

Sveučilište J.J. Strossmayera u Osijeku

Filozofski fakultet

Diplomski studij engleskog jezika i pedagogije, prevoditeljski smjer

Maja Đeke

Miltonic Influences in Gothic Victorian Literature

Diplomski rad
Doc. Dr. Sc. Borislav Berić

Osijek, 2011.

SUMMARY

Victorian Gothic literature, a genre started in Britain in the eighteenth century, is a genre that mixes romantic and horror conventions. It is based on Edmund Burke's theory of the sublime and it was influenced by German writers of the time. It was extremely popular with readers of the Victorian era and thus considered only a fad by the critics. Since the eighteenth century was a revolutionary time, the genre was also greatly influenced by the French Revolution. However, authors of the Victorian Gothic also drew their inspiration from another revolutionary poet, John Milton. Milton's *Paradise Lost* has had a great influence on Victorian Gothic literature, especially the Miltonic Satan, who is the prototype of a Gothic hero called the Satanic hero or the hero-villain. The main characteristics of the Satanic hero are excessive pride, vanity and self-love, which is often sexual, a perverted family surrounding, exaggerated promiscuity and the wish to corrupt and destroy others. This character also frequently changes his appearance in order to deceive. His condemnation is inevitable because he is too weak to choose what is moral and right, and instead chooses what is pleasurable only for him. This type of a hero is a parody of the epic hero and a total opposite of the biblical hero. One can see all these characteristics in the heroes of Matthew Gregory Lewis's *The Monk*, Charlotte Dacre's *Zofloya, or the Moor* and Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*. Except for the characteristics mentioned, the garden metaphor also points to a strong Miltonic influence.

Key words: Satanic hero, Gothic literature, Milton, self-love

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	4
SATAN IN <i>PARADISE LOST</i>	12
SATANIC HERO IN VICTORIAN GOTHIC LITERATURE.....	21
CONCLUSION	41
WORKS CITED.....	43

INTRODUCTION

The word *Gothic* can be found in many periods of human history, be that in art, architecture or literature. It was originally used to name East Germanic tribes, or Goths, whose existence is recorded as early as 100 AD and who later played a great role in the history of the Roman Empire. At a later time, *gothic* was used to refer to the medieval art and architectural movement in the twelfth century, developed in France and occurring in almost all of the Western Europe above the Alps. The designation appeared again in the eighteenth century, this time marking a literary genre started in Britain, the Victorian Gothic, which has had a great impact on culture as a whole; the influence was so great that the name is used even today, denoting a whole subculture, ranging from music over art to literature, fashion and lifestyle.

Gothic fiction, named that way because it started appearing about the same time as the Gothic revival in architecture (also called Neo-Gothic), is a mixed genre in literature. It marks a series of literary works which add a form of natural or supernatural horror to already popular romantic literary features of the eighteenth century: “Victorian Gothic is marked primarily by the domestication of Gothic figures, spaces and themes: horrors become explicitly located within the world of the contemporary reader” (Punter and Byron, 26). The first sign of literature leaning towards the supernatural – even though a “real” ghost was never presented in any of the poems – was the so-called “Graveyard School” in poetry, started by Thomas Parnell and his “A Night-Piece on Death”, which also included poets like Edward Young, Robert Blair and James Harvey. The Graveyard Poets showed a tendency toward graveyard images in their poetry which inspired thoughts on mortality and death. As for prose fiction, even though the first signs of the Gothic horror occurred as early as 1753 in Smollet’s *The Adventures of Ferdinand Count Fathom* where the count is trapped in a bandit’s hideaway with a corpse, it is widely agreed that the beginning of Gothic literary movement is marked by the publication of Horace Walpole’s *Castle of Otranto* in 1764. Based on Burke’s theory of the sublime according to which the sublime and beautiful are mutually exclusive and terror is the main principle of the sublime since it can also produce pleasure, just like the beautiful, *Castle of Otranto* achieved such a success that it lived to see its second edition the next year. Furthermore, in this edition the word “gothic” was added to the title of the novel: *Castle of Otranto: a Gothic Story*. As a form of literary narrative, *Otranto* is a novel; however, it differs from the mainstream novel of its time. In the first half of the eighteenth century the intended purpose of the novel was to be instructive rather than pleasurable.

Walpole, however, “wanted to combine the unnatural occurrences associated with romance and the naturalistic characterization and dialogue of the novel” (Clery, 24), and *Otranto* was written accordingly. This is also the form which influenced all later Gothic novels of the time. As for the sources of the Gothic fiction, or modern romance as it was then also called, there were two main sources that the critics and the authors named; the Celtic revival and the oriental source and they were discussed in what Clery called the “‘romance wars’ of the 1780s” (34). Those happened “both at the level of theory and practice, and there was considerable interchange between the two” (Clery, 34). Ann Radcliffe with *The Castles of Athlyn and Dunbayne* (1789) Sophia Lee with *The Recess* (1783), and Charlotte Smith with *Emeline, the Orphan of the Castle* (1788), were representatives of the Celtic revival, “while William Beckford with *Vahtek* (1786), produced the first full-fledged Orientalist tale of terror” (Clery, 34). However, it is important to mention that these two are not the only sources of inspiration for writers of Gothic fiction. Depending on the author, different works are based on various and diverse influences, one of which is also the Bible and its rendition by Milton.

The *Castle of Otranto* achieved such popularity that it resulted in a flood of Gothic novels on the market in the 1790s, being that Gothic fiction became a sort of a fad of the time. Burke’s view of the sublime attracted a broad public, and as such was genuinely looked down on by the critics then. However, the worse the reviews were, the broader the public of the Gothic became, and its most prominent writers such as Horace Walpole, Ann Radcliffe, the Aikins (John and his sister Anna Laetitia) and Matthew Gregory Lewis, had an ample audience. According to Miles, there are two phases Gothic fiction:

Terror fiction breaks down into two, broad phases: from 1788 to 1793, when the Gothic bursts onto the literary scene after a long period of intermittent gestation; and a plateau of market dominance from 1794 (the year in which *The Mysteries of Udolpho* and *Caleb Williams* were published) to 1807, when the Gothic begins its decline. If there is a peak, it is in 1800, the year in which the largest number of Gothic novels were published (42).

It is important to mention that late eighteenth century was a tumultuous time. The French Revolution took place at about the same time as the first phase of Gothic fiction was taking off (1789-1799), and it undoubtedly had a great influence on the genre. The first phase of Gothic fiction “revolves around Burke’s critique of the revolution and his idealization of chivalry as a culturally transcendent force” (Miles, 54), which can mostly be seen in Radcliffe’s novels. Ann Radcliffe was, by far, the most prominent figure in the first phase of Gothic fiction. Her works, primarily the previously mentioned *The Castles of Athlyn and*

Dunbayne, almost blindly follow the form of Walpole's *Otranto*. Also, being that these were revolutionary times, Radcliffe's works usually contain a heroine who fights the old regime, since oppression of the old regime was considered as one of the sources of horror by Radcliffe. Other than the French Revolution, German writers also exerted a great influence on the genre at the time, especially Schiller, whose *The Robbers* created a new trend, *the banditti*, in Gothic fiction. This long-lasting trend was present in many later Gothic works. The fact that most of the writers of the time were also translators of German works (Radcliffe, and later Godwin and Lewis all published translations of German dramas) is also an important indicator of the sources that influenced Gothic writers. Other than Ann Radcliffe, Eliza Parsons is another prominent writer from the first phase, and her most famous work, *The Castle of Wolfenbach* (1793) was also widely influenced by German writers of the time.

As far as the second phase is concerned, it starts with Radcliffe's *Mysteries of Udolpho* and Godwin's *Caleb Williams*, both of which were published in 1794. The influence of the Revolution was still strong at the time, so it is no wonder that *Caleb Williams* was one of the first representatives of Jacobin Gothic – as an English supporter of revolutionary ideas, Godwin used his work to show “how old codes lock us and how they are difficult to destroy” (Miles, 50). Ann Radcliffe was still an important figure in the genre. Alongside her previous ideas which closely resemble Godwin's Jacobin ideas on the revolution and old regime, her *The Italian* (1797) sets a new trend in the second phase of the Gothic, and that is *the inquisition*. A new way to shock and frighten (and thus attract) readers was to show the only people who were supposed to be pure (since they are close to God) as the real villains – it raised the question of whom one can trust, if not a holy man. Lewis uses the same principle in *The Monk* (1796), where the main character is supposed to be a holy man; however, as it turns out, he is everything but one. *The Monk* itself as a novel was very different from anything until then. Almost a polar opposite of Radcliffe's works which, even though they had terror in them, were more mild and feminine, *The Monk* breaks every possible taboo ranging from pregnant nuns over infanticide and witchcraft, all the way to incest and rape, and as such was loathed by a lot of prominent writers of the time. In *The Monk*, one cannot miss the fascination with the supernatural, which slowly takes over in the second phase of the development of Gothic fiction. That fascination is another thing that stems from German Gothic and it is largely based on the interest in Illuminati – “the German Gothics fixed upon the blind enthusiasm the Illuminati fostered through their ‘supernatural’ tricks” (Miles, 56), not to mention that the general opinion at the time was that “once liberated into a ‘higher reason,’ the adepts of Illuminati were ready for any matter of mayhem and bloodshed” (Miles, 56).

Therefore, they were a perfect source to draw from in literature whose only purpose was to provoke fear and terror in its reader. This kind of supernatural influence is visible both in *The Monk*, in *Zofloya, or the Moor* and *Frankenstein*.

Even though, according to Miles, the Gothic “begins its decline” (46) in 1807, Gothic elements still somehow find their way into some of the famous later works. The reason for that is the fact that Gothic elements were what attracted the public of the time, whether other authors wanted to admit it or not. At its very beginnings, Gothic fiction was popular both with readers and with critics. The popularity of Gothic novels reflected itself in the fact that many of them were adapted into plays. Radcliffe’s *Romance of the Forest* as Boaden’s *Fountainville Forest*, Lewis’s *The Monk* as Farley’s *Raymond and Agnes* and Godwin’s *Caleb Williams* as George Coleman the Younger’s *Iron Chest* are only the most distinguished ones from that time. First problems with critique started with Lewis’s play *The Castle Spectre* (1797), which, according to Gamer, proved to be “a source of irritation and envy to Wordsworth and Coleridge, both of whom submitted their own Gothic tragedies to Drury Lane at about the same time” (88). Being that their plays were not as successful as Lewis’s, he soon became the object of sharp and somewhat poisonous critique from two of the leading Romantics of the time. However, not only Lewis and his works were reproved, the negative opinion somehow seemed to encompass the whole genre and it included the authors, as well as the reading public, whose taste was considered mundane and crass. It went so far that, at one point in 1804, Coleridge even refused to appear in the same anthology of poems as Lewis since “for Coleridge, the prospect of appearing in a volume of poetry alongside Matthew Lewis – and through a poem whose title recalled that of Lewis’s infamous novel – produced nothing less than panic” (Gamer, 90) – Coleridge’s poem was called “The Mad Monk”. Under those circumstances, it was not really beneficent for ones critical acclaim to be considered a writer of Gothic fiction. Nevertheless, thanks to its vast popularity, Gothic was the way to go if one wanted to earn money, so it is no wonder that even its most fierce critics created somewhat of a double standard for themselves. One of the best examples for that is Coleridge himself. In 1804 he refused to appear in *The Wild Wreath* (Miss Robinson’s anthology of poetry) alongside Lewis because he was afraid that his own family might be lured into reading Lewis’s works. At the same time he translated and published Schiller’s *Wallenstein* because he knew it would pay well. It is also important to notice that a lot of critics of the time had some elements of the Gothic in their own works. In Gamer’s words, there was a certain “ease with which Romantic writers moved from criticizing Gothic texts to appropriating Gothic conventions” (93). Except Coleridge, whose “The Rhyme of the Ancient Mariner” clearly

shows Gothic influence, a good example is also Walter Scott, whose most critically acclaimed poem “Marmion” also lists a number of Gothic elements (a dark hero, a nun burned alive), even though he was an avid critic of Maturin and his Gothic works. The animosity towards the Gothic continues at the beginning of the nineteenth century, even though the aforementioned double standards now become common practice. Romantic writers still try to distance their works from the Gothic; however, Gothic elements seem to find their way into more works. In the course of time the view on the Gothic starts to change:

Mary Shelley and Byron, meanwhile, increasingly find in the Gothic a language for philosophical and psychological inquiry, taking their cues from writers like Radcliffe and Maturin while redirecting the focus of their texts away from romance narratives and toward the representation of extreme states of consciousness (Gamer, 100).

