2019

Tracing the Origins of the Eighteenth-and Nineteenth-Century Rake Character to Depictions of the Modern Monster

Courtney A. Conrad
Cleveland State University

TRACING THE ORIGINS OF THE EIGHTEENTH- AND NINETEENTH-CENTURY RAKE CHARACTER TO DEPICTIONS OF THE MODERN MONSTER

COURTNEY A. CONRAD

Bachelor of Arts in English

Cleveland State University

December 2011

Submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS IN ENGLISH LITERATURE

at the

CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY

MAY 2019

We hereby approve this thesis

For

COURTNEY A. CONRAD

Candidate for the Master of Arts in English Literature degree

for the Department of

ENGLISH

And

CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY'S

College of Graduate Studies by

_____

Thesis Chairperson, Dr. Rachel Carnell

_____

Department & Date

_____

Thesis Committee Member, Dr. Frederick Karem

_____

Department & Date

_____

Thesis Committee Member, Dr. Gary Dyer

_____

Department & Date

Student's Date of Defense: May 3, 2019

TRACING THE ORIGINS OF THE EIGHTEENTH- AND NINETEENTH-CENTURY RAKE CHARACTER TO DEPICTIONS OF THE MODERN MONSTER

COURTNEY A. CONRAD

ABSTRACT

While critics and authors alike have deemed the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century literary rake figure as a "monster" and a "devil," scholars have rarely drawn the same connections between monsters to rakes. Even as critics have decidedly characterized iconic monsters like Victor Frankenstein and Dracula as rapists or seducers, they oftentimes do not make the distinction that these literary monsters originated from the image of the rake. However, the rake and the monster share overarching characteristics, particularly in the inherent qualities their respective authors attribute to them, which shape the way they treat women and offspring. A side-by-side comparison between the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century rakes of romantic British literature and the nineteenth-century monsters of British Gothic literature exposes similarities in composition and characterization coupled with underlying patriarchal authority. From these similarities, I assert that the literary rake depicted throughout eighteenth- and nineteenth-century British literature evolves into the literary monster depicted in nineteenth-century Gothic novels. This monster reveals the true barbarianism of the rake by transforming his physiognomy from that of a wealthy aristocrat to that of a grotesque breeder of threatening monsters, underscoring the threat of patriarchal authority which rakes continually convey over their female counterparts and debunking the eighteenth-century misinterpretation "that a reformed rake makes the best husband" (Richardson 36).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

While many critics have analyzed depictions of seduction and rape by the infamous "rake" character in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century romance novels, few have connected depictions of the rake character to the literary "modern monster." The literary rake, an infamous male figure frequently portrayed in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century British literature, is characterized by narcissism, immorality, and passion.[1] He is oftentimes of high social status, giving him the means in which to pursue the opposite sex while leaving him protected from the legal repercussions of rape and seduction, echoing eighteenth- and nineteenth-century British sexual assault litigation favoring elite or noble

[1] The literary rake originated in mid to late seventeenth-century Restoration Comedies and Dramas as a stock character, sharing similar qualities to that of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century romantic rake (e.g. aristocratic, womanizing, narcissistic, etc.), but serving a secondary, farcical role juxtaposed to the moral degeneration of rakes depicting serious sexual violations against women in romance novels. As David S. Berkley points out, the rake of the Restoration Period repent for their sins after a life of pursuing "wine, women, and song" (223), an attribute often lost to vanity or contradicted by the rake's regression (e.g. Alec D'Urberville's repentance then subsequent pursuit of Tess in Thomas Hardy's *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*) in eighteenth and nineteenth-century romance novels.

men possessing great political power.[2] This favoritism remains prominent in literary representations of the rake in eighteenth-century novels such as Samuel Richardson's *Clarissa* (1748) and Mary Wollstonecraft's *Maria, or the Wrongs of Woman* (1798) and persists in late nineteenth-century novels such as Thomas Hardy's *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* (1891). The Oxford English Dictionary defines a rake as "A fashionable or stylish man of dissolute or promiscuous habits," emphasizing prestigious social status without purveying an adequate account of those promiscuities often associated with rakes ("rake, n.7").

Unlike the literary rake, monsters primarily appear in nineteenth-century British literature and often occur in allegorical texts within the English Gothic novel, such as Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818) and Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (1897), yet both the rake and the monster share many similar qualities. Just as the rake displays immoral, impassioned characteristics, so too does the monster. The Oxford English Dictionary

---

[2] In the chapter of Erin Skye Mackie's book *Rakes, Highwaymen, and Pirates: The Making of the Modern Gentleman in the Eighteenth Century* entitled "Always Making Excuses: The Rake and Criminality," Mackie provides a detailed background of the eighteenth-century rake figure, analyzing both the presence of the rake in literature as well as in British society. She suggests that the rake character's oftentimes elite social status in both contexts minimizes social perceptions and legal consequence for the rake, outlining three primary excuses made on behalf of the rake to encourage his persistence: "First, there is the celebratory defense of the rake inspired by his stylistic, that is, aesthetic and performative, mastery. Then there are apologies for his misconduct based on appeals to the irresistible pressure of his innate character . . . Finally, there are excuses made for him that appeal to the *merely* performative and thus ultimately inconsequential status of this behavior" (35). She goes on to indicate that these types of excuses often found in literary depictions of rakes are present in reality and further argues that because many politically powerful male figures, such as the king, also participate in rakish behavior, such behavior is overlooked. In fact, rakes are often above the law even when tried: "A law unto himself, the outlaw rake asserts the ultimate aristocratic privilege of sovereign will and thus, in Rochester's words, as a 'peerless peer,' the right to lord it over everyone" (38).

defines "monster" as "any imaginary creature that is large, ugly and frightening" or "A person of repulsively unnatural character, or exhibiting such extreme cruelty or wickedness as to appear inhuman; a monstrous example of evil, a vice, etc." ("monster, n., adv., and adj."). Further, the term "monstrous" is characterized as someone 'inhumanly wicked or depraved; atrocious, horrible" or "that which is monstrous in nature or appearance" ("monstrous, adj., adv., int., and n.").

While their physiognomy differs, the internal qualities of rakes and monsters are largely interwoven. Comparing monstrosity in Shelley's *Frankenstein* and Stoker's *Dracula* to the rakish libertines presented in Richardson's *Clarissa*, Wollstonecraft's *Maria, or the Wrongs of Woman*, and Hardy's *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* allows us to recognize that the true monsters in each Gothic novel are inherently narcissistic, immoral, and passionate – paralleling the qualities of their literary brothers, the rakes. Of course, the parallels between rakes and monsters go beyond these internal qualities. Critics often associate both Victor Frankenstein and Count Dracula with sex, and even maternal usurpation, as both successfully procreate while forgoing the role of female anatomy altogether. Ana María Losada Pérez, for instance, asserts that Victor's motivation in creating his own offspring stems from his desire for "absolute power" (104), emphasizing his desire for patriarchal control similar to the motivations of Richard Lovelace in *Clarissa*. Losada Pérez stresses Victor's oppression of female sexuality and even describes the resurrection of his Creation's corpse as "necrophiliac rape" (108). Losada Pérez's observations indirectly underscore the link between the literary monster and the literary rake since both characters desire to oppress female sexuality to assert patriarchal control. One of the few critics to make a direct connection between rakes and monsters,

David Glover argues that Dracula represents a sexual threat encompassing a "dense web of associations," including "that of rake *and* mother, a patriarch who gives birth to monsters" (256). While Glover associates Dracula with a rake, he stops short of providing a detailed analysis of this connection and its significance. Further, his comparison with Dracula to a mother stretches beyond Dracula's character since Dracula shows no maternal qualities – even as he "gives birth to monsters," he does so through the role of rake by seducing his female victims and subsequently abandoning them upon "birth" into vampirism just as Jemima's mother was seduced, leaving Jemima abandoned by her own father in Wollstonecraft's *Maria, or the Wrongs of Woman*. Such seduction and abandonment marks the character of both the literary rake and the literary monster as both characters seek to oppress their female victims.

Further, this oppression and/or exploitation is conducted through a triangular structural model imitated in all five novels where the rakish monsters, suffering from narcissism, compete with a male counterpart, resulting in the victimization of women as pawns. René Girard explains the concept of the triangular structural model in various forms, but his most compelling definition of "Triangular Desire" suggests: "A *vaniteux* will desire any object so long as he is convinced that it is already desired by another person whom he admires. The mediator here is a *rival*, brought into existence as a rival by vanity, and that same vanity demands his defeat" (7). Girard goes on to explain how the passion of this rivalry converts admiration to hatred, as we see in Richard Lovelace's rivalry with James Harlowe in *Clarissa*, George Venables' rivalry with Henry Darnford in *Maria*, Victor Frankenstein's rivalry with his Creation in *Frankenstein*, Alec d'Urberville's rivalry with Angel Clare in *Tess*, and Count Dracula's rivalry with

Jonathan Harker in *Dracula*. The triangular structural model executed throughout these novels emphasizes the power struggle in a patriarchal society between male tyrants while subverting the third party female simply as an object of desire. While these female "objects" fail to transcend the patriarchal boundaries oppressing them in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century novels, by the late nineteenth century, the monstrous rake becomes escapable through the transcendence of the female voice. In looking at the literary monster through the lens of the literary rake, we may conclude that male tyrants are literally dehumanized. This perspective underscores the role of women as commoditized cogs in a patriarchal machine, a position only exacerbated by the transition from aristocracy to industrialization between the mid-eighteenth and late-nineteenth centuries.

In fact, both Hardy and Stoker turn aristocracy on its head by depicting aristocratic titles as farce – Alec d'Urberville adopts his last name to associate himself with aristocracy and gain social status while Count Dracula's perceived aristocratic title highlights the threat of foreign invasion through land ownership as Dracula invades England through the procurement of several plots of land. Stoker reverses social perceptions of aristocracy further by depicting his literary monster as an aristocrat, deemed by critics as a savage barbarian, where society fears rather than respects him. One of the literary monster's defining characteristics is its physical deformation, a stark contrast to the generally appealing physical appearance of the rake. Thus, both Shelley and Stoker alter the image of the rake character in the form of their respective modern monsters, destroying the image of the rake through the depiction of a grotesque monstrous manifestation that only threatens to breed more monsters and undermine the

matriarchal role of the domestic female. Each author takes monstrosity a step further by depicting the threat of developing a race of monsters, echoing the respective social fears of their time – the newfound freedom and potential education of former slaves from Shelley's 1818 perspective and the integration of and reliance upon foreign trade from Stoker's 1897 perspective following technological advancements during the Industrial Revolution. Christopher Bundrick highlights the cultural transition from aristocracy to industrialism, noting that "Stoker's novel . . . seems to shrug off the final elements of Victorian sensationalism while trying to embrace the technological optimism of the twentieth century" (22). Bundrick goes on to suggest that Dracula represents the "gothic past," echoing Glover's assertion that "By vividly dramatizing the horrors of degeneration and atavism, the figure of the Count underscores the sexualised threat that lay at their core, the assumption of 'a sexual "instinct"' capable of turning to such perverse or precocious forms as 'homosexuality' or 'hysteria'" (Bundrick 22; Glover 255). Both Victor Frankenstein and Dracula, monsters depicted eighty years apart, echo similar threats of foreign invasion while conveying the physiognomic degeneration from rake to monster, ultimately reflecting the barbarianism of the literary rake much more prominently than Richardson, Wollstonecraft or Hardy dared to do in the span of over a century.

