ANALYZING THE "WHY" AND "HOW" OF DISABILITY IN *FRANKENSTEIN*, *POOR MISS FINCH*, AND *THE STRANGE CASE OF DR. JEKYLL AND MR. HYDE*

by

Rachel Diana Rose Pitcher

A thesis submitted to the faculty of Radford University inpartial fulfillment of requirements for degree of Master of Arts Department of English

Thesis Advisor: Jamie L. McDanielApril 2021

Jamie L. McDaniel 4/28/2021

Dr. Jamie McDaniel Date
Thesis Chair

Moira P. Baker 4/28/2021

Dr. Moira Baker Date
Committee Member

Sean M. Keck 4/28/21

Dr. Sean Keck Date
Committee Member

ABSTRACT

In *Frankenstein,* the Creature discovers that his horrific appearance is what separates him from others in society. The Creature realizes, "At first I stared back, unable to believe that was indeed I who was reflected in the mirror; and when I became fully convinced that I was the monster that I am, I was filled with the bitterest sensations of despondence and mortification" (Shelley 85). The other characters are not the only ones who treat the Creature as "disabled," but he treats himself as "disabled" as well after this realization. According to Fiona Kumari Campbell's concept of internalized ableism, the Creature has realized his own flaws and begins to judge himself for them (20). People's reaction to the Creature have made him realize that he is unacceptable in this ableist society. Coupling the close reading of this text with Campbell's disability studies theory and alongside other disability study theorists like Dan Goodley or David Mitchell and Sharon Snyder provide insight into "how" the characters disable the Creature.

In addition to examining literary texts using the "how" approach, it is important to look at the texts with the "why." The "why" approaches texts with the historical and cultural context during the time period the text was written. Using this context, the readers can be more aware of the author's conscious or unconscious choices for the characters in his or her texts. For example, Johann Caspar Lavater's physiognomy, the pseudoscience of studying the face to reveal a person's personality traits, was practiced during the nineteenth century. This practice could be one of the reasons why the Creature is judged so harshly by Romantic society. Similarly, Arthur Ladbroke Wigan's published medical ideas about the double minded capabilities of the brain could explain the split between Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde in *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. Lastly, Francis Galton's medical publications about the connections that twins have

could explain the treatment of Nugent and Oscar in *Poor Miss Finch*. Without these historical and cultural contexts, readers would only have a partial understanding of the primary text.

Therefore, I argue that to have a full understanding of disability studies within historical literary texts, readers need to approach the texts through two lenses. First, they must approach the text with the "how." Studying the primary text and applying modern disability studies theory gives the reader a strong understanding of how ableism operates in the text. Next, the "why" provides the cultural and historical context of the text, which could lead the reader to understand the author's literary choices and the character's actions. This combined approach will contribute to the field of disability studies and the field of New Historicism.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my fiancé, Brady. Your unwavering love for me and confidence in me never go unnoticed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is hard to decide only one person to acknowledge for this work. First, I have to thank Mrs. Burr and Dr. Gompf for introducing *Frankenstein* to me in the first place. I have loved this text since high school and that love was rekindled in my undergraduate career. Next, I have to thank Dr. Baker who continued to fuel my love for this text. Despite being unfamiliar with the text, she constantly listened to my ideas about the text and guided me to do a thorough close reading with research that led to my strong interpretation of it. In addition, Dr. Keck was a part of my thesis committee. I appreciate his comments about Bill Brown and how I can use his theory in my future research. The last professor who I must mention is Dr. McDaniel. From introducing me to the field of disability studies and then guiding me through this rollercoaster of a project, I owe him my eternal thanks. He was always willing to listen, adjust to missed deadlines, and guide my project even when it was going off the path. Lastly, I would like to acknowledge the Radford University English Master's program. Everyone in this program is incredible and I am so thankful that I was chosen to be a part of it.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract……...……ii

Dedication……..…….iv

Acknowledgments……v

Table of Contents……vi

Introduction: **Looking at Romantic and Victorian Texts Through Historical and Modern Disability Studies Lenses**……1

Chapter One: **The Creation "Disabled": Uncovering the "How" of Ableism and Disabling in *Frankenstein***……10

Chapter Two: **Explaining the "Why" Twins and Doubles: Medically and Culturally Constructed Freaks of Amusement to Contrast the "Abled" and "Disabled"**…….....26

Conclusion: **Looking to the Future of the Disability Studies and Historical Literary Texts Fields**……42

Works Cited……...46

Introduction: Looking at Romantic and Victorian Texts Through Historical and Modern Disability Studies Lenses