This new, changed attitude towards horror in literature led to some extraordinary literary works, most famous of which stem from *The Year Without Summer* in 1816 when Villa Diodati in Switzerland was visited by Mary and Percy Shelley, Claire Clairmont, George Gordon Byron and John Polidori. The visit resulted in two major works of Gothic fiction: Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein* (1818), and John Polidori’s *The Vampyre* (1819), both of which have had an extraordinary influence on later Gothic works. While *The Vampyre* is considered a predecessor of the vampire sub-genre of Gothic fiction, *Frankenstein* is one of the earliest examples of science-fiction genre. The influence of both of those works is felt even in literature today, and, as far as *Frankenstein* is concerned, it would not have happened if it were not for the influence of one of the greatest English poets, John Milton.

Being that Victorian Gothic was, in many ways, affected by the French Revolution, it is no wonder that Gothic authors drew inspiration from John Milton, the greatest revolutionary poet in English history. Milton was born in the midst of the tumult of changes of both religious and political nature in England which culminated with the Civil War in the 1640s. The political turmoil had a huge impact on Milton’s life and poetry, especially because his close friends and members of his own family differed in their political and religious views. Even though he was dealing with contrasting views on politics and religion during the whole course of his childhood and schooling, what shaped him the most in terms of his literary works was the political and religious situation he returned to in England after traveling Europe from 1638 to 1639. Having interests in politics and seeing that the country is no longer a place to live, Milton opened his own academy for middle class children in 1639 in London. What he came back to in London, politically speaking, was disarray. The situation between the Royalists and the Parliamentarians was so tense that a riot broke out in 1641.

King Charles I was forced to leave London and move to Oxford and the Civil War started the next year. The political situation was changing very forcibly during the war and the final battle was the Siege of Colchester in 1648, which was followed by the execution of King Charles I a year after, in 1649. All this led to the formation of the Commonwealth and Milton played an important political role in this state.

In the midst of political and religious conflicts, journalism emerges in the form of pamphleteering. It was essentially the only way people of that time could express their honest opinions, and it is no wonder that Milton soon became one of the most prominent pamphleteers of the time. Besides his well known pamphlets on divorce, he also published political pamphlets. Two weeks after Charles was executed, Milton wrote *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*. In it, he describes the period of time surrounding Charles's execution and also gives his opinion on how a monarchy should work. He claims that Charles deserved to be executed because that he did not keep his end of so-called "implicit agreement" every king has with his people, and thus choosing to be a bad king, instead of a good king. Soon after *The Tenure* was published, Milton was made Secretary of the Foreign Tongues in the Cromwellian State, which was a function in the Council. After getting the position he also moved near Westminster where he, with the aid of a large number of scribes, wrote justifications of government policies called *Observations*. Even though he was privately an independent, Milton soon became what one could call a defender of the State. He used his literary skills to justify the cause of King's execution. In *Eikonoklastes* (1649) he responded to *Eikon Basilike*, which was a "spiritual portrait" of the late King and which presented him as a martyr. "*Eikonoklastes* returns to the argument of *Tenure* but with far less restraint. Milton presents the king as a criminal; hedonist, thief, hypocrite, and in his Papal allegiances, traitor" (Bradford, 28). The second one occurred in 1651 as a response to Salmasius' *Defensio Regia Pro Carolo I* (A Defence of King Charles I), published in 1649. It was called *Defensio pro Populo Anglicano* (A Defence of the English People) and in it Milton uses the same thesis he used in *Areopagitica*, the *Tenure* and the above mentioned *Eikonoklastes* in order to justify Charles' execution (by being a bad king, Charles prevented people from living their best after the Fall).

In 1651 Milton was appointed Chief Censor which was a position he resigned only a year later, after being summoned by the Parliament for not actually censoring some works he should have (*Racovian Catechism* – a tract on religion which was heretical at the time). That same year (1652) he was appointed Latin Secretary and that is the position he kept until he

went blind. His sight was deteriorating over the years and he completely lost it in 1655 when he was replaced by Andrew Marvell.

Toward the end of the 1650s, the political situation began to change drastically again. Cromwell became less of what he promised in the beginning of his regime, and more of what he fought against. He died in 1658, and with him essentially died the Commonwealth of England. His son, Richard, briefly took his place as the head of Commonwealth; however, that lasted for only a year. Finally, in 1660, General Monck took control of the government and Charles II became king. Needless to say, this kind of situation was not very safe for Milton given his political roles in the former State, especially because the Royalists started their revenge on the Parliamentarians. He was arrested and imprisoned in October of the same year. However, he was out by December thanks to his brother Charles, a barrister and a Royalist. Charles based his defense on Milton's blindness, saying that it can be seen as God's punishment, so there is no need for him to be punished additionally. After his release, he was no longer a pamphleteer and he did not have a political position.

Needless to say, aside from the pamphlets he wrote, the rest of his works (including *Paradise Lost*) were also influenced by the revolution. The influence could be seen as early as *Comus* (1634), which was also a prediction of his future political and religious allegiances – Comus as a character is based on Lord Castlehaven who was tried and executed for the crimes of pedophilia and sadism, and he was also, as was covertly implied by Milton, a royalist and a Roman Catholic. It is also obvious in *Areopagitica* (1644), a pamphlet against licensing which deals with the freedom of speech and religious freedom and contains arguments against subjugation of one's thoughts and actions to external authority imposed by the state. However, political and religious influence is most of all visible in *Paradise Lost* (1667), on more than one level. Not only could the war between heaven and hell be seen as the war between Royalists and Parliamentarians, but Satan can also be seen as a character in whom an "inner revolution", with stages similar to the stages of Civil War, is taking place. In *Areopagitica*, Milton claims that people should have religious and political freedom from authority imposed by the state. If God is seen as the "head of state" in heaven, Satan's rebellion could be seen as an attempt of breaking free from authority imposed by the state. Satan's time spent in hell and in Eden trying to corrupt God's new creations – Adam and Eve – could be seen as a personal Civil War between God and Satan. The success in corruption could be paralleled with the execution of King Charles I and the formation of the Cromwellian State. Finally, God's punishment of both people and Satan (Satan's last metamorphosis) could denote Cromwell's false promises (which would, in that case, equal

Satan's false promises), the fall of Commonwealth and the return of Charles II as the new head of state. Positioning God as king and head of state, however, at least if Milton's former works are taken into account, shows Milton's opinion on God as an inadequate king who deserves the riot he gets. Additionally, it creates an air of sympathy towards Satan. Even though the readers know he is evil and his actions are wrong, the inner turmoil they witness makes them wonder if Satan is right, at least in a way. As a character, Satan is made of flesh and blood, he has flaws and he suffers. In other words, he is disturbingly human. In addition to that, positioning God as a bad father to Adam and Eve (in regards to allowing Satan to corrupt them), makes the readers additionally lean to Satan's side. In the end Satan is still punished because one just can not win against God, just like people can not win against the king and like children can not win against parents. And it is this type of Satanic hero, or the hero-villain, that appears, in one form or another, in many literary works from the Victorian Gothic era.

SATAN IN *PARADISE LOST*

If *Paradise Lost* followed the familiar pattern of the biblical story it tells, God would be its logical hero, and Satan its antagonist villain. However, “in his daring epic Milton does not only associate traditional scriptural types but also, to shocking effect, aligns paradoxically incongruous characters” (Graves, 174). That is why there is no simple answer to the question of hero in *Paradise Lost*. Even Adam seems to possess many characteristics of a biblical hero. He is the polar opposite of Satan, created in the image of God; he is pious, humble and above all, obedient. One could even say that Adam is a tragic hero; his excessive love for Eve is his tragic flaw and the cause of his hamartia; but, unlike pride and excessive anger love is a positive feeling. Basically, the only thing Adam can be blamed for is goodness and this is as far as Adam goes as a character. Somehow, as perfect as he is, he seems to have no depth, he seems plastic and artificial until he sins, and when he does sin, the epic ends.

Satan, on the other hand, as the polar opposite of Adam, is narcissistic, disobedient and stubborn. Hubris is his most prominent trait and he is over-confident, spiteful and vengeful. All things considered, it turns out that Satan has more human traits and is easier to relate to than Adam. Being that Milton, as John Rogers points out, knows that there is no way his fallen readers “can possibly know what it was like in this unknowable state before the Fall”, he uses Satan as eyes (fallen eyes) through which his readers first meet Eden and Adam and Eve before the fall. Thus Satan is the center of reader’s attention in the large portion of the epic and could be called its main character. He also shares the negative traits he has with the readers. Since Milton’s times were revolutionary, those readers who supported the Parliament sympathized with the need to rebel against the authority. However, this sympathy for the revolutionary spirit extended beyond the seventeenth century onto revolutionaries of other times. Satan’s likeability goes so far that “the Romantic poets thought him the prototype of Revolutionary heroism” (Forsyth, 6). Therefore, it is safe to say that the character of Satan in *Paradise Lost* helped shape many tragic heroes throughout literary history. In order to explain the phenomenon, it is necessary to explain Satan’s origin, excessive self-love, his family and the means he used to deceive and corrupt, being that those traits are what makes him so compelling to the reader.

Paradise Lost is a secondary epic and it is logical that its structure can be paralleled to the structures of other great epics, be they primary or secondary. Accordingly, Satan’s heroic stature in this epic can be paralleled with the stature of other epic heroes; he is a great leader and an outstanding warrior just like Hector; he is a volunteer chosen for the task just like

Ajax; he undertakes a tremendous journey just like Odysseus or Jason. “Satan, like Hector, has an encounter with his wife and son just as he is about to set off on his adventures through Chaos (though Sin and Death make a family rather different from Andromache and Astyanax)” (Forsyth, 29). In addition to that, “he is a variant of Achilles, who equates honor with his own status (the complex Greek notion of *arete*) and feels slighted by his commander-in-chief, refuses his orders and believes himself superior” (Forsyth, 30). The latter is also his hubris, another trait all epic heroes share. Further similarities can even be noticed in Satan’s war equipment – he keeps his shield and his spear after the fall. However, he does not carry them in the same way other epic heroes do – his shield “hung on his shoulders like the moon, whose orb/ Through optic glass the Tuscan artist views” (I, 287-288), while his spear “he walked with to support uneasy steps” (I, 296). This depiction of Satan not only shows him as cowardly, but according to Dobranski, the way he carries his weapons and armor (his shield is on his back hanging on both of his shoulders, which is not the way shields were carried) “suggests that classical modes of heroism are backwards, perhaps thoroughly wrong, at least retrograde” (499). It is not only the shield however, that suggests such a thing. The traits that Satan shares with other epic heroes are all somewhat wrong. As a great leader and an outstanding warrior, he still loses a war. As a volunteer to undertake a voyage of great danger to save his people, he betrays his true intentions when questioned by Gabriel in Book IV: “Who would not, finding way, break loose from hell/ .../ Farthest from pain, where thou might’st hope to change/ Torment with ease” (IV, 889-893). Even his family is abnormal and incestuous, started not out of love towards another person, but out of self-love. In the end, the tremendous journey which ends happily for Jason and Odysseus has a different ending for Satan – he returns home successful in his intent, but he is still punished by his enemy for his success. Based on all this, it is easy to conclude that Milton’s Satan is a parody of former epic heroes – he may have the traits necessary, but the way he carries them make him a caricature.