CHAPTER II

EVIL TWINS: THE BROTHERHOOD OF MALE TYRANNY FROM *CLARISSA* TO *FRANKENSTEIN*

Authors and critics alike often characterize the literary rake character, an eighteenth- and nineteenth-century seducer of women (or "libertine"), as monstrous just as anyone sexually harassing or abusing another would be. However, they have not made the same connection between depictions of the literary monster to that of the rake. Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* depicts two primary characters, both perceived as monsters by most critics throughout history, but neither is compared to depictions of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century rake character. Of course, the most evident link to a rake, sexual intercourse, is missing from Shelley's monsters; however, the underlying patriarchal tendencies of the rake and the social ostracism of the rake's Creation are echoed in Shelley's monstrous portrayal of Victor Frankenstein and his Creation. In fact, Shelley's portrayal of Victor as literary monster closely parallels both Richardson's portrayal of Richard Lovelace and Wollstonecraft's portrayal of George Venables as literary rakes.

In *Clarissa*, Richardson clearly identifies his primary rake figure as Richard Lovelace and, through several characters (including Lovelace himself), characterizes him

as a "devil" and a "monster." Clarissa's close friend and confidante, Anna Harlowe, goes so far as to suggest that unless Lovelace were to marry Clarissa, he should be "the ungratefullest *monster* on earth; as he must be, if not the kindest husband in it" (Richardson 515, emphasis mine). Interestingly, Richardson's descriptions of the evil wrongdoings of Lovelace throughout *Clarissa*, particularly where Lovelace's own friend and ally condemns his actions against Clarissa, correspond with the OED's definition of both "monster" and "monstrous" as well as with Christina Schneider's criticism of three literary monsters – Victor Frankenstein, Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, and Dracula – and their tendency toward "psychological and moral degeneration" (3). In *Clarissa*, Belford similarly describes Lovelace's immorality:

> Such an adorer of virtue to be sacrificed to the vilest of her sex; and thou their implement in the devil's hands for a purpose so base, so ungenerous, so inhuman! – Pride thyself, oh cruelest of men, in this reflection; and that they triumph over a lady, who for thy sake was abandoned of every friend she had in the world, was effected, not by advantages taken of her weakness and credulity; but by the blackest artifice; after a long course of studied deceits had been tried to no purpose. (Richardson 884)

Lovelace's deceit, and later, his rape, reflects his psychological and moral degeneration as his passion and desire for Clarissa in the face of her rejection along with his desire for vengeance against her family motivate him to transgress social constructs surrounding courtship and sexual relations after he continually fails in his attempts to seduce her through lies and manipulation. While many women throughout the novel deem Lovelace as sexually attractive, Richardson's characterization of him as an immoral rake

challenges the social constructs surrounding marriage as he transgresses moral boundaries surrounding sex and his relationship with the opposite sex.

Richardson further offers Lovelace as an example of the legal favoritism shown to men of his social rank when Clarissa explains why she has chosen not to seek legal council following her rape by Lovelace: "Little advantage *in a court* (perhaps bandied about, and jested profligately with) would some of those please in my favour have been, which *out of court*, and to a *private* and *serious* audience, would have carried the greatest weight against him – Such, particularly, as the infamous methods to which he had recourse" (Richardson 1253). Here, Richardson literally mocks, through his use of italics, the legal category of rape under eighteenth-century British law by depicting Lovelace's freedom to sexually assault the opposite sex without fear of legal repercussions, in contrast to Clarissa's helplessness in the face of social ostracism.

Fifty years later during the height of the French Revolution, Wollstonecraft would challenge the patriarchal social constructs surrounding marriage through her depiction of the immoral rake in correlation with the eighteenth-century male-dominated legal system. Julie Ann Carlson observes, "Wollstonecraft works to disarticulate women from the sentiments that have assigned them throughout history to the private sphere" (6). Wollstonecraft's depiction of Maria attempting and failing to stand up for herself in court against her husband is a clear indication of this disarticulation by exposing the "tyranny of the marriage contract" to underscore the oppression women face under the male tyranny dictating the institution of marriage (Poovey 122). Further, Wollstonecraft portrays the literary rake as a narcissistic abandoner to exemplify the patriarchalism under which women and illegitimate children are controlled and abused.

Wollstonecraft is not the only writer to associate patriarchalism with the victimization of women and children. Twenty years after Wollstonecraft's death, her daughter, Mary Shelley, depicted male tyranny through the literary figure of the monster in her most celebrated novel, *Frankenstein*, echoing her mother's prior concerns. Carlson suggests that "Shelley not only relied solely on books and stories for access to her mother's life but she consummated various collaborations with Percy by reading her parents' books – collaborations that are both sexual and textual" (3). Just as Wollstonecraft "identif[ies] existing marital relations and domestic affections as the chief impediment to social justice" and "alters[s] women's position within family by vindicating the rights of women within and outside of marriage" (Carlson 4, 6), Shelley depicts the removal of women from the act of reproduction, an act historically associated with marriage, to highlight the narcissism of the monstrous Victor under the influence of passion. Shelley's own experiences as a mother may also have largely influenced her depiction of a motherless "Creature" as Jill Lepore indicates: "Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin Shelley began writing *Frankenstein; or, the Modern Prometheus* when she was eighteen years old, two years after she'd become pregnant with her first child, a baby she did not name [because it died before she could]." Even more compelling is the fact that Shelley's first pregnancy was the result of an affair with a rake – a man who impregnated her then abandoned her and her unborn child – and this experience may have influenced her portrayal of Victor's abandonment of his Creation. According to Lepore, Shelley lost a total of three children and remained an anonymous, or unnamed, writer herself to protect herself and her family from backlash for publishing *Frankenstein*; thus, the anonymous "Creature" reflects Shelley's own loss and the illegitimacy of her authorship

which likely caused her to fear public ridicule: this fear may be reflected in Victor's illegitimate offspring, which closely parallels the social rejection experienced by Jemima, an illegitimate child of a rake, in Wollstonecraft's *Maria, or the Wrongs of Woman*. Just as Shelley's personal life influenced her writing, many critics associate certain cultural and historical events with *Frankenstein* as well, particularly the end of slavery in England.

Shelley's publication occurred in the middle of England's abolition of slavery. In 1807, the Slave Trade Act abolished the slave trade, followed by the Slavery Abolition Act of 1833. Critics are quick to make the connection between Shelley's "Creature" and African slaves in early nineteenth-century England. As Lepore again suggests: "Much of 'Frankenstein' participates in the debate over abolition, as several critics have astutely observed, and the revolution on which the novel most plainly turns is not the one in France but the one in Haiti." Further, Shelley applies certain racial attributes similar to Africans in England to Victor's "Creature" as he describes himself as: " . . . more agile than they, and could subsist upon coarser diet . . . I bore the extremes of heat and cold with less injury to my frame; my stature far exceeded theirs" (qtd. in Lepore). While Shelley clearly distinguishes the creature's features from Victor and the typical European, her doing so may serve to "other" the creature from the society he's born into, once again underscoring his status as a social outcast and an illegitimate product of the male rakish monster. England's "othering" of the slave would have been a ready example for Shelley to imitate, and her personal experiences of loss and social ostracism coupled with her familial influences (primarily that of her mother's writings attempting to vindicate

women from male tyranny) may have motivated her depiction of Victor as monster and rake and her portrayal of the "Creature" as illegitimate offspring.

Shelley critiques male tyranny through her depiction of Victor's narcissistic views surrounding his female counterparts, particularly in regard to pursuing knowledge. She does so using first-person musings as Victor recounts how he developed a passion for education in contrast to Elizabeth, his childhood friend and love interest's, simpler delights:

> We were strangers to any species of disunion and dispute; for although there was a great dissimilitude in our characters, there was an harmony in that very dissimilitude. I was more calm and philosophical than my companion; yet my temper was not so yielding. My application was of longer endurance; but it was not so severe whilst it endured. I delighted in investigating the facts relative to the actual world; she busied herself in following the aerial creations of the poets. The world was to me a secret, which I desired to discover; to her it was a vacancy; which she sought to people with imaginations of her own. (Shelley 20)

While on the surface, Victor's account of Elizabeth's disposition appears flattering, he alludes to his patriarchal superiority by applying characteristics of logic and reasoning to himself and of art and whimsy to Elizabeth, equating her to a pet: "While I admired her understanding and fancy, I loved to tend on her, as I should on a favourite animal; and I never saw so much grace both of person and mind united to so little pretension" (Shelley 20). Elizabeth's surprising lack of pretension contrasts Victor's own temperament, implicit in the "dissimilitude" of the two characters previously mentioned. Shelley displays Victor's pretensions more clearly as he immerses himself further into his passion

for chemistry: “As I applied so closely, it may be easily conceived that I improved rapidly. My ardour was indeed the astonishment of the students; and my proficiency, that of the masters” (29). Victor’s narcissism in relation to his intellectual superiority over fellow students, professors, and women parallels depictions of the literary rake’s narcissism in relation to patriarchal superiority over women, both possessing power over their “inferior” counterparts.

Two decades earlier, Wollstonecraft attributes narcissism to Mr. George Venables, one of the many literary rakes to which Maria is victim, emphasizing a “female property issue” cited by Fern Pullan as a result of the French Revolution (495). This narcissism is conveyed in Maria’s revelation about her then-husband after encountering the caretaker of his illegitimate offspring: “Soon after the death of my sister, an incident occurred, to prove to me that the heart of a libertine is dead to natural affection; and to convince me, that the being who has appeared all tenderness, to gratify a selfish passion, is as regardless of the innocent fruit of it, as of the object, when the fit is over” (165). Here, Wollstonecraft conveys the sexual passion of the rake as a means of fulfilling his selfish, narcissistic desires. Venables’s further abandonment of his offspring coupled with the lower social status and subsequent death of the woman he seduces exemplify the perceived patriarchal superiority men feel and the power they possess over women.

