interstices of Stoker's most horrific scenes. He does this through the fugitive figurations of "The Purloined Letter" which Dracula unconsciously, uncannily echoes, despite (or because of) its generic "difference(s)".

6 This suggests the importance of the glasses worn by both the Minister and Dupin in Poe's story. Specifically, these glasses allow them both to conceal themselves from the other's penetrating gaze. At a more abstract level, they reveal the fear they both have that their duplicity will be uncovered. The glasses allows them to "hyperobtrusively" conceal themselves from the "light of the day". This blinding daylight associates itself with the critical reader of the text. It is figured at the textual (or narratorial) level, the avoidance of each others' gaze at the narrative level.

7 Seeing is important to phallocentrism because the act of seeing something, of turning the traditionally masculine, all-knowing (objectifying) gaze onto it, places the (masculine) subject in possession or control of the desired (feminine) object. Through penetrating her secret with his "lynx eye", the Minister traps the Queen and empowers himself until Dupin sees the "hidden" letter and, as it were, through the Minister. Dupin becomes empowered, the figure invested with the objectivity and prestige traditionally bestowed on the rational male.
Indeed, according to Foucault,

the author is not an indefinite source of significations which fill a work; he author does not precede the works, he is a certain functional principle by which, culture, one limits, excludes, and chooses; in short, by which one impedes the circulation, the free manipulation, the free composition, decomposition, recomposition of fiction... The author is therefore the ideological figure by which marks the manner in which we fear the proliferation of meaning. (1988, 209)

Derrida's diagram is of two intersecting curves circumscribing an ellipse marked centre. It is "a double chiasmatic invagination of edges" illustrating that "[i]t is thus impossible to decide whether an event, account, account of event, or event of accounting took place. Impossible to settle upon the simple borderlines of this corpus, of this ellipse unreminding itself within its own expansion" (1981, 67).
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