As Graves notes, “at times, Milton also associates Satan with traditional Old Testament heroes” (175), Moses and Jacob. However, the comparison with these characters is once again based on disparities rather than on actual similarities. Therefore, Satan seems to be, if not a parody of biblical heroes, then at least their exact counterpart. This becomes evident already in Book I as he is compared to Moses:

As when the potent rod
Of Amram’s son in Egypt’s evil day
Waved round the coast, up called a pitchy cloud
Of locusts, warping on the eastern wind...

So numberless were those bad angels seen

Hovering on wing under the cope of hell (I, 338-345)

While Moses raises the locusts in order to punish the Egyptians for their sins, Satan raises his fallen angels who will later make people sin. According to Graves, this could be “understood as an ironic disparity that seeks to infer the immense contrasts between Moses and Satan” (183). Further similarities with biblical characters can be found in Book III, and they concern Jacob’s Ladder: “the stairs were such as whereon Jacob saw/ Angels ascending and descending, bands/ Of guardians bright, when he from Esau fled” (III, 510-512). In Old Testament, Jacob, running from his brother Esau after deceiving Isaac into giving him Esau’s birthright, sees a ladder to heaven in his dream: “And he dreamed, and behold a ladder set up on the Earth, and the top of it reached to Heaven: and behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it” (Genesis, 28:12). The ladder could be viewed as a bond between Heaven and Earth and a hand that God offers to people. Devoted and God-fearing Jacob takes the hand of God and builds Bethel as a place where God meets people. Satan, however, just turns away and leaves when he sees the ladder to heaven: “Satan from hence now on the lower stair/ That scaled by steps of gold to heaven gate/ Looks down with wonder” (III, 540-542). In other words, Satan once more turns his face away from God and to vengeance and he, “unlike Jacob, chooses not to repent” (Graves, 182). In conclusion, Satan as a character is everything biblical heroes are not – he is not a spiritual leader, he does not excel greatly among his peers (in heaven) and he is not an instrument of God (the latter, ultimately, being the cause of his rebellion).

Satan’s traits of excessive pride and narcissism make him attractive to both Eve and the reader, but on the other hand make his condemnation inevitable. Already in Book I it becomes evident that Satan’s “pride/ had cast him out of heaven, with all his host/ of rebel angels” (I, 36-38) when he tried to “set himself in glory above other peers” (I, 39). This excessive pride is what causes Satan to think of himself as higher than others – it is a sign of narcissism and it is Satan’s hubris. However, in order to determine why Satan’s narcissism is fatal, one must first explain the narcissism of other characters in *Paradise Lost*, namely Eve’s Adam’s and God’s:

The Father’s response betrays narcissistic desires. His promise that “What next I bring shall please thee, be assured,” displaces divine narcissism and then creates the potential for blurred ego boundaries in his promise that Adam will get his “likeness” in an “other self” (Martin, 62).

Since narcissism is, according to Milton, a sin, and it can be argued that here even God is portrayed as sinful, it is no wonder that Eve, who is considered to be the weaker part of the first human couple, is also guilty of the sin that is self-love. Eve's own narcissism is especially pointed out in the story of her creation in Book IV:

As I bent down to look, just opposite,
A shape within the watery gleam appeared
Bending to look on me, I started back,
It started back, but pleased I soon returned,
Pleased it returned as soon with answering looks
Of sympathy and love; there I had fixed
Mine eyes till now, and pined with vain desire,
Had not a voice thus warned me (IV, 460 - 467)

Her love for her own image makes Eve think of Adam as “less fair/ less winning soft, less amiably mild” (IV, 478-479), which is the reason she turns away from him and runs. The fact that she thinks so highly of herself and less of Adam is also what enables Satan to corrupt her, since Eve's eating the apple is actually her attempt to position her perfect self above less-perfect Adam. In a way, Eve's wish to “rule” her small world in which she is underneath Adam (marriage) and the inability to openly do so is something Satan can relate to, since he wanted the same in heaven but he was not allowed. “In particular, as the poem demonstrates many times, Eve's feeling of inequality, of belatedness is what Satan has to exploit” (Forsyth, 208). The fact that he is able to do so brings one again to the notion of pride. Eve is too proud not to be the leader. Even though this comparison basically leads one to the conclusion that Satan and Eve are more similar than they should be, Eve's pride is still not excessive, and her narcissism shows signs of naivety. In contrast to that, Satan's narcissism is much stronger – he loves himself to the point where the love becomes sexual. In Book II one finds out that Sin is Satan's daughter. She is literally his brainchild in a sense that the idea of rebelling against God physically manifested itself from his head. Being that every child is, in a way, an image of its parent, Sin is also an image of Satan. The point where Satan's self-love becomes so strong that it is sexual is when he produces a child (Death) with his own daughter. This is the basic difference between Eve and Satan when it comes to narcissism – even though both Eve's and Satan's self-love is based on sexual love towards oneself as a perfect being, Eve's self-love is more naïve. It makes her susceptible to sin abetted by someone other than her, while Satan's self-love is based on excessive pride, and thus makes him prone to sin (to creating Sin) even without the outer influence.

Satan's narcissism and its immediate consequence brings one to the notion of family, marriage and sex. As every other epic hero and as every other biblical hero, Satan has a family. However, the way that family is founded and the basic feelings that govern it are amongst the traits that make this character a type in literature to follow. Considering Milton's former works, namely his pamphlets on marriage and divorce, it is clear that he highly values marriage as "marriage of minds", and even malice or adultery can be forgiven if the minds are alike. He claims that if two married people are mentally incompatible, they should be able to legally divorce. The only marriage which is thus a normal marriage to Milton in *Paradise Lost* is Adam and Eve's. Even though Milton's view of women in this epic could be considered misogynistic since Adam is less culpable for losing the grace of God than Eve (she manipulates his love to make him a sinner) and even though Eve is the malicious one, what the two have is "marriage of minds". Although they are two different people, Adam and Eve share a bond that makes their marriage successful. That is why, no matter how largely scaled Eve's mistake is – she did disobey God's direct orders – there is no separation of the couple. "She has eaten the forbidden fruit. If he does likewise he will stay with his beloved, indeed his intellectual equal; if he does not he will obey God's law, but lose her. He eats" (Bradford, 25). When comparing this "right kind" of marriage to Satan's, one can easily see how grotesque Satan is in every aspect. Firstly, one should consider the basis of this extra-marital union. While the basis of Adam and Eve's marriage is love towards one another, the basis of Satan's union is love towards oneself, as Sin explains to Satan in Book II: "Thyself in me thy perfect image viewing/ Becam'st enamoured, and such joy thou took'st / with me in secret, that my womb conceived/ A growing burden" (II, 764-167). In other words, "Satan's rebellion against God ... generates his 'perfect image' (2.764), Sin, with whom he incestuously reunites" (Kilgour, 308). In this light, the term "marriage of minds" is also to be considered. Adam and Eve, even though they are both made in God's image, are two different minds. Satan and Sin, however, are the same mind, since his mind is what created her. This incestuous coupling results with a child, Death, which is born out of the relationship. Further, Adam loves Eve under all conditions: "Should God create another Eve, and I / Another rib afford, yet loss of thee/ Would never from my heart" (IX, 911-913). Satan, however, is quick to forget his family:

What thing thou art, thus double-formed, and why
 In this infernal vale first met thou call'st
 Me father, and that phantasm call'st my son?
 I know thee not, nor ever saw till now,

Sight more detestable than him or thee (II, 740-745).

The reason for this is that Adam's love is true love, while Satan's love is only temporary since it is based on lust. Satan's marriage is thus one more thing that shows how poor his choices really are and where they lead – being guided by impulses and mere needs, such as lust, is what makes one disobedient and sinful, and it is a trait all Satanic heroes share.

As far as the notion of sex goes, logically, sex which happens in the good marriage, the “marriage of minds”, is considered natural, productive and good, and it happens before the fall. This also leads to the conclusion that Satan's kind of sex, since it happens in an extra-marital union and is based on lust, is sinful, animalistic and wrong. The result of lustful sex is always sin. The point where sex stops being natural and starts being lustful is the fall. Satan creates both Sin and Death as the result of lust and that happens because he has fallen. Adam and Eve also discover lust only after the fall and, just like Satan, by giving in to lust they commit sin. Thus it can be concluded that sex after the fall is sinful and guided by impulses instead of noble feelings. It also needs to be mentioned that Milton never explicitly confirms that Adam and Eve are having sex before the fall. The sole fact that this topic is not addressed explicitly shows it as not sinful, since what happens in Adam and Eve's marital bower is a private thing which concerns only them and God, while all the sinful thoughts they have (mostly Eve) and the sin they commit later are revealed to the reader. The first hint Milton offers on marital love being something good is when Satan sees Adam and Eve kissing in Book IV and turns away:

So spake our general mother, and with eyes
Of conjugal attraction unreprieved,
And meek surrender, half embracing leaned
On our first father, half her swelling breast
Naked met his under the flowing gold
Of her loose tresses hid (IV, 492-497)
Aside the devil turned
For envy (IV, 502-503)

It is crucial to mention here that Milton specifies **conjugal** attraction as unreprieved, from which a conclusion can be drawn that any other kind of love is, in fact, reprieved. Furthermore, if Satan, who is evil, turns his face away from marital love, it can not be anything other than good. Sex after the fall, however, almost equals Satan's incestuous and lustful relationship with his daughter. First of all, Adam and Eve have to hide the first time they have sex after the fall: “her hand he seized, and to a shady bank, / Thick overhead with

verdant roof embowered, / he led her” (IX, 1037-1039). If what Adam and Eve were doing was not wrong, they would not feel a need to hide. Secondly, lustful sex is accompanied with feelings of shame and guilt: “they destitute and bare / Of all their virtue: silent, and in face / Confounded long they sat, as stricken mute” (IX, 1062-1064). Lastly, sex after the fall is “of their mutual guilt the seal, / The solace of their sin” (IX, 1043-1044) – it results with sin, just like in Satan’s case. In other words, lustful sex is also another thing that makes Adam and Eve less God-like, and more Satan-like.

Of course, lustful sex takes place only after the corruption. The lengths Satan goes to in order to corrupt are vast. So vast that, in order to taint others, he even changes his own shape. Every shape Satan takes, however, has a detail which gives away his true nature, be that the shape itself, a physical trait or his behavior. These metamorphoses aimed to deceive begin even in heaven. Before the fall, Satan was “the first archangel, great in power, / in favour and preeminence” (V, 670-671). According to that, one can conclude that he resembled the other angels physically – he was a beautiful creature. However, although similar in his outward appearance, Satan is very different from the inside because he has a trait which makes him prone to sinning. In order to show how foul his nature really is, Satan needs a trigger. The trigger in this case would be God anointing someone else than him. When Satan starts envying the Son, he starts showing his true nature. However, since all of the angels “limb themselves, and colour, shape or size / Assume, as likes them best, condense or rare” (V, 352-353), Satan keeps his outward appearance. His corruption of others starts already in heaven – he seduces some of the angels by showing them his true nature and thus awakening in them the pride and envy he himself feels and his looks deceive the others who do not share these sort of feelings.