Wollstonecraft goes on to underscore male privilege within eighteenth-century litigation, depicting Maria’s lack of legal rights as a wife when she is imprisoned by her own husband (legally) where she subsequently falls victim to another rake figure. Even while imprisoned, masculine privilege is prevalent in the relationship between Henry

Darnford and Maria where the third-person omniscient narrator emphasizes the insincerity of Darnford's relationship with Maria:

> With Darnford [Maria] did not taste uninterrupted felicity; there was a volatility in his manner which often distressed her; but love gladdened the scene; besides, he was the most tender, sympathizing creature in the world. A fondness for the sex often gives an appearance of humanity to the behaviour of men, who have small pretensions to the reality; and they seem to love others, when they are only pursuing their own gratification. Darnford appeared ever willing to avail himself of her taste and acquirements, while she endeavoured to profit by his decision of character, and to eradicate some of the romantic notions, which had taken root in her mind, while in adversity she had brooded over visions of unattainable bliss. (82)

Wollstonecraft alludes to Darnford's rakish tendencies throughout her narrative, and his pursuit to satisfy his own "gratification" by feigning love for Maria demonstrates male tyranny through sexual passion and a narcissistic exploitation of female sentiment, denying the social construct of marriage while taking sexual liberties with the opposite sex outside the realm of social acceptance.

Writing in the mid-eighteenth century, Richardson was one of the first to attribute narcissism to his primary rake figure. Lovelace frequently brags of his female conquests and their love for him in return: "Surely, Jack, if I am in a fault in my universal adorations of the sex, the *women* in general ought to love me the better for it. And so they do, I thank them heartily; except here and there a covetous little rogue comes cross me, who, under the pretence of loving virtue for its own sake, wants to have me all to herself"

(420). Here, Richardson conveys the sexual passion of the rake as a means of fulfilling his selfish, narcissistic desires. Lovelace's further observations regarding the opposite sex – that they should appreciate his admiration – exemplify the perceived patriarchal superiority men feel and the power they possess over women in the mid 1700s. Pullan highlights how the legal structure of land ownership and marriage at this time influenced male treatment of women throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, citing *Clarissa* as a prime example:

> By inheriting part of the familial estate in Richardson's novel, Clarissa gains some independence (as no male member holds the property in trust for her), which her family thinks she should yield, reverting back to the more usual state of male dominance over women. To their minds, this 'strain of natural rights theorizing about property reads the female body as itself a kind of property' (18). To build, therefore, on London's observation, we know that a woman's identity is absorbed into her husband's upon the marriage, but unmarried women held little legal identity anyway. (494)

Further, Lovelace's "adoration" of women reduces them to objects, and his derogatory supposition that women who presumably wish to maintain their virtue are simply trying to secure him as their own highlights both the pressures of marriage for women to establish some semblance of autonomy through their husbands as well as Lovelace's own vanity and distrust for women as a means of justifying his rakish behavior toward them. Based on the lack of legal rights for women at the time, Lovelace is free to pursue his sexual passions, reflecting his narcissistic thirst for pleasure through the mistreatment and rape of women.

Following major breakthroughs in electrochemistry in the early 1800s, Shelley attributes similar qualities of passion and narcissism to Victor even as she omits sexual pleasure, focusing instead on scientific pleasure. Victor's passion for the sciences leads to his narcissistic thirst for power as a means of transcending the defined parameters of science as well as familial relationships, paralleling depictions of the rake's sexual passion as a means of gaining patriarchal power over women and undermining socially constructed familial relationships, particularly of husband and wife. Such male tyranny is paralleled through Victor's passion for knowledge as he transcends the "ideal bounds" of life and death to feed into his own narcissistic gratifications: "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 their's" (Shelley 32). Here, the regulations on education and the social constructs surrounding sexual reproduction are evaded in an effort to gain pleasure in the pursuit of knowledge outside the discoveries of natural science. Shelley's depiction of Victor as monster relies upon his transcendence of sexual reproduction through unnatural, asexual reproduction and the omission of the female reproductive organ, yet, ironically, Victor's passion for this knowledge categorizes him as a rake character as he undermines femininity and enforces his own patriarchal dominance over his female counterparts. While some critics may argue that Shelley depicts Victor as an androgynous creator, taking on the role of both male and female, Victor only refers to himself as "father" and subsequently abandons his Creation, a disposition most notably attributed to the male rake figure.

Richardson, Wollstonecraft and Shelley display overlapping characteristics of male tyranny in their respective depictions of monster and rake since Richardson's Lovelace, Shelley's Victor and Wollstonecraft's numerous rakes abandon their offspring. Since Lovelace's abandonment is merely mentioned in passing, I will focus my analysis on Shelley and Wollstonecraft for the sake of brevity. The most notable depiction of fatherly abandonment in Wollstonecraft's *Maria* is presented by Jemima's first-person narration. Jemima, the daughter of a rake character, experiences severe patriarchal oppression from birth:

> My father . . . seduced my mother, a pretty girl, with whom he lived fellow-servant; and she no sooner perceived the natural, the dreaded consequence, than the terrible conviction flashed on her – that she was ruined . . . Her incessant importunities to prevail upon my father to screen her from reproach by marrying her, as he had promised in the fervour of seduction, estranged him from her so completely, that her very person became distasteful to him; and he began to hate, as well as despise me, before I was born. (26)

Here, Wollstonecraft defines procreation as the "dreaded consequence" of sexual passion and seduction, indicating that the aftermath of such passions is disappointment and, ultimately, the rejection of one's own creation. Shelley similarly conveys this rejection of offspring through the perspective of both Victor and his Creation. Victor once again possesses the qualities of the rake through his similar immediate distaste for his Creation: "I had worked hard for nearly two years, for the sole purpose of infusing life into an inanimate body. For this I had deprived myself of rest and health. I had desired it with an ardour that far exceeded moderation; but now that I had finished, the beauty of the dream

vanished, and breathless horror and disgust filled my heart" (34). Here, Victor's arduous desire parallels Jemima's father's fervour of seduction; both the monster and the rake are so consumed with passion that each ignores the consequences of acting on that passion, transgressing in their respective pursuit of patriarchal power. The result of such transgressions, their respective offspring, convey society's disregard for the innocence of birth as Victor's Creation and Jemima are both not only rejected by their male creators but also by society as a whole. Shelley gives voice to this rejection through Victor's Creation's first-person account that "You, my creator, would tear me to pieces, and triumph; remember that, and tell me why I should pity man more than he pities me?" (98). Through the act of transgressing against the social constructs of marriage-induced sexual reproduction, the resulting offspring itself becomes a transgression not only rejected by the monster/rake but also rejected by society as a whole. For Shelley, there is no place in the carefully constructed social order for illegitimate creations.

Wollstonecraft, writing at the height of the French Revolution, and Shelley, writing in response to it, suggest that even as Jemima and Victor's Creation understand the constructs of society, they remain social outcasts. Shelley's depiction of Victor's Creation highlights his inability to fit into any particular social group, as he is the first and only of his kind. This is apparent in his narrative as he observes the social behaviors of the cottagers from which he learns social norms, underscoring his failure to fit in:

> While I listened to the instructions which Felix bestowed upon the Arabian, the strange system of human society was explained to me. I heard of the division of property, of immense wealth and squalid poverty; of rank, descent, and noble blood.

> The words induced me to turn towards myself. I learned that the possessions most esteemed by your fellow-creatures were, high and unsullied descent united with riches. A man might be respected with only one of these acquisitions; but without either he was considered, except in very rare instances, as a vagabond and a slave, doomed to waste his powers for the profits of the chosen few. And what was I? Of my creation and creator I was absolutely ignorant; but I knew that I possessed no money, no friends, no kind of property. I was, besides, endued with a figure hideously deformed and loathsome; I was not even of the same nature as man. (80)

Victor's Creation's status as an outcast, and his self-awareness of this fact, disrupts social order by not only failing to provide a place for him within the well-defined constructs of society but also by setting the Creation against society so that his only options are to push back against such constructs or flee from them. Similarly, Jemima shares this self-aware displacement from society and is faced with the same choice, interpreting society's rejection of her:

> I shudder with horror, when I recollect the treatment I now had to endure. Not only under the lack of my task-mistress, but the drudge of the maid, apprentices and children. I never had a taste of human kindness to soften the rigour of perpetual labour. I had been introduced as an object of abhorrence in the family; as a creature of whom my step-mother, though she had been kind enough to let me live in the house with her own child, could make nothing. (28)

Just as Victor's Creation recognizes society's rejection of him and seeks vengeance against his creator and society as a whole, Jemima threatens social order. Wollstonecraft

thus depicts Jemima's breach of social constructs as she chooses a life of prostitution as a means of liberation from patriarchal oppression.

CHAPTER III

DÉJÀ VU: THE RAPE SCENE

Nearly eighty years later at the height of industrialization and New Imperialism, rakes and monsters continue to abandon their offspring in both *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* and *Dracula* while preying on female victims. In a comparison of Hardy's "The Fiddler of the Reels" and Stoker's *Dracula*, Carol Serf points out the similarities between Hardy and Stoker since both "were contemporaries as well as members of the same literary circles (Hardy often attended performances at the Lyceum Theater, which Stoker managed)." While Serf analyzes the progression from Gothic realism to Gothic horror in "Fiddler" and *Dracula*, her analysis touches on social fears prevalent in *Tess* and *Dracula* though her comparison emphasizes Dracula and the "Fiddler" as foreigners rather than rakes. The three overarching characteristics of narcissism, immorality and passion persist in Alec d'Urberville, the epitomized rake, and in Dracula, the epitomized monster. Moreover, the most disturbingly similar quality these two characters share is the rape of their victims as both act at night while their victims sleep helplessly.

Reflecting modern disagreement as to the precise definition of rape, many critics debate whether Tess was actually raped at all, suggesting instead that she was simply

seduced by Alec or ultimately declaring that Hardy was too ambiguous in his description of the scene to make a coherent conclusion toward either case.[3] While Hardy does omit the physical act of rape from this description, the information he provides is not altogether ambiguous:

> "Tess!" said d'Urberville.
>
> There was no answer. The obscurity was not so great that he could see absolutely nothing but a pale nebulousness at his feet, which represented the white muslin figure he had left upon the dead leaves. Everything else was blackness alike. D'Urberville stooped; and heard a gentle regular breathing. He knelt, and bent lower, till her breath warmed his face, and in a moment his cheek was in contact with hers. She was sleeping soundly, and upon her eyelashes there lingered tears. (82)

The scene then digresses toward the nature surrounding them followed by a question of spiritual faith and an allusion toward the rape of Tess's ancestors, but we may analyze the aforementioned scene closely to determine that Tess was undoubtedly raped. First, Hardy makes clear that Tess is asleep upon Alec's approach as Alec proceeds to touch her. Second, while the third-person narration typically follows Tess's point of view, Hardy depicts the rape scene from Alec's limited view, underscoring Tess's unconsciousness.

William A. Davis agrees that Hardy's description clearly conveys rape, and he goes on to underscore the rape laws developed beginning in the 1820s, citing Hardy's own notes on rape litigation and the parallels between various rape cases in the early to

---

[3] See the works of H. M. Daleski, Ellen Rooney, and Kristin Brady regarding a more detailed analysis between rape and seduction in *Tess*.

mid-nineteenth century juxtaposed to scenes throughout *Tess*. Unlike litigation during the mid-eighteenth century protecting rakes from prosecution, Davis acknowledges:

> A review of Victorian case law shows that the courts held firmly to the idea that a sleeping or unconscious woman was incapable of consenting to a sexual relationship. *R. v. Ryan* (1846), for example, affirmed that "where a girl is in a state of utter unconsciousness, whether occasioned by the act of the prisoner, or otherwise, a person having connection with her during that time is guilty of rape." (224).