The field of disability studies has evolved rapidly within the past thirty years. After the passage of the American with Disabilities Act in 1990, disability studies scholars and activists have sought both to expand upon this milestone in the fight for a more accessible society and to broaden the field's concerns outside of its original social justice context. Instead of seeing disability as a part of someone's identity, some people view a disability as a punishment either to the person who has the disability or the people who are related to the person with the disability. Goodley's moral model of disability suggests that people believe this has happened because the person with the disability did something wrong (7). Other models that Goodley discusses are used in the scholarship of disability studies. This field has practitioners from the natural sciences, who often seek to work against the medical model of disability that views disability as a biological problem requiring cure and rehabilitation; from the social sciences, which often subscribe to the social model of disability that uses approaches such as universal design and participatory design to make the world more accessible and usable for people with disabilities; and from the humanities, which often subscribe to the cultural model of disability that tends to focus on the importance of representation in texts such as books, films, and popular discourse. These humanities-based approaches, for example, might criticize certain works as "inspiration porn," which is "a phrase that refers to inspirational stories depicting people with disabilities supposedly overcoming obstacles when in actuality they are simply performing actions that people without disabilities do on a regular basis" (McDaniel, "Zombies" 434). Ideas constantly circulate about how disability should be viewed. These narratives commonly show people who must adapt to how "able" people perceive the world. However, it seems that "able" people are

the ones who do not understand. For example, Deborah Gallagher analyzed the label "learning disability" and found no definite answer for it. She argues that this is a way for people to control children who see the world differently than they should. She states, "It is no small irony that this situation has been hiding in plain sight for decades. While children are routinely identified and labeled as *having* learning disabilities, efforts have been ongoing to reconfigure and reconceptualize the criteria and hence the very nature of this disability" (Gallagher). Therefore, it seems that anyone can begin to question definitions of disability. One of the best ways to question these definitions is to look at their appearances in discourse and literary texts and see how they have progressed throughout history.

However, with this rapid expansion, an important question in the disability studies field has appeared: Should scholars apply modern disability studies approaches to literary texts from previous generations? By "modern disability studies approaches," the field should be using foundational scholars like Dan Goodley, David Mitchell, Sharon Snyder, and Fiona Kumari Campbell to base the claims and supplementing with more specific disability studies scholarship. Sari Altschuler and Cristobal Silva discuss a potential answer to this question in "Early American Disability Studies," the introduction to a special issue of the journal *Early American Literature*. Altschuler and Silva start by claiming "the potential contributions of disability studies to the field of early American literary studies are as vital as they are complicated; […] this work is historiographic in nature, but, our approaches have been shaped by a conviction that historiographic work is bound to a set of narrative and discursive forms that literary studies and disability studies are ideally positioned to investigate" (2). Looking at texts through a historical lens is important, but literary and disability studies can help to study the language within these texts revealing aspects that a historical lens might not uncover. Although Altschuler and Silva

only discuss early American texts, I argue that this approach could be used with texts in other periods as well. With a combination of historical and cultural contexts and modern disability studies theory, I offer specific examples of how the combination of these approaches could lead to a full understanding of *Frankenstein, Poor Miss Finch,* and *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*.

Historical and Cultural Contexts Reveal the "Why" in Primary Texts

Oftentimes, readers go into historical literary texts without knowing the historical and cultural context during the period the work was created. This does not necessarily mean that they cannot comprehend the text. They will be able to understand the general plot of the text, but they might not fully understand the actions of the characters. Many times, characters act a certain way because of the influences going on during that time period. Medical and cultural contexts can undergo changes in five years; imagine how much these contexts can change in 200 years. Without providing this context, the readers will likely miss out on the "why" behind the characters' motives and actions. Potentially, the lack of this context could cause a misunderstanding of the text, or only a partial understanding for the reader. Approaching the primary texts with the historical and cultural contexts in this section will help an audience better understand how disability was viewed in the nineteenth century. Possibly, this information could shape the way disability is read within the primary texts.

During the nineteenth century, medical and psychological practices and ideas were drastically different from those in the twentieth and twenty-first century. As a result, it is important to look at these contexts and see how they could possibly relate to the primary texts and their definitions of disability. All three primary texts have characters who are judged because of their appearance; for example, Oscar's blue skin in *Poor Miss Finch* and the Creature and Mr.

Hyde's grotesque appearance in *Frankenstein* and *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. John Casper Lavater's study of physiognomy helps us understand this strong focus on appearance. His study explains, "The moral life of man, particularly, reveals itself in the lies, marks, and transitions of the countenance. His moral powers and desires, his irritability, sympathy, and antipathy; hid faculty of attracting or repelling the objects that surround him; these are all summed up in, and painted upon, his countenance, when at rest" (8-9). According to Lavater's nineteenth century medical theory, a person's potential moral actions can be judged by their physical appearance. People who adopted this idea would find it necessary to separate themselves from the people who fit the criteria to be morally corrupt. This is why the characters mentioned above are "othered" when people see their physical appearance. Other characters associate their features with negative physiognomic traits because of this common practice. Therefore, they are mistreated like someone with a disability would be treated.