The first metamorphosis after the fall happens in Book III when Satan changes his appearance in order to deceive Uriel into telling him where Eden is: “But first he casts to change his proper shape, / Which else might work him danger or delay: / And now a stripling cherub he appears” (III, 634-637). At first he succeeds in his deceit; however he can not control his emotions and that is the detail which reveals his true nature:

Artificer of fraud; and was the first
That practiced falsehood under saintly show,
Deep malice to conceal, couched with revenge:
Yet not enough had practiced to deceive
Uriel once warned; whose eye pursued him down
The way he went, and on the Assyrian mount

Saw him disfigured, more than could befall

Spirit of happy sort (IV, 121-128)

The second time Satan changes is when he wants to enter the garden. “Thence up he flew, and on the tree of life, / The middle tree and highest there that grew, / Sat like a cormorant” (IV, 194-196). This time the shape he takes discloses his true nature to the reader, since cormorant is, in many cultures, a symbol of greed and deception. The following shapes he takes bring him closer and closer to the ground – first he is a toad and later a snake. Not only is that a physical downfall, but also a metaphorical one – with every new shape he takes he is closer to hell. According to Forsyth, by choosing the final shape of a snake he “is indeed choosing his sentence just here” (276), a claim that has much to do with the final metamorphosis. The final metamorphosis happens as a means with which God punishes Satan by physically transforming his demeanor to match his nature:

His visage drawn he felt to sharp and spare,
His arms clung to his ribs, his legs entwining
Each other, till supplanted down he fell
A monstrous serpent on his belly prone,
Reluctant, but in vain, a greater power

Now ruled him, punished in the shape he sinned (X, 511-516)

According to Kerrigan, “the serpent metamorphosis is amongst the incidents in the poem from which ... we possibly ‘shrink with horror’” (326). One does not only shrink in horror because Satan turns into something which is considered foul, but also because one sees here the exact strength of God’s punishment. “The criminal must go on being and doing involuntarily what he formerly was and did by choice” (Samuel qtd. in Butler, 148). Not only did he turn Satan into a being which will grovel at the feet of the ones he just corrupted, but he also waited for the exact moment in which Satan announced his victory, which stresses the fact God’s punishment for sins is unavoidable and comes when it is least expected: “We are pointedly reminded that Satan owes everything in this moment of supreme triumph to God’s permission. The metamorphosis will make that fact apparent – indeed, make *no other fact* apparent” (Kerrigan, 328). This final punishment is also a typical occurrence in Satanic characters – since this type of a hero is destined for damnation, he can never win and he is always sanctioned for his bad deeds, in one way or another.

Satan’s character was extremely captivating to people of the time because of his human characteristics. These are also the reason he is a successful corruptor – by knowing the depth and the power of human faults since he is the one to have them too, Satan is able to

penetrate all man's emotional defenses and reach into his core in order to trigger whatever it is that will make man sin. Man as a whole could be represented as a garden – when Satan reaches the heart of the garden, he reaches the heart of man. In this sense the Garden of Eden is mentioned in Book IV of *Paradise Lost*. It is a place created by God for Adam and Eve to live in – he created it for them as a father would build a home for his children. As such, it is the ideal place for Satan to take his revenge in, since damaging God's children while he is “not home” is what will hurt God the most:

This place may lie exposed,
The utmost border of his kingdom, left
To their defence who hold it: here perhaps
Some advantageous act may be achieved
By sudden onset (II, 360-364)

First of all, what needs to be mentioned is the fact that the readers of *Paradise Lost* see the garden for the first time with Satan's eyes. This happens because Milton took it upon himself to “represent this unfallen Eden to a fallen audience of the 1660s from his own perspective as a fallen man himself and as a fallen poet” (Rogers). That is the same reason readers never see Adam and Eve before Satan does. They are also unfallen, sinless and impossible to describe to a fallen audience. Furthermore, being that the garden is a place where man lives before the Fall, one can use its qualities to discern the qualities of its inhabitants, Adam and Eve. There is no sin in Adam and Eve before the Fall, just as “there are no weeds in paradise, only in the fallen world we inhabit” (Knott, 69). Naturally, that changes when Satan deceives Eve into eating the apple – they are cast out of the garden into a world with weeds (sin). The garden as a place of living can thus be said to represent the person who lives in it. The representation of the garden as a private place with no weeds, which denotes its inhabitants as sinless children of God to be later corrupted by Satan, is what also influenced the authors of the Gothic works. Additionally, the garden in *Paradise Lost* is protected “with thicket overgrown, grotesque and wild” (IV, 136) that “access denied” (IV, 136), and Satan has to penetrate the outer defenses to get inside to actually corrupt its inhabitants – he has to reach the heart of the garden, just as he later has to reach the heart of man in order to corrupt him.

SATANIC HERO IN VICTORIAN GOTHIC LITERATURE

There are two types of Gothic literature: male and female. The type of Gothic depends mostly on the author of the work – male authors are more prone to writing male Gothic works, while female authors usually write female Gothic: “male authors do not conventionally conceal their gender behind the mask of a female pseudonym, nor indeed, do women appear to write many tales in this tradition” (Williams, 102). Accordingly, gender of the author has great influence on how narrative is developed. Furthermore, the form of the narrative influences the way the hero is shaped and how well the reader is able to connect with him. As Williams points out, unlike the female Gothic, “Male Gothic derives its most powerful effects from the dramatic irony created by multiple points of view” (102) and that is what distances the reader from the character. This is why one finds it easy to understand Shelley’s Adam or even Dacre’s Victoria to some extent, while it is impossible to relate to the actions of Lewis’s Ambrosio. Moreover, male Gothic works differ from female Gothic in their attitude concerning the supernatural. While female authors usually describe the cause of all supernatural occurrences, “the male formula simply posits the supernatural as a ‘reality’, a premise of this fictional world” (Williams, 103), a fact also apparent in Lewis, Dacre and Shelley. However, Williams also argues that the “Male Gothic has a tragic plot” (103) while “the female formula demands a happy ending” (103). *Frankenstein* and *Zofloya*, even though they are both works of the female Gothic, oppose the last convention – their heroes both suffer a tragic end. Additionally, as Byron and Punter claim, the question of male and female Gothic is rather unclear in these two works:

Women writers frequently exploit motifs from both male and female Gothic. They may even produce male, rather than female Gothic. Charlotte Dacre’s *Zofloya, or the Moor* (1806) and Mary Woolstonecraft Shelley’s *Frankenstein* (1818) for example, would both appear to have more links to the former than the latter (Byron and Punter, 280).

One can thus conclude that the heroes of those works are actually male Gothic heroes. Additionally, even though one can find a lot of “Male archetypes of the female” (Williams, 141) in Dacre’s *Zofloya*, the heroine Victoria does not fall into any of them. She is neither the princess nor femme fatale; she is not a witch, a Good Mother or a Devouring Mother. Rather, she transcends gender roles by assuming “the role of both heroine and monster” (Byron and Punter, 27), just like the monster Adam does in Shelley’s *Frankenstein*. One can conclude that these three characters are all male Gothic characters modeled after Milton’s Satan and are

thus Satanic heroes or hero-villains. That is shown by similarities in their origin, feelings of excessive pride and their attitude towards marriage and sex. They also share the need to change their appearance in order to deceive, and the garden metaphor is almost always used when corruption of any kind occurs.

Milton's Satan is the prototype of the Gothic hero-villain for Lewis's Ambrosio. Even though *The Monk* is far from being an epic, both in structure and in the narrative style, one can still find traces of an epic hero in Ambrosio, or rather, traces of Satan as a parody of an epic hero. That is obvious from the parallels one can make between the two characters regarding their heroic stature, family life and hubris. Firstly, Ambrosio is, like Satan, a great leader. He is the Abbot and the main preacher of the Capuchin Church in Madrid. As such, he could also be considered a great warrior, even though he is involved in spiritual rather than in physical warfare – he is a warrior of faith: “Ambrosio is introduced to the reader as a Christian warrior against the temptation of the flesh” (Gentile, 24). Furtheron, he is also chosen for an important task by his peers: “till these last three weeks, when he was chosen superior from the society to which he belongs, he had never been on the outside of the abbey-walls” (Lewis, 8). Also, like Satan and like epic heroes, Ambrosio has a family, or specifically, he seems to have two of them. His public family, the Cappuchins, seems as perfect as the family of Hector from *The Illiad* – while Hector has a loving wife and a loving daughter, Ambrosio has loving brothers. His private family, however, consists of his long lost mother Elvira, and his long lost sister Antonia whom he later rapes and murders – in a way, this family, or rather Ambrosio's role in it, is as twisted as Satan's. One more trait that makes Ambrosio a parody of an epic hero is the most apparent trait he shares with Satan – hubris:

When he remembered the enthusiasm which his discourse had excited, his heart swelled with rapture, and his imagination presented him with splendid visions of aggrandizement. He looked round him with exultation; and pride told him loudly that He was superior to the rest of his fellow-creatures (Lewis, 23).

Needless to say, all these virtues Ambrosio has are only external. His true nature is the complete opposite.

Even though Ambrosio is never directly compared to any Biblical heroes, some parts of the narrative show him as a strict opposite of Jacob, at least in regard to the story about Jacob's Ladder. Jacob offers his hand and heart to God by building Bethel around the Ladder. Satan turns away from God when he sees “the stairs were such as whereon Jacob saw” (III, 510-512) and takes opposite direction. Ambrosio, however, willingly rejects God when he

takes the staircase leading to the cavern where Matilda would do a ritual to summon the Devil – he takes the staircase to Hell:

Still holding Ambrosio's hand she descended the marble steps; but profound obscurity which they were overspread obliged them to walk slow and cautiously. ... They reached the foot of the staircase, and continued to proceed, feeling their way along the walls. (Lewis, 178).

Ambrosio is, therefore, the exact opposite of a Biblical hero. It is important to mention that Lewis's monk is definitely not the only character with these traits – he is among the first characters introducing a new fad of that time – holy men and women (usually Catholic) as evil characters.

Unlike Lewis, Dacre completely ignores epic heroes' traits while creating Victoria. Rather, she models her after Milton's Satan and Ambrosio the monk:

Ambitious and oversexed, the protagonist Victoria has frequently been seen as a female version of Lewis's notorious Ambrosio, and in a manner reminiscent of Ambrosio is encouraged to commit increasingly fiendish and illicit acts (Byron and Punter, 107)

In Victoria's character one can see a series of deviations of the epic hero. First of all, she is everything but a great leader. She associates with no one because her peers are repulsed by her character:

The society of Victoria was generally shunned, not in reality on account of the disgrace brought upon her by her mother's conduct, but on account of her own violent and overbearing disposition, which rendered her obnoxious to the young nobility of Venice (Dacre, 15).

Furtheron, she is not a great warrior in any sense. Instead of being brave, she is vengeful, haughty and cruel. The way she deals with her enemies, in her case the orphan Lilla, is cowardly and vile. She does not fight her own battles; rather, she needs supernatural help, which is why she is noticed by Satan. Her family is abnormal as well. Her mother, Laurina, is a cheater and her brother, Leonardo, is a bandit leader. The only honorable member of the family – her father, the Marchese di Loredani – is dead, murdered by his wife's lover. The great journey Victoria takes ends with a punishment greater than Satan's – she loses everything she has in life and beyond; Satan takes not only her physical body, but also her soul: "Eventually Victoria is, again like Ambrosio, thrown into an abyss by her satanic lover" (Byron and Punter, 107). In fact, the only trait she shares with epic heroes is hubris: "Victoria, though at the age of fifteen, beautiful and accomplished as an angel, was proud, haughty and

self-sufficient” (Dacre, 4). The separation of character from the epic hero is more than obvious in Victoria’s case. Dacre does not even try to make her likeable to the reader and she gives her no redeeming traits. Victoria’s character is as obnoxious as her behavior and no matter what mask she puts on, traces of her true self always show. All these traits make her a true Satanic hero.