Davis goes on to raise a rather obvious question: if Tess would have been afforded legal protection from Alec, why does Hardy depict her avoiding litigation? In answer, Davis only briefly touches on the lack of legal rights for working class women, instead emphasizing Hardy's desire to implicate Tess as a seductress toward Angel Clare later in the novel to complicate her moral status for the reader, leaving the status of her purity in question, going so far as to argue that "The sexual assault so carefully foreshadowed, described, and revised by Hardy all but disappears from the plot after Phase the First. Its implicit return occurs in Phase the Seventh, when Tess murders Alec with a knife" (228-229). In contrast to Davis's analysis, Tess's sexual assault remains an underlying cause of angst and hesitation in her pursuit of happiness throughout the duration of the novel. Following Phase the First, Tess's rape is emphasized by the birth of her illegitimate child, Sorrow. Then, following the death of Sorrow, Tess continues to experience turmoil in her relationship with Angel as she dwells on whether or not to confess her ruined status, attempting to on several occasions and failing until she is rejected by Angel following her confession on their wedding night. Thus, Tess's rape continues to follow her even as she

seeks to leave it behind, and the double standard of gendered sexuality rears its head as her husband, Angel, chooses to leave her for being a *victim of rape* even after confessing his own *willing sexual promiscuities* prior to marriage.

During the same decade but within the genre of Gothic horror, Stoker conveys similar "rape" scenes as Dracula sucks the blood of his female victims as they sleep. In contrast to Tess, however, we are given various perspectives of the scene, gaining a first person account from Mina Harker where she mistakenly perceives the scene as a dream: "Suddenly the horror burst upon me that it was thus that Jonathan had seen those awful women growing into reality through the whirling mist in the moonlight, and in my dream I must have fainted, for all became black darkness. The last conscious effort which imagination made to show me a livid white face bending over me out of mist" (Stoker 274). Additionally, Stoker depicts a second person account of a similar scene from Dr. Seward shortly thereafter:

> 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. (298)

While Glover has declared Dracula a rake, he has done so in passing without defining a rake or drawing a direct comparison. Based on the passages above, we see that Dracula's ability to incapacitate his victims and take advantage of them in their sleep, or at least a trance-like state they perceive as sleep, closely parallels the aforementioned rake scene where Alec rapes Tess in her sleep. The lack of details provided by both victims indicate their unconscious states, and Dr. Seward's account even echoes the 1878 *R v. Young* Victorian rape appeal case noted by Davis where justices "affirmed the conviction of the prisoner, John Young, for having connection with a married woman while she was asleep (her husband and two children were asleep next to her)" (224). Moreover, critics consistently read the scene Dr. Seward describes as a sex scene. After citing the same scene, Jennifer A. Swartz-Levine suggests "This scene can rightly read as a rape, since she is assaulted in her own bedroom by a man not legally her husband and the act is violent and angry" (352). Another critic, Kathleen Spencer, interprets the scene as one of consensual sex where Dracula acts as "more seducer than rapist" (217). Thus, even criticism of Dracula's rake scene echoes that of Alec's where critics cannot agree on rape or seduction. Again, following nineteenth-century and twenty- to twenty-first century feminist consensus, it is clear that Tess and Mina are both unconscious victims of rape.

Perhaps unexpectedly, Mina's experience following her rape differs greatly from Tess's. Instead of being cast out by her own husband, she is protected by him and his "committee" of men against further attacks. While Tess murders Alec and suffers the legal consequences (she is put to death), Mina's protection committee excludes her

entirely from the physical act of murdering Dracula – a murder to which there are no legal consequences because Dracula is a vampiric monster whereas Alec is a man with legal protection. Thus, the literary monster – though more powerful than a human rake – is made vulnerable by his monstrous status because he no longer affords social admiration and protection during acts of male tyranny.

The similarities between depictions of monsters and rakes in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century literature beg the question of how certain historical socioeconomic and political circumstances may have influenced such depictions. The literary monster and rake are connected in their narcissistic passions and their association with male tyranny. Victor's patriarchally dominated, asexual means of reproduction emphasizes the discord between men and women in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries just as Darnford's selfish pursuit of the opposite sex displays the advantages men possess through male tyranny. The ultimate patriarchal ostracism of their offspring is echoed in society's rejection, conveying a deep immersion of patriarchal dominance in both the household and social constructs. Further, Dracula's sexually charged vampirism echoes the rake's sexual assault against women in the late nineteenth century while shedding the rake's legal rights. As I have already suggested, many sociopolitical concerns throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries center on patriarchal authority (i.e. litigation protecting rakes in the mid-eighteenth century, marriage litigation protecting husbands and commoditizing wives in the late eighteenth century, etc.). Consequently, deploying Girard's triangular structural model declaring women as pawns between male rivals may shed more light onto the historical sociopolitical trends addressed through the progression from rakes to monsters.

CHAPTER IV

BECOMING THE THIRD WHEEL: TRIANGULAR DESIRE AND FEMALE NEGLECT FROM ROMANCE TO THE GOTHIC NOVEL

Samuel Richardson, a male eighteenth-century novelist, and Mary Shelley, a female nineteenth-century novelist, manage to convey a similar message surrounding the oppression of women and children when viewed through the triangular structural model described by Girard. The patriarchal dominance presented by both Wollstonecraft and Shelley follow Girard's triangular structural model, emphasizing the prominence of relationships between men juxtaposed to the commoditization of women where women are not treated as individuals but are instead pursued by their male counterparts to fulfill male vanity. For instance, in *Maria*, Wollstonecraft conveys the vanity of two rake figures – Darnford and Venables – where Venables sues Darnford for seducing his wife and Darnford abandons Maria, fleeing the country and pursuing a new mistress. Venables's lawsuit highlights women's lack of social status in general as Venables finds it more worthwhile to sue Darnford, and Maria acts as a commodity where she is deemed the property of her husband even in estrangement:

> But the misfortune is, that many women only submit in appearance, and forfeit their own respect to secure their reputation in the world. The situation of a woman

> separated from her husband, is undoubtedly very different from that of a man who has left his wife. He, with lordly dignity, has shaken of a clog; and the allowing her food and raiment, is thought sufficient to secure his reputation from taint. And, should she have been inconsiderate, he will be celebrated for his generosity and forbearance. Such is the respect paid to the master-key of property! A woman, on the contrary, resigning what is termed her natural protector (though he never was so, but in name) is despised and shunned, for asserting the independence of mind distinctive of a rational being, and spurning at slavery. (Wollstonecraft 179)

Maria's cynical views on marriage reflected the court's decision and the judge's conclusion that "It was [a woman's] duty to love and obey the man chosen by her parents and relations, who were qualified by their experience to judge better for her, than she could for herself" (Wollstonecraft 264). As Wollstonecraft underscores the objectified social status of women and the patriarchal tyranny within the household and the legal sphere, she utilizes the triangular model to demonstrate male privilege where Darnford is able to leave a pregnant Maria even after losing his legal battle with Venables, and Venables is able to imprison his wife, confiscate her child, and sue her lover without consequence. This triangular structure works to depict the oppressed state of women as Wollstonecraft suggests that there is no escape from male tyranny in a patriarchal society. Further, her alternate endings muddle any possible transcendence for women though one alternate ending in which Maria and Jemima leave for the country alludes to a possible mode of escape through isolation from patriarchal society.

Twenty years later, Shelley also alludes to isolation as a means of escape in *Frankenstein* when Victor's Creation expresses a desire to take a female companion and leave society. However, his Creation never officially pursues social isolation because Victor destroys his female companion. This destruction exemplifies the triangular structure Shelly adapts since Shelley's triangular model adheres to Girard's analogy to the "devil's game of tennis" where "the players are *partners*, but they agree only to disagree. No one wants to lose and yet, strangely, there are only losers in that game" (103). Both Victor and his Creation lose their respective female counterparts – Victor destroys his female Creation in a passionate anguish against a potential new, destructive race, and his Creation, in an act of revenge, murders Victor's wife, Elizabeth. Victor and his Creation both pursue vengeance, which results in loss as they compete with one another for control. Victor and his Creation are partners insofar as their circumstances tie them to one another, and the master-slave binary, which appears to define their relationship, is actually interchangeable.

As one of the few critics to recognize Shelley's incorporation of the master-slave binary, John Bugg suggests a role reversal of master and slave between Victor and his Creation. He asserts that the reversal of roles takes place upon Victor's Creation's demands for a female companion and Victor's subsequent exile:

> Like a slave, [Frankenstein] is enchained . . . At the same time, the Creature rises to power . . . Shelley's inversion of 'master' and 'slave' engages an important aspect of contemporary abolitionist rhetoric, that in the master/slave relationship the master would necessarily become as degraded as the slave, shackled by moral "chains" as the slave was by iron ones. The Creature actualizes this reversal: to

exact his revenge, he first kills those closest to Frankenstein, and then forces Frankenstein to experience the exile he has suffered. (664)

Bugg's argument for a reversal of roles is compelling, yet his assumption that Victor's Creation has risen to power as master over his creator is inherently flawed. We may find that neither Victor nor his Creation achieve "master" status; in contrast, both strive to become masters over each other but ultimately become enslaved by their own passion to do so. Shelley depicts both characters in positions of perceived power, or "mastery," yet such mastery is an illusion as neither achieves perpetual freedom. This illusion of power is echoed in Shelley's narrative structure where Victor and his Creation are each given a voice, but their voices succumb to the framed epistolary narrator, Walton.

Shelley repeats the words "master" and "slave" throughout the narratives of both Victor and his Creation, often associating mastery with knowledge and slavery with emotional turmoil. For instance, Victor describes his enslavement to his passion for knowledge as he strives to produce his Creation: "But my enthusiasm was checked by my anxiety, and I appeared rather like one doomed by slavery to toil in the mines, or any other unwholesome trade, than an artist occupied by his favourite employment" (Shelley 33). Even in pursuit of knowledge prior to the existence of his Creation, Shelley enslaves Victor to the emotional state surrounding his pursuit.

Looking back from the twenty-first century with the benefit of hindsight, we may apply Girard's triangular structural model to Shelley's depiction of the consequences associated with possessing too much passion. Shelley conveys a message through Victor regarding the pursuit of knowledge and the follies associated with passion, indicating that a balance between the two is necessary. Victor advises Walton:

> A human being in perfection ought always to preserve a calm and peaceful mind, and never to allow passion or a transitory desire to disturb his tranquility. I do not think that the pursuit of knowledge is an exception to this rule. If the study to which you apply yourself has a tendency to weaken your affections, and to destroy your taste for those simple pleasures in which no alloy can possibly mix, then that study is certainly unlawful, that is to say, not befitting the human mind. (33)

Shelley takes this advice a step further by suggesting that tragedies across the world (in Victor's case, the existence of his Creation) could have been avoided "if no man allowed any pursuit whatsoever to interfere with the tranquility of his domestic affections;" presumably, such tragedies of the world would include slavery in England (33).

Victor's retrospective beliefs in regard to a necessary balance between passion and knowledge are further substantiated, or at least insinuated, in his references to masters of his field. For instance, at the beginning of his time at Ingolstadt as he began to revisit the study of natural sciences, he juxtaposes his previous infatuation with the passions of ancient natural scientists with the tame discoveries of modern natural science: "It was very different, when the masters of the science sought immortality and power; such views, although futile, were grand: but now the scene was changed. The ambition of the inquirer seemed to limit itself to the annihilation of those visions on which my interest in science was chiefly founded. I was required to exchange chimeras of boundless grandeur for realities of little worth" (Shelley 27). Victor indicates that the "masters" of science do not answer every question within their field; even masters have limitations as

they seek out "futile" ideals. He alludes to the masters of his field once again during his passionate pursuit of knowledge:

> As I applied so closely, it may be easily conceived that I improved rapidly. My ardour was indeed the astonishment of the students; and my proficiency, that of the masters . . . Two years passed in this manner, during which I paid no visit to Geneva, but was engaged, heart and soul, in the pursuit of some discoveries, which I hoped to make . . . I, who continually sought the attainment of one object of pursuit, and was solely wrapt up in this, improved so rapidly, that, at the end of two years, I made some discoveries in the improvement of some chemical instruments, which procured me with great esteem and admiration at the university. (29)

Here, Shelley foreshadows the dangers of getting "wrapt up" in the pursuit of discovery and neglecting familial relations, conveyed later in Victor's message to Walton indicating the need for balance between passion and knowledge. Victor's insights surrounding true masters of the natural sciences contrast his own approach to the pursuit of knowledge and his desire for mastery as he attempts, and succeeds in, transcending the natural boundaries of scientific discovery. Thus, the dangers of passion predict Victor's enslavement to his pursuits and, later, to his Creation. For Shelley, such passion leads to neglect, loss of control, and irrationality – Victor neglects his Creation, thereby losing control of him, and acts irrationally in his attempt to gain back control. Two decades earlier, Wollstonecraft depicts the same neglect in her rake figures as Venables neglects his wife and child, resulting in Maria's attempts to flee her marriage – Venables then acts

with irrational fervor in imprisoning Maria and taking her daughter away (the fate of whom remains unknown).

Paradoxically, Shelley never depicts Victor referring to himself directly as "master" even as he refers to his predecessors in the field of natural science as such and compares himself in a similar light; instead, he refers to his enslavement to passion even before he produces his Creation, as mentioned previously. After he succeeds in producing his Creation, he still does not call himself a "master." As Bugg observes, he "goes on to name his relationship to the Creature as a condition of slavery on several occasions" (664). The first of these occasions occurs when Victor resolves to return to England to fulfill his obligation in creating a female companion for his Creation: "my promise might be fulfilled, and the monster have departed; or some accident might occur to destroy him, and put an end to my slavery for ever" (105). While Victor's abandonment and destruction of his female Creation may be perceived as an act of mastery over his Creation, Shelley's portrayal of his destruction in a convoluted attempt to save humanity is motivated again by "a sensation of madness" and "passion" (115). Shelley foreshadows this act of passion through Victor's second acknowledgement of enslavement, underscoring his impulsivity: "But through the whole period during which I was the slave of my creature, I allowed myself to be governed by the impulses of the moment; and my present sensations strongly intimated that the fiend would follow me, and exempt my family from the danger of his machinations" (105). Ultimately, Victor is still enslaved by his emotional distress, and his abrupt loss of control is both reckless and steeped in irrationalities. Further, Shelley juxtaposes Victor's irrational suppositions with the deadly consequences he decidedly faces.

While Shelley does not dehumanize Victor literally, she does dehumanize him through his association with his Creation. Further, her depiction of the fluidity of the master-slave binary ultimately suggests that both remain slaves to one another. In contrast, Wollstonecraft's depiction of Maria (and females in general) as slaves to their husbands does not change. Her husband, the rake figure, remains master over her, at least legally, and her only escape from his tyranny is through social isolation. By considering Victor and his Creation, both monsters – figuratively and literally, respectively – through the lens of the rake and, further, as enemies to one another through Girard's triangular model of vanity and vengeance, we may find that the male rake figure is enslaved to his own passions. Shelley's portrayal of Victor's death and his Creation's total isolation from society (and supposed suicide) ultimately suggests that the pursuit of vengeance in the heat of passion only breeds misery and death, and happiness cannot be achieved if we enslave one another. We may perceive that the master-slave role reversal is not a clear "reversal" as defined by Bugg; instead, the master-slave binary fluidly shifts back and forth between Victor and his Creation. Shelley not only depicts this continuous shifting, indicating that mastery is but an illusion, but she also suggests that both Victor and his Creation are enslaved not just by each other and by social expectations; they are victims of self-enslavement through emotional turmoil. The master-slave binary of Victor and his Creation overshadow the presence, and subsequent murder, of women in *Frankenstein*, ultimately underscoring the female objectification and disposability within a patriarchal machine. Writing nearly seventy years earlier, Richardson conveys Lovelace's objectification of Clarissa as a result of his rivalry with her brother.

Some critics argue that Lovelace differs from the typical rake because he develops feelings of sentiment and compassion toward Clarissa while others suggest that Richardson presents women as even more tyrannical than their male counterparts. For instance, Elizabeth Johnston argues that "bad women" throughout the novel are even greater tyrants than their male counterparts as a means to "[deflect] blame away from the men's monstrous behavior" as Richardson further provides a first-person account of Lovelace's thoughts and feelings to gain sympathy from the reader (11). However, Lovelace's own disregard for his feelings toward Clarissa and his motivation for vengeance against Clarissa's family conquers any sentimental feelings he possesses. Further, the presence of "bad women" is balanced by the presence of virtuous women in Clarissa and Anna, and the fact that "bad women" are promoted by male tyrants to behave badly suggests an underlying criticism of patriarchal authority, indicating its corruption of women who remain faithful to such male authority. Ultimately, Richardson suggests that male tyranny leads to the objectification, oppression, and destruction of women where women are sacrificed for the sake of male relations.

Similarly, Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818) depicts two primary male characters – Victor Frankenstein and his Creation – both perceived as monsters by most critics throughout history, who each cause female destruction. Just as Richardson conveys in *Clarissa*, Shelley perpetuates this destruction through the disregard for and objectification of women motivated by male rivalry. The male relationships in both *Clarissa* and *Frankenstein* overshadow relationships with women, imitating the triangular structural model defined by Girard. Lovelace's rivalry with James Harlowe in *Clarissa* and Victor's rivalry with his Creation in *Frankenstein* both exemplify Girard's triangular

structural model where the passion of the rivalry converts admiration to hatred and pits two male figures against one another.

Richardson and Shelley's depictions of male rivalry appear to epitomize Girard's assertions about "Triangular Desire" where Lovelace and James seek vengeance against one another, paralleling the vengeful motivations of Victor and his Creation. Girard further defines "Triangular Desire" in the form of a "double mediation" where "The more intense the hatred the nearer it brings us to the loathed rival. Everything it suggests to one, it suggests equally to the other, including the desire to *distinguish oneself* at all costs. The brother-enemies therefore always follow the same paths, which only increases their fury" (100). Girard goes on to suggest that these male rivalries include a master and a slave: "In double mediation each one stakes his freedom against the other's. The struggle ends when one of the partners admits his desire and humbles his pride. Henceforth no reversal of imitations is possible, for the *slave's* admitted desire destroys that of the *master* and ensures his genuine indifference. This indifference in turn makes the slave desperate and increases his desire" (Girard 109). This master-slave binary is present between Lovelace and James Harlowe as well as Victor and his Creation; however, rather than defining one as "master" and one as "slave," the master-slave binary is more fluid as each male rival may act a master or slave as the plot progresses. As noted earlier, both Victor and his Creation are slaves to their passion, or desire, for vengeance against one another. Similarly, James's jealousy toward Lovelace enslaves him to Lovelace's superiority:

> Mr. Lovelace was always noted for his vivacity and courage; and no less, it seems, for the swift and surprising progress he made in all parts of literature; for

> diligence in his studies, in the hours of study, he had hardly his equal. This, it seems, was his general character at the university, and it gained him many friends among the more learned youth; while those who did not love him feared him by reason of the offence his vivacity made him too ready to give, and of the courage he showed in supporting the offence when given, which procured him as many followers as he pleased among the mischievous sort. No very amiable character, you'll say, upon the whole.
>
> But my brother's temper was not happier. His native haughtiness could not bear a superiority so visible; and whom we fear more than love, we are not far from hating: and having less command of his passions than the other, was evermore the subject of his, perhaps *indecent*, ridicule: so that they never met without quarreling. And everybody, either from love or fear, siding with his antagonist, he had a most uneasy time of it, while both continued in the same college. (49)

While Lovelace, in this instance, possesses mastery over James, he later becomes enslaved to his own passion for vengeance toward James and his family. Further, his passion for pleasure weakens his mastery over James as his passion for vengeance is circumvented by his passion for pleasure. Yota Batsaki argues that Lovelace analyzes the risk of kidnapping and raping Clarissa and concludes, "Lovelace's plot is based on the assumption that the worst outcome for him would be marriage to a virtuous and beautiful heiress. The highest stake he hopes to win is cohabitation without a marriage contract" (35). The desire to remain unwed, according to Batsaki, reflects Lovelace's passion for "'pleasure' over interest" (41). Whether Lovelace treats Clarissa as a means of obtaining

vengeance against James Harlowe, obtaining sexual pleasure or gaining economic status through marriage, Richardson underscores the relationship between Lovelace and James as dominant over Clarissa's status as their mutually desired object; Clarissa acts as a catalyst for Lovelace and James's rivalry as Lovelace kidnaps and rapes her while James forbids her relationship with Lovelace and attempts to force her marriage with Solmes. Here, both familial and libertine tyrannies work to oppress Clarissa as a commodity within the patriarchal machine where her only function is either economic or sexual gain for her male counterparts.

Richardson further presents James as a slave to his own selfish interests and his passion for vengeance against Lovelace, perceived by Anna in a letter to Clarissa on her brother and sister's motivations to destroy her:

> This her secret motive (the more resistless, because her pride is concerned to make her disavow it), joined with her former envy and with the general and avowed inducements particularized by you, now it is known, fills me with apprehensions for you; joined also by a brother, who has such an ascendant over the whole family; and whose *interest*, slave to it as he always was, and whose *revenge*, his other darling passion, are engaged to ruin you with everyone. (85)

Similarly, Richardson presents Lovelace as a slave to his passionate advances against Clarissa: "She flew from me. As soon as she found her wings, the angel flew from me. I, the reptile kneeler, the despicable slave, no more the proud victor, arose; and, retiring, tried to comfort myself that, circumstanced as she is, destitute of friends and fortune; her uncle moreover, who is to reconcile all so soon (as, I thank my stars, she still believes,) expected" (930). We may perceive both James and Lovelace as slaves throughout the

novel as they each try to maintain master status – James over Clarissa to ruin her chances at happiness, and Lovelace over Clarissa upon stealing her virtue. As both are motivated by their rivalries with one another, neither can transcend the enslavement of their passion for revenge. Perhaps, like Shelley, Richardson is advocating for a balance between passion and knowledge, where knowledge in this instance may be replaced by reason.