As a character, Shelley’s Adam is very different from both Victoria and Ambrosio. His character traits do not stem from the epic hero and he is neither a parody, nor a complete opposite of that type of a hero. There are no similarities regarding bravery or leadership between Adam and any of the epic heroes, in fact, the monster Adam is not even hubristic, which is a trait common to almost all Satanic heroes. However, Adam does resemble Miltonic Satan in main traits that he possesses. In creating Adam, Shelley concentrates more on the duality of character also present in Satan, or the *doppelganger* concept: “the doppelganger motif typically depicts a double who is both duplicate and antithesis of the original, as is the case with ... Mary Woolstonecraft Shelley’s Victor Frankenstein and Frankenstein’s monster” (Snodgrass, 84). In other words, Adam is capable of good, but he does evil because he is also an image of his egotistical creator. Another important aspect of the monster is his abnormal family which he shares with other Satanic heroes. However, his family is abnormal in the literal sense of the word because his creation is “a perversion of human birth which negates women and normal childbirth” (Snodgrass, 129). Specifically, he has no mother because he was made artificially, by combining parts of dead bodies. In addition, Shelley frequently hints to incestuous relations in this family. Not only does the father, Victor, want to marry his stepsister, but the bride he would create for Adam would also be Adam’s sister. Victor, has the strongest emotional bond with his best friend Clerval, which also alludes to homosexuality, another “unnatural” phenomenon.

There are no similarities or disparities with Biblical heroes like Jacob and Moses, however, the whole creation of the monster is a perverted version of the Creation Myth. Here Victor has the role of God, the father, while Adam takes the role of two sons; Adam and Satan simultaneously. Even though the monster Adam does not share his origin with Milton’s Satan, he is modeled after him – like Satan, he has one creator whom he detests, he feels that he is not given the chance he needs in life and he is able to do good but chooses not to. Shelley’s Adam is not a typical Gothic hero-villain since he is missing traits such as excessive self-love, over-exaggerated sexuality and weakness of character which leads to corruption. Instead, he is humble, in need of love and compassion and shunned by everyone because of his outward appearance. However, the circumstances he was created under and the lack of love he gets

from his creator make him a monster on the inside. As a result of that, one can relate to him completely just as one can relate to Satan and that is what makes him a true Satanic hero.

As a Satanic hero, Ambrosio is excessively vain and it shows the most when he is left alone in his room after one of his sermons:

“Who” thought he, “Who but myself has passed the ordeal of youth, yet sees no single stain upon his conscience? Who else has subdued the violence of strong passions and an impetuous temperament, and submitted even from the dawn of life to voluntary retirement? I seek for such a man in vain. I see no one but myself possessed of such resolution. Religion cannot boast Ambrosio’s equal!” (Lewis, 23)

By being so confident in his uprightness, Ambrosio takes the first step towards the fall since, as Botting points out, “his pride in his own sanctity blinds him to his ambitions and passions” (50). Furthermore, his vanity grows as the story progresses. At first, it is more naïve and can be paralleled to Eve’s; his thoughts are like water she sees her complexion in when she first awakes. Ambrosio can not stop thinking of his grandeur, just like Eve can not stop looking at her reflection. However, Eve’s self-worship is interrupted by the voice of God; Ambrosio’s is interrupted by Rosario. In this situation, Rosario, who is later revealed to be Matilda (an agent of Satan), serves as a premonition of Ambrosio’s fall. She notices Ambrosio’s vanity as a weakness Satan could exploit, just like Milton’s Satan realizes he could benefit from Eve’s vanity when she tells the story of her awakening in Book IV of *Paradise Lost*. Ambrosio’s self-love becomes more like Satan’s when it turns sexual. In *Paradise Lost*, by copulating with his daughter, Sin, who is made in his image, Satan really copulates with himself. In *The Monk*, Ambrosio feels sexual desire for his sister, Antonia, which can also be interpreted as sexual desire towards himself, since siblings share the same mother and are thus made in the same image. Just like with Satan, this desire is what makes Ambrosio take the final fall. It takes one look at Antonia for the monk to abandon the chastity he was once so proud of:

Did she know the inexpressible charm of modesty, how irresistibly it enthralls the heart of man, how firmly it chains him to the throne of beauty, she never would have thrown it off. What would be too dear a price for this lovely girl’s affections? What would I refuse to sacrifice, could I be released from my vows, and permitted to declare my love in the sight of earth and heaven (Lewis, 159)?

This sexual desire is the reason Ambrosio engages in witchcraft, kills his mother and kidnaps, rapes and stabs his sister to death. Like Satan, by copulating with himself, he creates the ultimate sin which condemns him.

Victoria is, like Ambrosio, extremely vain. In her case, however, one can notice an aspect of Milton's Satan caused by pride which is not noticeable in Ambrosio – she is exceptionally vengeful and, like Satan, she swears revenge against her parent:

Her passion vented itself in a violent paroxysm of tears; but becoming suddenly ashamed of yielding, as she thought it, to a weakness so ignoble, and angry with herself that the ill treatment of any one should have power to excite in her either grief or lamentation, she checked a rising gush, while rage and most deadly hatred against those who had thus dared to dupe and to betray her, took possession of her swelling heart. An ardent desire of revenge followed (Dacre, 45).

All these strong features make Victoria a mirror image of Milton's Satan. The self love she feels leaves no place for love towards any other person. That is the reason Victoria never really feels true love for anyone, be they the members of her own family or men she encounters in life. All that she feels is lust: "But it happened that the heart of Berenza had acquired a real passion, while that of Victoria was susceptible only of novel and seducing sensations – of anticipations of future pleasure. Berenza loved – Victoria was only roused and flattered" (Dacre, 29). Her self-love is also sexual – she is a hedonist to such an extent that her own sexual pleasure is more important than life and she is prepared to forcibly take the object of her passion, Henriquez. In order to explain the sexual nature of Victoria's vanity, one should first emphasize that Victoria's forceful character makes her more masculine than feminine: "Victoria is not a female Gothic heroine, nor is *Zofloya's* plot that of the female Gothic: Victoria's character and her quest are those of the male Gothic" (Craciun qtd. in Davison, 37). As a masculine character, she desires sexually the person who resembles her the most – Henriquez is more masculine than Berenza, and therefore "Henriquez, the lovely Henriquez, was more upon an equality with her, and it was for him that the selfish Berenza should have reserved her" (Dacre, 134). One can conclude that by wanting Henriquez, Victoria really wants the most accurate image of herself. In order to acquire that image, she commits sin – she rapes Henriquez and kills Lilla. Therefore, just like with Satan, sin is created out of a sexual desire for oneself. Considering the scope of the sins she commits, Victoria's condemnation is inevitable and again, just like Satan, she is severely punished for them.

Frankenstein's monster, Adam, differs from both Victoria and Ambrosio when it comes to self-love. He is not vain or narcissistic; on the contrary, he is well aware of his outward appearance which he highly despises:

I had admired the perfect form of my cottagers – their grace, beauty, and delicate complexions; but how I was terrified when I viewed myself in a transparent pool! At first I started back, unable to believe that it was indeed I who was reflected in the mirror; and when I became fully convinced that I was in reality the monster that I am, I was filled with the bitterest sensations of despondence and mortification (Shelley, 109).

However, Adam was partially made in the image of his creator and that brings one back to the *doppelgänger* motif. Snodgrass claims that the monster “mirrors the base, egotistical instincts of his creator” (129). If Victor has egotistical instincts, Adam must also share them. Victor’s ego shows when he deems himself good enough to control the forces of life and death – in other words, Victor plays God. By creating life without natural birth, he presumes he is better than everyone else because he can be a mother and a father simultaneously, both physically and psychologically. This ego shows in the creature too. In Book VIII of *Paradise Lost* Milton’s Adam asks for a companion equal to himself (a sign of his vanity) when he says:

In disparity
The one intense, the other still remiss
Cannot well suit with either, but soon prove
Tedious alike: of fellowship I speak
Such as I seek, fit to participate
All rational delight (VIII, 386-391)

Frankenstein’s Adam wants the same thing – a creature like himself. However, the monster does not ask, rather, he gives an ultimatum:

Remember that I am thy creature; I ought to be thy Adam, but I am rather the fallen angel whom thou drivest from joy for no misdeed. Everywhere I see bliss from which I alone am irrevocably excluded. I was benevolent and good; misery made me a fiend. Make me happy, and I shall again be virtuous. (Shelley, 96)

Even though he hates himself, Frankenstein’s Adam shows inherited traces of his creator’s ego. He is too proud and obstinate to live alone. His unhappiness is his creator’s fault. He wants his creator to admit his mistakes and he wants him to make things right. If Victor refuses, vengeance will follow: “I will revenge my injuries; if I cannot inspire love, I will cause fear, and chiefly towards you my arch-enemy” (Shelley, 141). In this aspect Adam slightly resembles Dacre’s Victoria – he is too proud to forgive Victor, just as she is too proud to forgive those who wrong her, including her mother (her creator). In the above quote, the monster compares himself both to Milton’s Adam and to Satan, hinting that there is a part of

him which can not be saved from condemnation. Furthermore, the creature's desire for a mirror-image mate is sexual, even though he would prefer a human mate. As in the case of Ambrosio and Victoria, this desire drives him to sin which makes his condemnation imminent.

As a place where one is raised and nurtured, family is the instrument which shapes one's personality and determines identity. The foundation of every family is marriage. According to Milton, the only successful marriage is the marriage of minds. It is based on true love instead of lust. Since true love toward another does not exist in any of the Satanic heroes being discussed, their marriages and families are twisted and perverted. Ambrosio stands as a perfect example of this thesis. As a Capuchin, he has two families. His secular family consists of his mother, Elvira, and his sister, Antonia. The Capuchin order is his second family. As a man of religion, Ambrosio is supposed to be celibate, his only "marital duties" being the ones to God and faith. In other words, if this marriage were to be a marriage of minds, Ambrosio's mind should be focused on God. However, Ambrosio's religious family has an intruder. Matilda, disguised as a monk, Rosario, is an agent of Satan sent to corrupt Ambrosio. "I observed your blind idolatry of the Madonna's picture. I bade a subordinate but crafty spirit assume a similar form, and you eagerly yielded to the blandishments of Matilda" (Lewis, 289), Satan tells Ambrosio before the final punishment. It is obvious that Ambrosio had a choice in this marriage – he could have stayed married to faith, but instead he chose Satan, just like Satan chose himself instead of God in *Paradise Lost*. However, his religious family, or as Williams calls it, "Mother Church" (117), could also be considered guilty for Ambrosio's wrong choices since "family prohibitions produce illicit passions" (Botting, 50). Therefore, influences other than his faulty nature could be blamed for Ambrosio's actions. Further, choosing a brother Capuchin as a lover, even if it is a woman in disguise, hints to another aspect present in the family of Milton's Satan – incest, definitely an illicit passion. As if an incestuous "marriage" to an agent of Satan was not enough, Lewis hints to homoerotic love towards Rosario / Matilda before her disguise is uncovered:

Ambrosio on his side did not feel less attracted towards the youth: with him alone did he lay aside his habitual severity; when he spoke to him, he insensibly assumed a tone milder than was usual to him; and no voice sounded so sweet to him as did Rosario's (Lewis, 24).

Of course, the transformation of a boy into a woman does eventually happen; however, that does not erase the pre-transformation attraction Ambrosio feels. As Williams notes, "it is the

sympathies (and attractions?) aroused by this ‘boy’ – the supposedly orthodox affection of the ‘father’ for the ‘son’ – condoned by monastic rule – that facilitate all the other far less sanctioned passions” (272). It follows that Ambrosio’s marriage was definitely not a good one.

His secular family is equally perverse because of him – he is what perverts it. His mother and father did have, by Milton’s standards, a good marriage and therefore the grounds for being good parents and role-models to their children. However, as Leonella says, Elvira’s father is to blame for Ambrosio’s absence from this family:

How he stormed on finding she that she had escaped him, had joined her husband, and that they had embarked together for the Indies! ... He had the cruelty to take from us my sister’s little boy, then scarcely two years old, and whom, in the abruptness of her flight, she was forced to leave behind her. I suppose that the poor little wretch met with bitter treatment from him, for in a few months after we received intelligence of his death (Lewis, 5).

A combination of Ambrosio’s distance from his secular family and his inborn bad traits is what makes him a Satanic character. Narcissism and vanity make him lust for his own sister, who is an image of himself and whom he later rapes and murders. The familiar pattern of Ambrosio choosing a sister, this time the biological one, for a lover, is what makes him perverted and Satan-like.

Naturally, the majority of these sins can be blamed on impulses instead of true, marital love. “*The Monk* takes place in a world where sexuality, whether experienced as love or lust or as a desire to escape its shameful consequences, is the prime motive for all action” (Williams, 116). Ambrosio is, just like Satan, guided only by sexual desires which stem from self-love – the satisfaction of his needs is more important than anything else, his soul included. However, the fulfillment of Ambrosio’s desires does not only damage him, it damages all around him. As Williams adds, “Ambrosio is also explicitly presented as a male Eve who acts entirely out of lust” (116). Just like Eve irrevocably damages her family (Adam and her future children), Ambrosio destroys his. Furtheron, Adam and Eve hide when they have sex after the fall. Ambrosio also hides his sexual endeavors, first with Matilda and later with Antonia. As expected, every time his lust is satisfied, guilt follows:

Ambrosio’s lust was satisfied. Pleasure fled, and shame usurped her seat in his bosom. Confused and terrified at his weakness, he drew himself from Matilda’s arms; his perjury presented itself before him; he reflected on the scene which had just been acted, and trembled at the consequences of a discovery; he looked forward with

horror; his heart was despondent, and became the abode of satiety and disgust: he avoided the eyes of his partner in frailty (Lewis, 146).

The need to hide and the guilt he feels both show that Ambrosio is actually aware of immorality of his actions; however, he is so tainted that he continues sinning. Giving in to passion and impulses is, in Ambrosio's case, a sign of weak character and shows that, even if he did get the second chance to live righteously, he would take the same path. Therefore, Ambrosio's behavior is both influenced by his abnormal family and it prevents him from having a normal one.

Just like Ambrosio, Victoria is influenced by her family. As a result of unhealthy surroundings, her inborn traits are developed in the wrong direction:

Ever of a bold and towering spirit, haughty, fond of sway, it was with difficulty that her partial mother could occasionally administer a slight reproof; but now, with an unlimited scope for the growth of these dangerous propensities, they bade fair soon to overtop the power of restriction. Vainly did the Marchese hope that time, by maturing her reason, and improving her ideas, would correct the wrong bias of her character (Dacre, 14).

Her mother, Laurina, could be compared to Eve on many levels. She is seduced in a garden by a man whose objective in life is to "seduce the best, the noblest affections of the heart, and to glory and to exult in the wide-spreading havoc he had caused" (Dacre, 7). Like Eve, she is seduced because she is susceptible to flattery. Also, like Eve, she affects her children with her decisions. Victoria's brother runs away and joins the banditti, and Victoria continues to live in shame caused by her mother's actions. Since Victoria sees her mother choosing an extramarital union instead of "marriage of minds" she had with her husband up to then, it is only logical that she follows her example. However, just like Ambrosio, Victoria chooses Satan as a lover. Both of these unhealthy relationships, Laurina's and Victoria's, could be attributed to their inability to truly love anyone but themselves – they are both seduced by flattery. According to Davison, both of these unions, especially the one between Victoria and Zofloya, are a form of slavery:

Victoria is, she opines to Zofloya prior to the murder of her husband, 'wedded to a wretch whom. . . [she] abhors' and yearns to be 'freed from those hated fetters that bind [them]' (159). Victoria, effectively and ironically, moves from the frying pan of her insufferable marriage to Berenza into hell-fire (literally) in her 'marriage' to Zofloya. In both instances, marriage is figured as a type of enslavement, the marital institution being equated by Dacre with a most peculiar institution (slavery) (38).

In *Paradise Lost*, Satan's marriage to Sin could also be considered slavery. In the same way, Victoria is a slave to Zofloya. Considering Zofloya's true identity, it follows that Victoria is really a slave to sin.

When it comes to sex and lust as impulses that drive Victoria, she is even worse than Ambrosio. While he feels guilty about yielding to passion, she is angry about being unable to do it more. When Henriquez wakes up and realizes it is Victoria he had sex with and not Lilla, he kills himself. Victoria reacts with rage and violence instead of guilt:

Victoria beheld her death-reared visions; – frantic rage fired her soul at the thought, and keen disappointment maddened her brain. – Now she clasped her hands, and twisted her fingers in each other, and now tore, by handfuls, the hair from her head, strewing it in agony over the lifeless body of Henriquez (Dacre, 222).

After throwing the tantrum, she commits a vicious crime – she kills her young prisoner, Lilla, by stabbing her with a dagger and shoving her off a cliff. Therefore, in Victoria, sexual impulses and passion lead to uncontrollable violence, which again shows that she is a slave to sin. In order to show the level of Victoria's submission to sin, one could consider Davison's argument that Victoria "has recently been diagnosed with Nymphomania (*Furor Uterinus*), an apparent medical condition discussed in a treatise from 1775 that Dacre may have read" (36). Since Nymphomania was, in the nineteenth century, considered a mental illness so severe that it was treated in asylums, Dacre's logic is clear – promiscuity is so deeply rooted in Victoria's brain that she is helpless against it. Even the way she kills Lilla is a sexual metaphor – she takes a virgin's life by stabbing her to death. This murder is also a symbol of Victorian belief that the loss of a woman's chastity is equal to death.

According to Moers, Shelley's *Frankenstein* "is a 'birth myth'" (qtd in Williams, 177), which means that Shelley handles the notion of family quite differently in *Frankenstein* than Dacre and Lewis do in their works. Due to Victor's god complex, the monster does not have a mother – he is created artificially. Even though he negates the role of a woman in the process of creation, Victor still manages to create life. However, what he is missing are the basic motherly instincts. As a result, Victor's first reaction to his child is horror. After he "'labors' for two years to bring his creature to life" (Williams, 178), instead of giving the creature a loving, "motherly" welcome, he abandons it in terror:

I beheld the wretch – the miserable monster whom I had created. He held up the curtain of the bed; and his eyes, if eyes they may be called, were fixed on me. His jaws opened, and he muttered some inarticulate sounds, while a grin wrinkled his cheeks. He might have spoken, but I did not hear; one hand was stretched out, seemingly to

detain me, but I escaped and rushed downstairs. I took refuge in the courtyard belonging to the house I inhabited (Shelley, 56).

Victor's inability to love the product of his labor determines the course of the creature's life: "Victor's efforts to deny what he has created ('realized') transform this 'fiend in need' (of recognition, care, love) into a 'fiend in deed'" (Williams, 178). However, before becoming a "fiend in deed", the monster Adam tries his best to fit in any kind of a family. He finds the first substitute for his father in the DeLacey family. At first, it seems like the cohabitation with DeLaceys really does work as a family surrounding should; Adam learns from them what a child learns from its family. He learns how to read, write and talk, but he also learns "of division of property, of immense wealth, of squalid poverty" (Shelley, 115), and about "the difference of sexes, and the birth and growth of children" (Shelley, 116). In addition to that, he contributes to daily chores by cleaning the snow and gathering woods for the fire when no one sees him. The image of a happy family is completed by the fact that Adam has a sentimental bond to the DeLaceys. "When they were unhappy, I felt depressed; when they rejoiced, I sympathized in their joys" (Shelley, 108), he says when he retells the story to his "biological" father. However, not being able to show his face in front of them due to his monstrous countenance makes him an outsider instead of a beloved family member. The rejection he repeatedly suffers from various people incites him to violence. After being refused by the DeLaceys, Adam tries to find any kind of a companion for the last time. Ironically, the boy he wants to "adopt" is William, Victor's brother: "Suddenly, as I gazed upon him, an idea seized me that this little creature was unprejudiced and had lived too short a time to have imbibed the horror of deformity" (Shelley, 136). Being rejected by yet another family member, the creature commits his first sin: he murders William. The same pattern continues; Adam asks Victor for a companion and Victor refuses. The more Victor refuses the more of his friends and family members die. As a father, Victor can be compared to Satan: he created Adam by himself just like Satan created Sin by himself. Therefore, Adam is Victor's sin. As a mother, Victor can be compared to Eve. Like Eve's family suffers for her sins, the fate of Victor's family members is determined by his sin of unnatural conception – in order to get his revenge, Victor's son kills all his family members. Satan's nature is visible in the creature too. God's rejection of Satan as his heir drives Satan to sin. Similarly, Victor's rejection drives Adam to murder.

A large part of both Victor's and Adam's sins are also a product of their repressed sexuality. By choosing to create a child by himself, Victor clearly avoids a sexual relationship with a woman. In fact, the way he speaks of his family and friends point to asexuality; he uses

the same friendly terms to describe his best friend, Clerval, and his fiancée, Elizabeth. The only time Victor ever mentions passion is when he speaks of his studies:

In drawing the picture of my early days, I also record those events which led, by insensible steps, to my after tale of misery, for when I could account myself to the birth of that passion which afterwards ruled my destiny I find it arise, like a mountain river, from ignoble and almost forgotten sources (Shelley, 37).

As Crockett points out, Victor “declares that he is ‘ardent’ in his pursuit of such knowledge, ‘eager’ in his studies, reading ‘with ardour’ (29), and these powerful adjectives serve to situate Victor’s behavior on the verge of sexual addiction” (135). In other words, the only thing that excites passion in Victor is the time he spends alone in his studies – he is attracted to himself and his mental abilities. Crockett also shows the sexual side of Victor’s self-love by comparing him to L.D., the masturbator in Tissot’s anti-masturbation text *Onanism*: “Like Tissot’s watchmaker who transforms himself into a monster, Victor, the solipsistic and solitary scientist, uses his own hands to produce a creature that is horrible to behold” (133). Therefore, Victor’s Adam is, like Satan’s Sin, a product of his own mind (hands). Considering the *doppelgänger* motif, the repression of sexual desires is something Adam inherits from his maker. Even though he never overtly desires passion, sexual frustration is what causes most of his crimes. This is particularly shown in his description of Justine:

Here, I thought, is one of those whose joy-imparting smiles are bestowed on all but me. And then I bent over and whispered: ‘Awake, fairest, thy lover is near – he who would give his life but to obtain one look of affection from thine eyes; my beloved, awake!’ ... Not I, but she, shall suffer; the murder I have committed because I am forever robbed of all that she could give me, she shall atone. The crime had its source in her, but hers is the punishment (Shelley, 138).

In a way, Adam can be compared to both Victoria and Ambrosio. Even though he only wishes for opportunities equal to those of creatures created by natural birth, the basis of those opportunities is the chance to find a mate and reproduce. Despite the fact that Adam is not as promiscuous as Ambrosio and Victoria, his needs are primarily sexual and eventually they drive him to sin.

In order to corrupt, Milton’s Satan uses his shape-shifting abilities. Heavily influenced by the character of Milton’s Satan, three demonic characters in *The Monk* also use shape changing and disguise with the same intention. First of those is Lucifer. When first summoned by Matilda, he appears as a beautiful angel:

It was a youth, seemingly scarce eighteen, the perfection of whose form and face was unrivalled. He was perfectly naked: a bright star sparkled upon his forehead, two crimson wings extended themselves from his shoulders, and his silken locks were confined by a band of many-coloured fires ... circlets of diamonds were fastened round his arms and ankles, and in his right hand he bore a silver branch, imitating myrtle (Lewis, 181).