Although Girard's model is not historically specific, his insights may be incorporated into a historical interpretation. While Richardson's *Clarissa* precedes the anti-slavery movement, his frequent use of the term "slave" to describe Lovelace, James, and Clarissa still works to suggest an enslavement to male rivalry between Lovelace and James and an enslavement to male tyranny within a patriarchal society experienced by Clarissa and other women stripped of virtue. Richardson frequently portrays the dehumanization of women through lost virtue, implied previously by Johnston with her characterization of "bad women," and it is imperative to analyze the cause of this dehumanization. Johnston suggests that the depiction of "bad women" is Richardson's convoluted representation of women, which serves to promote patriarchy. While she provides an interesting account of the women in the novel, she does not give a detailed account of the more virtuous representations of women in Clarissa or Anna. Even Lovelace's closest friend and fellow rake, Belford, acknowledges Clarissa's virtues in comparison to other women following her rape:

> CLARISSA LIVES, thou sayest. That she does is my wonder; and these words show that thou thyself (though thou couldst, nevertheless, proceed) hardly expectedst she would have survived the outrage. What must have been the poor lady's distress (watchful as she had been over her honour), when dreadful

> certainty took place of cruel apprehension!—And yet a man may guess what it must have been, by that which thou paintest, when she suspected herself tricked, deserted, and betrayed, by the pretended aunt and cousin . . .
>
> Poor, poor lady! With such noble qualities as would have adorned the most exalted married life, to fall into the hands of the only man in the world who could have treated her as thou hast treated her! – And to let loose the old dragon, as thou properly callest her, upon the before-affrighted innocent, what a barbarity was that! (Richardson 884)

Consequently, while Richardson dehumanizes Lovelace's female victims by converting them to tyrants, their dehumanization only serves to objectify them further as pawns in Lovelace's rakish game to seduce Clarissa as a means of revenge against James. In addition, Clarissa's virtuous disposition highlights the immorality of Lovelace and James as they place Clarissa in the middle of their feud, a woman deemed least deserving of objectification and exploitation. Helen Ostovich analyzes the effects of confinement on Clarissa, suggesting that the "connection between literary projection and psychological evidence facilitates the modern reader's understanding of the effects of imprisonment on Clarissa's capacity to judge and act. It demonstrates that the experience of confinement challenges traditional assumptions about the stability of an apparently well-integrated personality, like Clarissa's, in an abusive situation" (153). Thus, Clarissa's ultimate death is a result of the confinement and abuse she experiences primarily by Lovelace but also, indirectly, by James. While James ostracizes her from her family, ultimately pushing her into Lovelace's protection, Lovelace imprisons her and rapes her.

Applying Girard's model of "Triangular Desire," we may see the eighteenth-century rake and his rival as victimizing their female pawn without regard for her well being, emphasizing patriarchal dominance through male tyranny and the lack of female autonomy. This is particularly true due to patriarchically centered litigation surrounding land ownership and courtship prevalent during Richardson and Wollstonecraft's times. While the impending abolition of slavery potentially influencing Shelley's master-slave dynamic and her portrayal of Victor's Creation as a monster, her emphasis on patriarchal dominance was likely induced by her personal biographical experiences noted previously, such as her own victimization by a rake in the early nineteenth century. Thus, Victor's rejection and destruction of his female Creation in favor of the preservation of a patriarchally dominated society emphasizes the discord between men and women in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries just as Lovelace's selfish pursuit of the opposite sex displays the advantages men possess through male tyranny. The patriarchal dominance presented by Richardson, Wollstonecraft and Shelley follow Girard's triangular structural model, emphasizing the prominence of relationships between men juxtaposed to the commoditization of women where women are not treated as individuals but are instead pursued, objectified and enslaved or slaughtered by their male counterparts to fulfill male vanity.

At the height of industrialization and with the introduction of female laborers, the late nineteenth century brought about a new type of enslavement through economic status. Hardy portrays Tess's enslavement to both Alec and Angel at various points throughout *Tess*, underscoring Girard's triangular structural model as both Alec and Angel possess socioeconomic power over Tess and rival over her affection. Judith

Weissman suggests that "the triangle of Tess, her pure husband Angel, and her sensual lover Alec" bare "a superficial resemblance" to Tennyson's Guinevere, Arthur and Lancelot in the *Idylls of the King* (190), but though Weissman later refers to Alec as a "rapist," she does not readily condemn him for his actions as a rake against Tess. Instead, she attributes his actions and Tess's victimization to Victorian notions of Christianity and class distinctions. She also juxtaposes Angel to Alec as more of a moral foil without recognizing Angel's own rakish tendencies, yet Hardy classifies both Alec and Angel as rakes, emphasizing the double standards of gender and sexuality once again: "[Angel] then told [Tess] of that time of his life to which allusion has been made when, tossed about by doubts and difficulties in London, like a cork on the waves, he plunged into eight-and-forty hours' dissipation with a stranger" (Hardy 243). While Hardy pits Alec and Angel against one another as a devil would be pitted against an angel, Angel's superiority ends up being as much of a farce as Alec's claim to the d'Urberville name.

Contradictory to his own actions, Angel lets Alec's sexual assault against Tess come between their marriage, abandoning Tess to Alec's power by failing to fulfill his role as husband. As Davis hinted at previously and Weissman asserts more apparently, Tess's economic status as a lower class, working woman ultimately enslaves her to Alec since, like Davis suggests, Tess does not have the same legal rights as those afforded to upper class women to pursue legal action against Alec for rape in the late nineteenth century. Weissman makes this distinction evermore clear: "Tess cannot resist Alec, but not because he is irresistibly attractive; she is in his power first because she is his employee; and she is his employee because she and her class are poor, and getting poorer" (192). Angel represents a means of escape for Tess from economic oppression,

yet even he uses her social status against her as a means of placing blame for her rape: "I thought – any man would have thought – that by giving up all ambition to win a wife with social standing, with fortune, with knowledge of the world, I should secure rustic innocence, as surely as I should secure pink cheeks" (Hardy 257-258). With her husband's disownment, Tess attempts autonomy and independence through industrialization – becoming a female laborer to support herself; trading sexual objectification for mechanized objectification in the workforce – but her attempts at autonomy are quickly thwarted by her family's poverty following her father's death, and she must once again enslave herself to Alec for economic gain.

Much like industrialism, the late nineteenth century marked the return of imperialism, or New Imperialism, as well as reliance on foreign trade and commerce. As much as England was colonizing overseas, foreign invasion became a threat to social order. Stoker conveys this threat in his depiction of Dracula, a foreign Count from Transylvania invading London and acquiring land. Here, foreign invasion marks the beginning of the triangular structural model proposed by Girard by introducing Jonathan Harker to Dracula, eventually leading Dracula to Mina, presumably as a means of vengeance against Harker for escaping his castle and foiling his plans in London. Dracula vocalizes his vengeance while being attacked by Mina's brigade of protectors:

> You think you 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! You think you have left me without a place to rest; but I have more. 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. (Stoker 324)

Harker clearly conveys his motivation for thwarting Dracula's plans early on after discovering that "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" (Stoker 54). Harker's fears soon become realized as Dracula begins converting female victims into vampiric pawns, with Lucy as his primary victim. Stoker clearly portrays the inferiority of both Lucy and Mina to their male counterparts as both desire simply to fulfill the role of housewife or "angel in the house" per their trite, conventional conversations surrounding courtship: "When we are married I shall be useful to Jonathan, and if I can stenograph well enough I can take down what he wants to say in this way and write it out for him on the typewriter, at which also I am practising very hard" (Stoker 57). With the seemingly willing subservience of the female protagonists, they appear as easy targets to fulfill Girard's sacrificial role in the wake of male tyranny.

By observing depictions of the literary monster through the lens of the rake, we may find that male tyranny has been equated to monstrosity through male rivalry, portraying the triangular desire of male vanity in a much more brutal light while further underscoring female oppression through male destruction. However, as our literary figures progress into the late nineteenth century, we see Tess and Mina take female action against the rake and monster, respectively. While Tess's aggressive act of murder against Alec ultimately results in her demise within the judicial system, it marks a transition for women from passive sufferers to active ambassadors for social change. Still within the

late nineteenth century, Stoker conveys the irony in which Mina's initial role as sacrificial pawn and victim to Dracula becomes the sole means of Dracula's defeat. While Mina is first enslaved by Dracula's foreign usurpation and subsequent "rape," acting as a pawn between Dracula and Harker's conflict as Harker combats foreign invasion, Dracula inadvertently empowers her with vampiric abilities, allowing her to escape from the oppression faced under Dracula's control. Glover attributes Mina's superiority to her "man-brain" and suggests that "By putting herself in Van Helsing's hands and asking him to hypnotise her, Mina becomes both patient and double-agent, serving as a kind of conductor between vampire and man" (260). He goes so far as to suggest that Mina acts "as woman *and* as honorary man" (261), yet her intelligence is still minimized in scope by being attributed to masculinity. Further, she still remains limited by the men around her as she does not take physical action against Dracula, and any help she is able to provide is inherently linked to Dracula, a man, rather than her own mental abilities as an autonomous woman. Thus, even as Mina takes action against her captor, she never achieves true autonomy since – like Tess – she still must succumb to the patriarchal authority, which continuously works to oppress her even as women's roles evolve toward the end of the nineteenth century to include working women outside the domestic sphere, and we find in the endnote that Mina has reverted back to domesticity as wife and mother (Stoker 400).

Overall, we may track a progression from domesticity and enslavement during the mid to late eighteenth century to industrialization and imperialism in the late nineteenth century. Richardson clearly depicts Clarissa's lack of rights and autonomy to make her own decisions – even the land left to her is a controversial family affair, and she does not

feel that she has a right to claim it under her family's influence. Wollstonecraft conveys a similar lack of female rights both within marriage (for Maria) and within the lower class (for Jemima). In the early nineteenth century, Shelley does not provide women a means of autonomy outside of marriage either and, in fact, demonstrates the destruction of the domestic female on numerous occasions throughout *Frankenstein*, emphasizing the enslavement and subsequent death of women under the aristocratic patriarchalism associated with eighteenth-century social order. Even the late nineteenth century's industrialization found in *Tess*, which may offer a means of autonomy and escape from patriarchal enslavement for women through labor, threatens to objectify women as cogs within a machine and confines women laborers to the lower class with low wages. Even as Mina serves as the primary defense against Dracula's foreign invasion, she regresses back into the role of "angel of the house" once the job is complete. Thus, though the late nineteenth century certainly offers more autonomous roles for women, Hardy and Stoker's female protagonists remain limited by patriarchal authority within both the legal system and the marriage contract.