However, Lucifer, like Milton's Satan, possesses a trait which gives away his true identity. There is a certain "wilderness in the demon's eyes" (Lewis, 181) which shows that he is really a fallen angel. Even though Lucifer is directly featured only twice in the novel, his ability to transform in order to appear as something he is not is his primary characteristic. It is also extended to his emissary, Matilda. While the "wilderness" in Lucifer's eyes convinces Ambrosio that he is indeed a demon, he remains oblivious to the same thing in Matilda. She goes through multiple changes so she could corrupt him. She "first arouses Ambrosio's interest while disguised as the (male) novice Rosario" (Williams, 117). Targeting his latent homosexual tendencies, she first takes the shape of a young boy and uses flattery as a means of seduction. Just like a characteristic which shows true identity always appears in all shapes Milton's Satan takes, it is obvious that Rosario is not really who he presents himself to be. He has no past people know of, he has a certain "hatred of society" (Lewis, 25) and most importantly, he always covers his face. This emphasized shame clearly points out one's sinfulness, since the first time Adam and Eve feel the need to hide in Book IX of *Paradise Lost* is when they have done something wrong. However, seduced by flattery, Ambrosio does not pay attention to these signs, even when Rosario openly warns him about his faults: "I must not let you know them, You would hate me for my avowal! You would drive me from your presence with scorn and ignominy" (Lewis, 26). The next shape Matilda takes is when she "presents herself as a twin of Ambrosio's portrait of Madonna" (Williams, 117). This is the shape she keeps until Ambrosio is completely corrupted. The signs of her faulty character which Ambrosio chooses to ignore become more and more apparent with time: first she is miraculously healed from fatal poisoning and then she openly offers her sexual favors. After Ambrosio starts rejecting those favors, she reveals that she practices witchcraft and demon-summoning. She even openly suggests the murder of Antonia. The last metamorphosis she goes through is when both she and Ambrosio are caught and imprisoned by the Inquisition: "She had quitted her religious habit. She now wore a female dress, at once elegant and splendid; a profusion of diamonds blazed upon her robes, and her hair was confined in the coronet of roses" (Lewis, 281). Her appearance here openly resembles Lucifer's looks from

the first time he is summoned. Ambrosio makes no connection between the two until she openly tells him that it was her soul she gave for freedom from the Inquisition. He readily eats the metaphorical apple she offers and signs a contract giving his own soul to the devil in order to be acquitted.

The possible reason Ambrosio chooses not to see all that gives Matilda away as an evil character could be the fact that he shares a lot of her traits. In fact, the duality of his character (the real him versus the public him) could also be interpreted as a form of shape-changing. Like Matilda and Milton's Satan, Ambrosio has an affinity towards corrupting others – he wants to corrupt Antonia. In order to do that, he presents himself as a confessor, a benefactor and a friend to Antonia and her mother, Elvira:

With persuasive evidence he calmed every fear, and dissipated every scruple. He bade her reflect on the infinite mercy of her Judge, despoiled death of his darts and terrors, and taught her to view without shrinking the abyss of eternity, on whose brink she then stood. Elvira was absorbed in attention and delight; while she listened to his exhortations, confidence and comfort stole insensibly into her mind (Lewis, 162).

Just like Milton's Satan appears to Eve as benevolent because she is naïve, Ambrosio uses Antonia's naivety to do the same. Both are successful in their intent; Antonia's life is taken away and Eve loses her immortality.

Another character who changes his demeanor in order to deceive is Satan in Dacre's *Zofloya, or the Moor*. When he sees the weaknesses he could exploit in Victoria, he possesses Henriquez's Moorish servant, Zofloya. The Moor is introduced for the first time in Victoria's dream:

She beheld advancing a Moor, of a noble and majestic form. He was clad in a habit of white and gold; on his head he wore a white turban, which sparkled with emeralds, and was surmounted by a waving feather of green; his arms and legs, which were bare, were encircled with the finest oriental pearl; he wore a collar of gold round his throat, and his ears were decorated with gold rings of an enormous size (Dacre, 136).

Even though he comes to Venice with Henriquez, Zofloya is not mentioned until Victoria starts lusting after her brother-in-law. Therefore, the dream is a foreshadowing of both Victoria's destiny and the first transformation of Satan into the Moor. The transformation happens sometime after Zofloya's disappearance. During the Moor's absence, Henriquez's dying servant Latoni admits to killing him by stabbing him in the back and pushing him into a canal. However, nine days after Latoni's death, Zofloya appears saying that a fisherman

picked him up from the canal and nurtured him back to life. Some aspects of his story point to demonic intervention:

Fortunately, none of my wounds proved to be serious; and being in possession of a secret transmitted to me by my ancestors, for speedily healing even the most dangerous ones, I remained at the hut of the fisherman till I was perfectly recovered (Dacre, 142).

According to Michasiw, “advancement that defies established ‘truths’ about intellectual capacities, defined by sex or race, is explained away with Satanic meddling” (277). Therefore, the application of the mysterious “secret” Zofloya inherits denotes Satanic possession. Another trait that makes the Moor look suspicious is his behavior. Even though he is a slave of African descent (the position he openly admits), he behaves as Victoria’s superior and owner: “And I too, Signora, shall have proud cause to *mark* that day; for it gave to the unworthy slave, Zofloya, the most beautiful and enterprising of her sex” (Dacre, 160). As in Lewis’s *Matilda*, the signs of his demonic character show more as Victoria descends into sin and like Ambrosio, she chooses to ignore them.

In order to get what she wants, Victoria also makes herself seem something she is not. The first shape-change is, like in *Ambrosio*, the duality of her character, i.e. her false appearance. She takes the role of a loving wife to Berenza and a caring friend to Lilla and Henriquez. Her true traits show in many ways, especially in the masculine and forceful behavior she subconsciously displays. However, only Henriquez seems to notice how unattractive Victoria’s character actually is:

As for Henriquez, though he treated her with friendship and respect, as the wife of his brother, he did no more: first, because he was absorbed in Lilla; and secondly, because being so completely, both in mind and person, the reverse of that pure and delicate being, he not only failed to view them as two creatures of the same class, but almost thought of Victoria with a tincture of dislike (Dacre, 138).

By intuitively comparing Victoria to Lilla (who is kind, gentle and good), Henriquez is not fooled by Victoria’s false demeanor. In fact, “for Henriquez, physical and moral difference classify Lilla and Victoria as belonging to separate species” (Michasiw, 48). Being that her false charms do not work on Henriquez, Victoria goes through another shape-change in order to seduce him. This time, however, she drugs him so that when he looks at her, he sees Lilla: “The better to deceive him, she wore a veil of Lilla’s, and such parts of her dress that might suite indiscriminately either one or the other. His conduct had already evinced her, how powerfully the philter was acting” (Dacre, 218). Just like Milton’s Satan, Victoria succeeds in

her intent by changing her appearance; however, unlike Satan, she does not use vanity as a weakness to exploit. While Ambrosio uses Antonia's naivety to doom her, Victoria uses Henriquez's true love to the same result. Using a feeling so sincere and honest in order to corrupt makes her sin even greater. As a consequence of this sin, she is destroyed in the same way as Ambrosio and ironically, the same way she destroyed Lilla – her demonic lover hurls her over the cliff into the foaming water below.

Since *Frankenstein* is a novel much different from both *Zofloya* and *The Monk*, one can not speak of corruption or seduction of others in the literal sense. But it can be said that by persisting in his attempts to create a life, Victor Frankenstein really corrupts himself, since this diabolical "birth" makes him a sinner. By attempting to sin, Victor involuntarily changes his appearance:

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. Every night I was oppressed by a slow fever, and I became nervous to a most painful degree: the fall of a leaf startled me, and I shunned my fellow creatures as if I had been guilty of a crime (Shelley, 54).

Satan, Ambrosio and Victoria all give out a trait which shows their true nature. In the same way, Victor's appearance is a sign of what his true nature becomes when he sins. However, Victor's appearance is a result and not the means of corruption.

The creature's demeanor is also the result of his maker's sinful nature:

His limbs were in proportion, and I had selected his features as beautiful. Beautiful! Great God! His yellow skin scarcely covered the work of muscles and arteries beneath; his hair was of a lustrous black, and flowing; his teeth of pearly whiteness; but these luxuriances only formed a more horrid contrast with his watery eyes (Shelley, 55).

No matter how hard Victor tries to produce beauty, the monster he creates expresses the wrongness of the unnatural creation. At the same time, this appearance is what corrupts the creature. Even though Adam has the potential to do good, he is being repeatedly rejected by people, which causes the shift in his nature – he starts sinning. It can thus be said that by giving him the horrid appearance he has, Victor is really Adam's corruptor; however, he does not shape-shift himself – instead he shapes his victim. As with Victoria and Ambrosio, the result is damnation of both the corruptor and the corrupted.

The garden metaphor, where a garden represents the man as a whole, is widely present in Lewis's *The Monk*. As two main places of corruption, both the convent of St. Clare and the Capuchin abbey have adjoining gardens which conveniently share a sepulcher – a place where

both Ambrosio and the Prioress of St. Clare, as the highest ranking members of their order, commit their gravest sins. Both of those gardens are surrounded with a high wall, just like the Garden of Eden in *Paradise Lost*. The wall represents the outer defenses of a person's soul that need to be penetrated for the corruption to take place. Therefore, the garden of Ambrosio's monastery represents Ambrosio:

In all Madrid, there was no spot more beautiful or better regulated. It was laid out with the most exquisite taste; the choicest flowers adorned it in the height of luxuriance, and, though artfully arranged, seemed only planted by the hand of nature. ... A gentle breeze breathed the fragrance of orange-blossoms along the alleys, and the nightingale poured forth her melodious murmur from a shelter of an artificial wilderness (Lewis, 30).

Just like Ambrosio, the garden seems beautiful and natural. However, the garden only seems "planted by the hand of nature" and is an "artificial wilderness". One could say that the beautiful appearance of the garden is artificial, just like Ambrosio's holy demeanor. By disguising herself as a boy and entering the Capuchin abbey (she penetrates the walls), Matilda gets the chance to seduce Ambrosio: "In the garden of the Monastery, he is tempted not by a wily serpent, but by Matilda ... He is *bitten* by the serpent, which gives Matilda the opportunity to undermine his principles further" (Williams, 116).

The main heroine of the second storyline in *The Monk*, Agnes, is also tempted by her lover in the garden of the St. Clare convent. "Ambrosio's fall is echoed in that of Agnes, who yields to her lover in the garden of *her* convent" (Williams, 116). Unlike Ambrosio, Agnes is a prisoner, forced to become a nun by her family. Her lover and future husband, Raymond, enters the garden in a similar way Milton's Satan does in Book IV of *Paradise Lost*. Similar to Matilda, Raymond disguises himself in order to enter the garden:

Disguised in a common habit, and a black patch covering one of my eyes, I was presented to the lady prioress, who condescended to approve of the gardener's choice. I immediately entered upon my employment. ... On the fourth night I was more successful. I heard the voice of Agnes and was speeding towards the sound when the sight of the domina stopped me. I drew back with caution, and concealed myself behind a thick clump of trees (Lewis, 119).

Raymond's actions after entering the garden mirror those of Satan in Book IV of *Paradise Lost*. He is sneaking about and preying on his victim. Even though Raymond's intentions are far more different than those of Milton's Satan and Matilda, the result of his seduction is Agnes' suffering – when the prioress finds out about her pregnancy, she imprisons her in the

sepulcher below the garden, starving her newborn child to death and almost killing her too. By letting Raymond penetrate her outer defenses and giving herself to sin, Agnes is forced to endure horrible pain; however, since both her and Raymond's intentions are a result of true love, both of them are given a second chance.

The garden is a frequent place of seduction in *Zofloya, or the Moor* too. Victoria's mother, Laurina, is seduced by Count Ardolph in the garden of their family house in Venice. In order to penetrate the house walls and get to the garden (Laurina's heart) Ardolph pretends to be a friend to Victoria's family "like a demon would put on the semblance of an angel" (Dacre, 8) and is invited as a guest. In a conquest that lasts for three months, he succeeds in capturing Laurina's interest using flattery, like Satan flatters Eve in order to get her to sin:

It was one evening, that, straying pensively down an avenue in the garden, she suddenly encountered him; not, however, accidentally on his side, who was forming, unconsciously to herself, a portion of her thoughts. ... He threw himself at her feet, and acknowledged, in hurried accents, the passion with which she had filled up his heart. Confounded, bewildered, and overcome, Laurina knew not how to fly (Dacre, 10).

Like Eve, by succumbing to her sexual needs without caring about the effect her actions will have on others, Laurina chooses self-love instead of true love she should feel towards her husband. By allowing herself to be governed by impulses, she shows weakness of character and ruins her family. Her daughter, Victoria, inherits the trait which, combined with excessively violent temperament, leads her down the same path.

Victoria's seducer, Zofloya, can be paralleled with both Ardolph and Lewis's Matilda. By arriving to Berenza's house as a slave to his brother, Henriquez, he gains access to the house and to Victoria. Victoria's real-life seduction and Zofloya's true character are foretold in her dream:

First she beheld, in a beautiful and luxurious garden, Lilla and Henriquez; his arm encircled her waist, and her head reclined upon his shoulder, while he contemplated her angelic countenance with looks of ineffable love. ... Presently she beheld, approaching towards her, a group of shadowy figures ... These passed gradually; when, as in from the midst of them, she beheld advancing a Moor. ... 'Wilt thou be mine?' in a hurried voice whispered the Moor in her ear, 'and none then shall oppose thee.' But Victoria hesitated, and cast her eyes upon Henriquez" (Dacre, 135/136).

One can conclude that Lilla and Henriquez play the roles of Adam and Eve in this dream. If the garden they are in is the Garden of Eden, then Zofloya must be Satan. Considering the

feelings Victoria has for Henriquez and the proposition Zofloya gives, it follows that she will be seduced by him. As foretold, they talk for the first time in the garden and that is also the place where they plot the murders Victoria commits:

In yet another garden, Victoria is later approached by the moor Zofloya, who offers to help her win the heart of the man she loves. Like Ambrosio in *The Monk*, Victoria is hesitant about accepting the help offered by the tempter. Like him, she is persuaded to do so by a clever monologue uttered by the tempter, a tempter who in fact turns out to be the Devil himself (Faxneld, 5).

Therefore, the garden represents Victoria. Like the garden of Ambrosio's abbey, Victoria's garden is man-made, while Milton's Eden is a "steep wilderness, whose hairy sides / With thicket overgrown, grotesque and wild / Access denied" (IV, 135-137). Because of that, Victoria's garden is easily susceptible to change, not necessarily for the better. Milton's Satan corrupts and runs, his victory not being final since Adam and Eve repent. Zofloya, on the other hand, shapes Victoria's actions any way he likes, like a gardener would shape an artificial garden.

Since the real corruptor of Shelley's Adam in *Frankenstein* was actually his maker and the corruption took place during the creation, Shelley does not use the garden with steep walls to represent the hero of her novel. Rather, Adam's nature, even though he is artificially made, is represented by wilderness with no boundaries. Since wilderness is the only place Adam feels safe, he has no choice but to make it his home. However, the first crime he commits and the beginning of his fall happen outside – in the fields surrounding Victor's house:

It was evening when I arrived, and I retired to a hiding place among the fields that surround it to meditate in what manner I should apply to you. ... At this time, a slight sleep relieved me from the pain of reflection, which was disturbed by the approach of a beautiful child, who came running into the recess I had chosen. ... The child still struggled and loaded me with epithets which carried despair to my heart: I grasped his throat to silence him, and in a moment he lay dead at my feet (Shelley, 136/137).

Like the wilderness the creature inhabits, his corrupted nature cannot be tamed and he cannot run from it. Victoria and Ambrosio start out as innocent, with the ability to choose between the love they feel towards themselves and actions that are righteous and virtuous. Their behavior is cultivated into sin by their corruptors who use their weaknesses to seduce. The corruption of Shelley's Adam, like Milton's Satan, is the result of both his inheritance and his own choices. Due to a lack of a gardener (a caring father), Adam's nature remains untamed and he becomes a sinner.

CONCLUSION

The Satanic hero or the hero-villain is a dark, troubled and mysterious individual. He is shaped by life experiences and traits which he inherits from his maker. His choices are determined by his defining characteristics – excessive pride and vanity. Those choices usually satisfy only sexual desires and the needs of the flesh, regardless of the consequences they might have. Since passion and selfish gain are the primary goals of the Satanic hero, he is morally deficient – predatory, power-hungry and sexually deprived. Since he is corrupted, the Satanic hero also aims to corrupt and ruin others. In order to do that he uses lies, shape-changing and even violence. Furthermore, the Satanic hero has a dual character. He is capable of both good and evil, but he always chooses evil because he is weak and self-centered. At the same time, while his nature is primarily evil, he tries to make his demeanor good and that is why nuns, monks and priests are frequently Satanic characters. However, there is always a betraying characteristic, like unknown origin or strange behavior, which gives the Satanic hero away. The above-mentioned duality is the aspect which makes this kind of a hero compelling to the reader. By observing his own sinful nature in the character, the reader is able to identify with him and at the same time judge him for taking the wrong path. In other words, the Satanic hero is simultaneously what the reader is and what he could become – his duality mirrors human duality.

All these traits are visible in Lewis's *Ambrosio* and Dacre's *Victoria*. They are both orphans in body and spirit. *Ambrosio* is taken away from his biological family and raised by Mother Church, a parent whose repressive upbringing only nurtures his bad traits. *Victoria* is abandoned by her sinful mother and left to raise herself any way she can. Since they are both extremely vain, they are easily corrupted and end up condemning themselves with their actions. Shelley's *Adam*, even though different from *Ambrosio* and *Victoria*, also shares the main traits of a Satanic character. Instead of physical self-love, *Adam*'s primary characteristics are spite and obdurate pride. He is not narcissistic, but he is willing to ruin the lives of others so he could get what he wants. He behaves this way because he is, like *Victoria* and *Ambrosio*, missing the positive influence of a parent – he is rejected by his maker (also a sinner) and left alone to decide what is good and what is evil.

All three characters have a choice – to do what is moral and right, or to rebel against the authority. The rebellion they choose is the result of tumultuous times in which the novels are created. The French Revolution at the end of the eighteenth century highly influenced the writers of the Victorian period and the Satanic character is the mirror of the revolutionary man

of the time. However, the main influence on the creation of the Satanic hero is another revolutionary poet, John Milton. By creating a version of Oliver Cromwell (a rebel) in his Satan, Milton sets the grounds for the hero-villains of the Victorian Gothic. As a rejected, troubled child of God, Satan decides to forcefully take what he thinks he should have by birthright. When he does not succeed, he decides to corrupt God's new children. Just like the Gothic hero-villain, Satan is narcissistic, vain, proud and jealous. However, he is also remorseful and aware of the wrongness of his actions. He alone thinks he can not be pardoned for the sins he commits, so he forcefully pushes forward in his need for revenge. At the same time, Satan shows disturbingly human characteristics, but also inexplicable immorality. Just when one thinks one can reach a humane reason for Satan's behavior, one is left baffled by how evil he actually is.

The mysteriousness of Milton's Satan is precisely what attracts the attention of both the readers and the writers in subsequent literary history. The Satanic hero, based on this character, has been a frequent villain of many Gothic novels since the eighteenth and nineteenth century. Today, this kind of a hero can be found in many literary genres, most prominent of those being fantasy and science-fiction literature, contemporary Gothic literature and horror literature which focuses only on the subliminal aspect of horror. The Satanic hero can thus be found in works such as Phillip K. Dick's *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep* (Roy Batty), Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (Count Dracula) and Stephen King's *Carrie* (Carrie). Therefore, the scope of literary works in which one can see Miltonic influences is wide. The reason that the character of Milton's Satan is so influential is that, by incorporating excessive self love, promiscuity and vengefulness into the core of his hero-villain, Milton actually achieves in 1667 with *Paradise Lost* the same thing Edmund Burke later incorporates into his theory of the sublime. By finding their own traits in Satan, Milton's readers experience the terror of realizing that they might be just like him. However they also feel the pleasure derived from the realization that he is only a fictional character. These contrasting motions are the grounds for attraction both readers and later writers feel towards Satanic hero-villains.

WORKS CITED

- Botting, Fred. *Gothic*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Bradford, Richard. *The Complete Critical Guide to John Milton*. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Butler, George F. "The Fall of Tydeus and the Failure of Satan: Statius' *Thebaid*, Dante's *Commedia*, and Milton's *Paradise Lost*". *Comparative Literature Studies*. 43.1/2 (2006): 134-152.
- Byron, Glennis and Punter, David. *The Gothic*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.
- Clery, J.D. "The Genesis of 'Gothic' Fiction". *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction*. Ed. Jerrold E. Hogle. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 21-40.
- Crockett, Christine M. "'The Monster Vice': Masturbation, Malady, and Monstrosity in *Frankenstein*". *Demons of the Body and Mind: Essays on Disability in Gothic Literature*. Ed. Ruth Bienstock Anolik. North Carolina: McFarland & Company Inc., 2010. 129-141.
- Dacre, Charlotte. *Zofloya, or the Moor*. 1806. Ed. Kim Ian Michashiw. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Davison, Carol Margaret. "Getting Their Knickers in a Twist: Contesting the Female Gothic in Charlotte Dacre's *Zofloya*". *Gothic Studies*. 11.1 (2009): 32-45.
- Dobransky, Stephen B. "Pondering Satan's Shield in Milton's *Paradise Lost*". *English Literary Renaissance*. 35.3 (2005): 490-506.
- Faxneld, Per. "Woman liberated by the Devil in four Gothic novels: William Beckford's *Vathek* (1786), Matthew Lewis' *The Monk* (1796), Charlotte Dacre's *Zofloya, or The Moor* (1806), and Charles Maturin's *Melmoth the Wanderer* (1820)". *Grotesque Femininities: Evil, Women and the Feminine*. Ed. Maria Barrett. Oxford: Inter-Disciplinary Press, 2010.
- Forsyth, Neil. *The Satanic Epic*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.
- Gamer, Michael. "Gothic Fictions and Romantic Writing in Britain". *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction*. Ed. Jerrold E. Hogle. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 85-104.
- Gentile, Kathy Justice. "Sublime Drag: Supernatural Masculinity in Gothic Fiction". *Gothic Studies*. 11.1 (2009): 16-31.
- Graves, Neil D. "Typological Aporias in *Paradise Lost*". *Modern Philology*. 104.2 (2006): 173-201.

- Kerrigan, William. "Complicated Monsters: Essence and Metamorphoses in Milton". *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*. 46.3 (2004): 324-339.
- Kilgour, Maggie. "'Thy perfect image viewing': Poetic Creation and Ovid's Narcissus in *Paradise Lost*". *Studies in Philology*. 102.3 (2005): 307-339.
- Knott, John R. "Milton's Wild Garden". *Studies in Philology*. 102.1 (2005): 66-82.
- Lewis, Matthew Gregory. *The Monk*. 1796. Ed. Tom Crawford. New York: Dover Publications, 2003.
- Martin, Roberta C. "How Came I Thus? Adam and Eve in the Mirror of the Other". *College Literature*. 27.2 (2000): 58-79.
- Michashiw, Kim Ian. "Charlotte Dacre's Postcolonial Moor". *Empire and the Gothic: The Politics of Genre*. Ed. Andrew Smith and William Hughes. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. 35-55.
- Michashiw, Kim Ian. "Explanatory Notes". *Zofloya, or the Moor*. Ed. Kim Ian Michashiw. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Miles, Robert. "The 1970s: The Effulgence of Gothic". *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction*. Ed. Jerrold E. Hogle. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 41-62.
- Milton, John. *Paradise Lost*. 1667. Ed. Stephen Orgel and Jonathan Goldberg. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Rogers, John. "Lecture 14 - *Paradise Lost*, Book IV". Fall 2007. Transcript of Video. <http://oyc.yale.edu/english/milton/content/sessions/session-14-paradise-lost-book-iv>
- Shelley, Mary. *Frankenstein*. 1818. London: The Penguin Group, 1994.
- Snodgrass, Mary Ellen. *Encyclopedia of Gothic Literature*. New York: Facts On File, 2005.
- The Bible*, King James Version, Complete. E-Book. Project Gutenberg, 2002.
- Williams, Anne. *The Art of Darkness: A Poetics of Gothic*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995.