CHAPTER V

WHEN TO JUDGE A BOOK BY ITS COVER: THE DEGENERATIVE PHYSIOGNOMY OF RAKE TO MONSTER

The literary rake, despite his violent behavior, is often depicted as an attractive member of elite society. While Richardson, Wollstonecraft and Hardy all attempt to depict literary rakes disgracefully, their relative physiognomic appeal and ultimate "human" qualities make it difficult to cast them in a monstrous light. Senf recognizes a significant difference between the genres of Hardy's "Fiddler" and Stoker's *Dracula*: "Looking once again at "The Fiddler of the Reels" and *Dracula* reveals a critical difference between the Gothic and realism as well as reveals the extent to which Gothic writers took advantage of the exploration of the horror of ordinary human life." Thus, while literary rakes are inherently *human*, Shelley and Stoker's literary monsters lack the humanity of their rakish brothers; consequently, we may find that while the literary monster echoes the internal characteristics of the literary rake, his physiognomy has degenerated into an inhuman or animalistic "othered" figure. Such a contrast is significant in dehumanizing the rake figure as a means of unmasking the rake's inherent monstrosity into a physically grotesque manifestation.

We may see the difficulty Richardson and subsequent novelists faced in conveying the true monstrosity of the literary rake by analyzing the rake's physical attributes as well as the readers' receptions between the mid-eighteenth and late nineteenth centuries. Beginning in the mid-eighteenth century, Richardson's Lovelace was considered a valid prospect for marriage at first by Clarissa's sister before his duel with Clarissa's brother, James, and at times by Clarissa's best friend, Anna. Richardson further iterates Lovelace's appeal in the Preface to *Clarissa,* characterizing him as a libertine but not an infidel and emphasizing his more appealing attributes: "And yet that other, [altho' in unbosoming himself to a *select Friend*, he discover Wickedness enough to intitle him to general Hatred] preserves a Decency, as well as his Images, as in his Language, which is not always to be found in the Works of some of the most celebrated modern Writers, whose Subjects and Characters have less warranted the Liberties they have taken" (Richardson iv). Likewise, in Richardson's Postscript, he acknowledges the sentimentality of many readers' responses advocating for a "happy ending" for Clarissa: "And how was this happy ending to be brought about? Why, by this very easy and trite expedient; to wit, by reforming Lovelace, and marrying him to Clarissa . . ." (1489). Against the backlash of his readership, Richardson condemns Lovelace's actions as Alex Eric Hernandez surmises: "Reformation, like virtue, Richardson suggests, is not something easily brought about after a life dedicated to the type of aggressively self-interested libertinism that the author felt was pervasive among the British elite," and Richardson sought to redefine the "divine providence" of Christianity and the "poetic justice" provoked by early capitalism in the mid-1700s emphasizing material gain (606; 609-610). Yet what of Belford, Lovelace's libertine friend and confidante? Just as

Richardson refuses to reform Lovelace in an attempt to debunk the myth that "a reformed rake makes the best husband," he does so anyway with "the repentant and not ungenerous Belford," who marries and is "*made signally happy*" (1498). Thus, the limitations of social perception and sentimentalism during the mid-eighteenth century limit Richardson's condemnation of the literary rake.

Sentimentalism persists in the late eighteenth century in Wollstonecraft's *Maria* where critics often question whether she has made any real progress in her attempts to highlight the patriarchal authority dominating marriage litigation, with Mary Poovey pointing out the contradictions in Wollstonecraft's beliefs: "Wollstonecraft's political insights and the sentimental structure through which she hoped to develop 'finer sensations' were dangerously at odds. For those 'finer sensations' – and the sentimental genre in which they were characteristically enshrined – were deeply implicated in the very values of bourgeois society which Wollstonecraft wanted to criticize" (112). Poovey indicates that Wollstonecraft's conflicting ideas inhibited her progress on *Maria*, observing, "the fiction that Wollstonecraft believed 'capable of producing an important effect' repeatedly threatens to fall out of grace and into just another sentimental novel" (120). Diane Long Hoeveler agrees, proclaiming "What is at stake in Wollstonecraft's career is her attempt to merge deeply felt personal experiences of pain – woundings, a series of psychic traumas – with a more just social, legal, and political agenda for women" (388). Poovey and Hoeveler each harshly criticize Wollstonecraft's inability to separate her emotions from the narrator's voice in *Maria*, but we may reevaluate Wollstonecraft's sentimental narration as a literary device indicating the ease in which women fall victim to rakes through passion and the physical and emotional appeals they

evoke. Wollstonecraft exemplifies this ease in her depiction of one of Maria's early encounters with her eventual husband, George Venables, after he secretly slid a guinea into her hand:

> What a revolution took place, not only in my train of thoughts, but feelings! I trembled with emotion—now, indeed, I was in love. Such delicacy too, to enhance his benevolence! I felt in my pocket every five minutes, only to feel the guinea; and its magic touch invested my hero with more than mortal beauty. My fancy had found a basis to erect its model of perfection on; and quickly went to work, with all the happy credulity of youth, to consider that heart as devoted to virtue, which had only obeyed a virtuous impulse. (140)

Here, sentimentalism persists as Maria's perception of Venables transcends mortal beauty, again emphasizing the appeal to the physiognomy of the rake figure.

Hardy depicts two rakes in *Tess* – Alec d'Urberville and Angel Clare – yet critics only seem to recognize Alec's infamous status even as they acknowledge Angel's inconsistencies. Rosanna Nunan, for instance, suggests that Angel's rejection of Tess after her confession is a result of his idealized notions regarding rural spaces and chastity – he associates the countryside with sexual purity (294). She goes on to assert: "what Hardy shows us is that Angel's ethic of chastity conceals a decidedly unchaste sexual propensity that, associated with the city, rises to the surface whenever his faith in Tess's rural purity falters" (296). Nunan attributes Angel's hypocrisy toward Tess's confession to spatial circumstances and concludes that because Angel's affair took place in London, it only affirms his belief that "the city must be avoided to combat the widening reach of sexual depravity" (294). Nunan does not associate Angel's sexual promiscuity with his

own physiognomy (his inherent rakish qualities); instead, she attributes his affair to external circumstances. Hardy depicts Angel as an anomaly – an angel sent to rescue Tess from her poor circumstances, elevated above the average man:

> At first Tess seemed to regard Angel Clare as an intelligence rather than a man. As such she compared him with herself; and at every discovery of the abundance of his illuminations, of the distance between her own modest mental standpoint and the unmeasurable, Andean altitude of his, she became quite dejected, disheartened from all further effort on her own part whatever. (141)

In contrast to Hardy's depiction of Angel, he labels Alec as "almost" foreign and barbaric upon Tess's first encounter with him:

> He had an almost swarthy complexion, with full lips, badly moulded, through red and smooth, above which was a well-groomed black moustache with curled points, though his age could not be more than three- or four-and-twenty. Despite the touches of barbarism in his contours there was a singular force in the gentleman's face, and in his bold rolling eye. (45)

Nunan associates Alec with the sexual depravity of the ancient D'Urbervilles and goes on to suggest that "because of Alec's oblique association with syphilis and the Contagious Diseases Acts, the two iterations of aristocratic depravity, ancient and modern, are also linked to urban degeneration" (297). Like Angel's sexual promiscuity, Nunan links Alec's barbarism to his environment – his urban association; however, she also cites his (false) aristocratic status as another contributing factor to his degenerative status. Thus, we may identify Alec clearly as a rake because of his aristocratic status, yet his status also works to protect him from condemnation for raping Tess – a poor, working class

woman. While Hardy clearly associates Alec's status as a rake with barbarism, he depicts Angel masquerading as a figurative angel; consequently, it is up to the reader to recognize that Angel is equally barbaric (and perhaps degenerative) to Alec.

Critics consistently associate Victor and his Creation and Dracula with degeneration and atavism, and they are right in this association insofar as the creature and Dracula's physical manifestations reflect degenerative physiognomy. This physical degeneration is evident in Victor's reaction to his own Creation:

> 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 shriveled complexion, and straight black lips.
>
> . . . I had worked hard for nearly two years, for the sole purpose of infusing life into an inanimate body . . . but now that I had finished, the beauty of the dream vanished, and breathless horror and disgust filled my heart. (Shelley 34)

Victor's reaction to his Creation emphasizes both its degenerative physiognomy and Victor's self-reflection toward the monster he has created. His Creation is meant to be his son, and Victor his father; hence, we may interpret Victor as a degenerate insofar as his failed Creation reflects his own monstrosity. Harker's reaction to Dracula, particularly in his "natural" state of satiated rest, also alludes to degenerative physiognomy:

> . . . I saw something which filled my very soul with horror. There lay the Count, but looking as if his youth had been half renewed, for the white hair and

> moustache were changed to dark iron-grey; the cheeks were fuller, and the white skin seemed ruby-red underneath; the mouth was redder than ever, for on the lips were gouts of fresh blood, which trickled from the corners of the mouth and ran over the chin and neck. Even the deep burning eyes seemed set amongst swollen flesh, for the lids and pouches underneath were bloated. It seemed as if the whole awful creature were gorged with blood. He lay like a filthy leech, exhausted with his repletion. (Stoker 54)

Both Victor's Creation and Dracula are essentially undead corpses, frightful and even animalistic in appearance. However, degeneration halts at their physical attributes. Instead, each transcends both human and animal form – Victor's Creation through his intellectual superiority and brute strength and Dracula through his supernatural abilities to shape shift, mesmerize his victims, scale walls, etc. Thus, rather than simply embodying social fears of the degenerative past as Glover suggests, Dracula also epitomizes the unknown or "foreign" threat to social order during colonization efforts. H. L. Malchow emphasizes social fears regarding educating freed slaves eighty years earlier echoed in Shelley's *Frankenstein*: "As with Frankenstein's monster, the problem of education in the early nineteenth century had a dual aspect: the advancement, moral well-being and happiness of those to be educated, on the one hand; but also, on the other, the safety of the society to which, to some extent, the new urban citizen of the 'dangerous class' or the freed slave of the plantation was to be admitted" (116). Shelley underscores these social insecurities surrounding race following the Slave Trade Act in Victor's fears regarding the threat of a "race of devils" who may wipe out "the existence of the whole human race" (115).

Of course, the degenerative physiognomy of Victor's Creation and Dracula does more than highlight relevant social fears. It also works to externalize the inherent qualities of the rake. While rakes may appear civilized and even noble on the surface, their immoral sexual passions and narcissistic tendencies are inherently barbaric and monstrous. Whereas Tess is subjected to the legal consequences of murdering a human being of aristocratic society, Dracula's inhuman state of monstrosity allows Mina to avoid social retribution for murder. Stoker thus eliminates the legal protections afforded to the elite rake through his depiction of the rake as a literal monster. Through the physiognomy of the literary monster, Shelley and Stoker work to bring the barbarianism of the rake to the surface. Hence, as we trace the nineteenth-century monster back to depictions of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century rake, we may unmask the degenerative status of the rake.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

As we have seen, eighteenth- and nineteenth-century novelists depict literary rakes like Lovelace, Belford, Venables, Darnford, Angel and Alec as members of the socially elite, gaining sympathy and hope for reformation from the sentimental readers of their respective times. Shelley and Stoker have transformed the rake into the allegorical monsters who remain iconic today as they commit acts that several critics associate with rape and/or seduction, similar to the rake, but breed hideous, undead monsters, eliminating any possible redemption through the threat to nineteenth-century society of a monster race (and perhaps playing into social fears at that time regarding the threat of freed slaves following the abolition of slavery or the threat of foreign trade as industrialization progressed). Victor Frankenstein is recognized so readily as a monster that modern remakes of the iconic tale reimagine him as his Creation. In the early twenty-first century, however, the progression of rake to monster has reversed unexpectedly through the image of the vampire. While Stoker depicts Dracula as a grotesque version of man, vampires of the twenty-first century resemble the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century literary rake – handsome, wealthy, charismatic, and redeemable – crossing into

the romance genre. The "sparkly" vampires of Stephenie Meyer's *Twilight* (2005), for instance, are so beautiful in the sunlight that they avoid it altogether to blend in with the average human. Further, they are extremely wealthy and idolized by their human peers. Even after revealing that each of them has committed murder, they are redeemed by their conversion to a "vegan" lifestyle coupled with their seductively good looks. This regression from monster back to rake raises the question of whether patriarchal authority has really changed since the eighteenth century.

Female oppression will likely exist until we end patriarchalism, yet female independence has gained traction since the eighteenth century. The "angel of the house" relegated by marriage contracts and litigation favoring male ownership over their wives and daughters, which plagued Richardson and Wollstonecraft, has since transformed. While Shelley was wrapped up in the abolition of slavery of her time, industrialization was developing across Britain and creating more opportunities for women to work outside the home by the time Hardy and Stoker were publishing in the late nineteenth century. Of course, industrialization was an entirely different form of enslavement as workers had few rights and were often treated as cogs within a machine – perhaps a new form of slavery that plagued both men and women. Women were oftentimes the most victimized in these settings as their superiors were men, and women became sexualized even in the workplace. Today, sexual harassment policies and litigation are in place to protect women (and men) from sexual assault, yet rape remains a current issue as demonstrated by the recent #MeToo movement. Even so, twenty-first-century novelists have come a long way since the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century depictions of rakes and monsters by casting female vampires as seductresses alongside their male

counterparts. Thus, twenty-first century novelists echo today's progression toward female autonomy and independence and give twenty-first century readers hope for gender equality.

Works Cited

Batsaki, Yota. “Clarissa; or, Rake versus Usurer.” Representations, vol. 93, 2006, pp. 22-48. EBSCOhost, proxy.ulib.csuohio.edu:2050/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=2006872106&site=ehost-live.

Berkeley, David S. “The Penitent Rake in Restoration Comedy.” *Modern Philology: A Journal Devoted to Research in Medieval and Modern Literature*, vol. 49, no. 4, May 1952, pp. 223–33. *EBSCOhost*, proxy.ulib.csuohio.edu:2050/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=0000422039&site=ehost-live.

Brady, Kristin. “Tess and Alec: Rape or Seduction?” *Thomas Hardy Annual No. 4*, MacMillan Literary Annuals, Palgrave MacMillan, 1986, pp. 127-147.

Bugg, John. "'Master of Their Language': Education and Exile in Mary Shelley's Frankenstein." Huntington Library Quarterly: Studies in English and American History and Literature, vol. 68, no. 4, 2005, pp. 655-666. EBSCOhost, proxy.ulib.csuohio.edu:2050/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=2006870817&site=ehost-live.

Bundrick, Christopher. “‘Covered in Blood and Dirt’: Industrial, Capital, and Cultural Crisis in Red Rock and Dracula.” *Southern Literary Journal*, vol. 47, no. 1, 2014, pp. 21–34. *EBSCOhost*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=2015382632&site=ehost-live.

Carlson, Julie Ann. England's First Family of Writers: Mary Wollstonecraft, William Godwin, Mary Shelley. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009, ProQuest Ebook Central, https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/clevelandstate-ebooks/detail.action?docID=3318343.

Daleski, H. M. "Tess of the d'Urbervilles: Mastery and Abandon." *Essays in Criticism: A Quarterly Journal of Literary Criticism*, vol. 30, 1980, pp. 326–45. *EBSCOhost*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=1980107500&site=ehost-live.

Davis, William A., Jr. "The Rape of Tess: Hardy, English Law, and the Case for Sexual Assault." *Nineteenth-Century Literature*, vol. 52, no. 2, Sept. 1997, pp. 221–31. *EBSCOhost*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=0000303334&site=ehost-live.

Girard, René. *Deceit, Desire, and the Novel*. The John Hopkins Press, 1965.

Glover, David. "'Our Enemy Is Not Merely Spiritual': Degeneration and Modernity in Bram Stoker's Dracula." *Victorian Literature and Culture*, vol. 22, 1994, pp. 249–65. *EBSCOhost*, proxy.ulib.csuohio.edu:2050/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=1995066900&site=ehost-live.

Hardy, Thomas. Tess of the D'Urbervilles. Oxford UP, 2008.

Hernandez, Alex Eric. "Tragedy and the Economics of Providence in Richardson's Clarissa." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, vol. 22, no. 4, 2010, pp. 599–630. *EBSCOhost*,

search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=2010582344&site=ehost-live.

Hoeveler, Diane Long. "Reading the Wound: Wollstonecraft's Wrongs of Woman, or Maria and Trauma Theory." *Studies in the Novel*, vol. 31, no. 4, 1999, pp. 387-408. EBSCO*host*, proxy.ulib.csuohio.edu:2050/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=1999056011&site=ehost-live.

Johnston, Elizabeth. "The Female Jailor and Female Rivalry in Samuel Richardson's Clarissa." Gender Forum: An Internet Journal of Gender Studies, vol. 58, 2016, pp. 3-19. EBSCOhost, proxy.ulib.csuohio.edu:2050/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=2017309393&site=ehost-live.

Lepore, Jill. "The Strange and Twisted Life of 'Frankenstein.'" *The New Yorker*, Feb. 2018, https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2018/02/12/the-strange-and-twisted-life-of-frankenstein.

Losada Pérez, Ana María. "Mary Shelley's Frankenstein: The Terror of Being Defined in Romantic Terms." *Sites of Female Terror/En Torno a La Mujer y El Terror*, edited by Ana Antón-Pacheco Bravo et al., Aranzadi, 2008, pp. 103–110.

Mackie, Erin Skye. "Always Making Excuses: The Rake and Criminality." Rakes, Highwaymen, and Pirates: The Making of the Modern Gentleman in the Eighteenth Century, Johns Hopkins University Press, Ebook, 2010, pp. 35-73.

Malchow, H. L. "Frankenstein's Monster and Images of Race in Nineteenth-Century Britain." Past & Present, no. 139, 1993, pp. 90-130. EBSCOhost,

proxy.ulib.csuohio.edu:2050/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsfra&AN=edsfra.4284302&site=eds-live&scope=site.

Meyer, Stephenie. *Twilight*. Little, Brown and Company, 2005.

"monster, n., adv., and adj." *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, December 2018, www.oed.com/view/Entry/121738. Accessed 12 December 2018.

"monstrous, adj., adv., int., and n." *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, December 2018, www.oed.com/view/Entry/121759. Accessed 12 December 2018.

Nunan, Rosanna. "Urban Depravity, Rural Unsophistication: Hereditary Taint in Hardy's Tess of the D'Urbervilles." *Victorian Literature and Culture*, vol. 46, no. 2, 2018, pp. 289–307. *EBSCOhost*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=2018582194&site=ehost-live.

Ostovich, Helen M. "'Our Views Must Now Be Different': Imprisonment and Friendship in Clarissa." Modern Language Quarterly: A Journal of Literary History, vol. 52, no. 2, June 1991, pp. 153–69. EBSCOhost, proxy.ulib.csuohio.edu:2050/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=1992070213&site=ehost-live.

Poovey, Mary. "Mary Wollstonecraft: The Gender of Genres in Late Eighteenth-Century England." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*, vol. 15, no. 2, 1982, pp. 111-26. EBSCO*host*, proxy.ulib.csuohio.edu:2050/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=0000316067&site=ehost-live.

Pullan, Fern. "'Marriage Had Bastilled Me for Life': Propertied Women as Property in the Legal Fictions of Richardson, Wollstonecraft and Collins." *Literature Compass*, vol. 13, no. 8, Aug. 2016, pp. 493–500. *EBSCOhost*, proxy.ulib.csuohio.edu:2050/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=2016397670&site=ehost-live.

"rake, n.7." *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, December 2018, www.oed.com/view/Entry/157646. Accessed 12 December 2018.

Richardson, Samuel. *Clarissa, or, The History of a Young Lady*. Penguin Books, 2004.

Schneider, Christina. "Monstrosity in the English Gothic Novel." *Victorian*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2015, pp. 1–11. *EBSCOhost*, proxy.ulib.csuohio.edu:2050/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=2015140139&site=ehost-live.

Rooney, Ellen. "'A Little More than Persuading': Tess and the Subject of Sexual Violence." *Rape and Representation*, edited by Lynn A. Higgins and Brenda R. Silver, Columbia UP, 1991, pp. 86–114. *EBSCOhost*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=1992031105&site=ehost-live.

Senf, Carol. "Realism, Horror and the Gothic in *Dracula* and Thomas Hardy's 'The Fiddler of the Reels.'" Palgrave Communications, 2017, https://doi.org/10.1057/palcomms.2017.83.

Shelley, Mary. *Frankenstein*. W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1996.

Spencer, Kathleen L. "Purity and Danger: Dracula, the Urban Gothic, and the Late Victorian Degeneracy Crisis." *ELH*, vol. 59, no. 1, 1992, pp. 197–225.

EBSCOhost, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=0000302066&site=ehost-live.

Stoker, Bram. Dracula. Bantam Books, 1981.

Swartz-Levine, Jennifer A. "Staking Salvation: The Reclamation of the Monstrous Female in Dracula." *Midwest Quarterly: A Journal of Contemporary Thought*, vol. 57, no. 4, 2016, pp. 345–361. *EBSCOhost*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=2018700411&site=ehost-live.

Weissman, Judith. "Tess of the D'Urbervilles: A Demystification of the Eternal Triangle of Tennyson's Idylls of the King." *Colby Library Quarterly*, vol. 11, 1975, pp. 189–97. *EBSCOhost*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=1975105944&site=ehost-live.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *Maria, or the Wrongs of Woman*. Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation, Ebook, 2006.