In addition to the practice of physiognomy, the duality of the mind and double consciousness were common medical considerations. During the nineteenth century, the capabilities of the human brain were still not understood. Some medical professionals thought that the two hemispheres operated separately, with one possibly harboring positive thoughts while the other harbored negative thoughts. Similarly, it was possible for the two hemispheres to act separately depending on which one was in control. Arthur Ladbroke Wigan, a practitioner during the 1800s claimed, "That, in the healthy brain, one of the cerebra is almost always superior in power to the other, and capable of exercising control over the volitions of its fellow, and preventing them from passing into acts, or from being manifested to others" (125). This action could go either way, but in the texts, especially in *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, it seems that this is most concerning when the part of the brain with the negative thoughts

takes over the side with positive thoughts. The actions from the negative side of the brain take over in all three of the primary works. The Creature and Victor's evil actions lead to their exile, Mr. Hyde's vile actions cause Dr. Jekyll to commit suicide to save himself, and Oscar finally proves his identity and Nugent's vicious intentions are revealed and he disappears. All these situations do not end positively, showing the seriousness of this medical idea.

Examining the medical context of the nineteenth century is important, but examining the cultural context is important as well. Beginning in the mid 1800s, there was the emergence of the freak show enforcing the idea that someone with a disability was meant to entertain and not to live a "normal" life. Not all freaks relied on a physical appearance to be different, but a distinct physical difference was one of the ways people were chosen for the freak show. In Robert Bogdan's book, *Freak Show*, he discusses the emergence of the freak show, the different types of peoples who participated in these shows, and how the freak show ultimately ended. Some peoples in these shows would have been similar to the characters who are "Othered" for their physical appearance in the primary texts I have mentioned. Bogdan states, "The second major category of exhibit consisted of 'monsters,' the medical term for people born with a demonstrable difference. Lusus naturae, or 'freaks of nature,' were of interest to physicians for whom the field of teratology, the study of these so-called monsters, had become a fad" (6). The Creature, Oscar, or Mr. Hyde could all be characterized as the "monster" and as a result the "freak" according to these standards. Despite when the physical deformity appeared, any physical difference sets these characters apart and makes other characters in these works question them and their place in society outside of the freak show.

At first, the multitude of sources used to provide the historical and cultural context can be overwhelming, especially for a reader who is not familiar with the period. However, they offer a

potential "why" behind the character's actions and reactions within the primary text. Without this context, the reader might make any other assumptions that they can through close reading. For example, without knowing about physiognomy, the audience might simply dismiss Victor's mistreatment of the Creature as the way he would treat a failed experiment. It is important to say that this reading would not be wrong. Victor is disappointed when he realizes that his experiment has not come out the way he wanted it to. However, with the historical and medical context, the audience can analyze why he thinks his experiment is a failed experiment. One of the possible explanations would be the readings of the Creature's face according to physiognomic standards. Victor knows he will be judged as a result of creating these features and tries to permanently distance himself from the Creature. With this context, readers can begin to understand the medical, psychological, and cultural implications of the period and the influence they might have on the primary text in general.

Disability Studies Close Reading Revealing the "How" in Primary Texts

After equipping readers with the "why," they can start to study the "how." With the historical and cultural context, they can identify when and where disability is being discussed in the text. As a result, they can look more closely at those instances and investigate "how" they are operating. By using modern disability study theorists, it is possible to identify the way each instance of disability is treated. These texts could possibly be circulating positive ideas or they could be circulating negative ideas about disability. Studying these texts more closely will contribute to the cultural and historical context as well because it is possible authors might have tried to push against the commonly accepted ideas of their periods. With the combination of the "why" and "how," the reader and the field of literary studies will come to a more in-depth understanding of the text.

Scholars have read *Frankenstein* through a disability studies lens, but the Creature is commonly viewed through the lens of David T. Mitchell and Sharon L. Snyder's *Narrative Prothesis*. This would define the Creature as a disabled character with a basic function: "people with disabilities have been the object of representational treatments, but rather that their function in literary discourse is primarily twofold: disability pervades literary narrative, first, as a stock feature of stock characterization and, second, as an opportunistic metaphorical device" (47). The Creature can be studied using this definition, but he is more than just a stock character or convenient metaphor for the audience. Instead, he is a dynamic character who experiences discrimination because of his appearance, causing him to change emotionally. Also, Dan Goodley's moral model and medical model have been applied, which can seem very similar to the study of physiognomy: "A moral stance perceives disability as a sin (a punishment from God forgiven through divine intervention) while a medical position understand disability primarily as a pathology" (7). Although assessing the Creature's appearance can be a part of a medical practice, people can see the Creature's impairments as indicative of his moral shortcomings. Again, these models can show how medical and cultural contexts are operating within the novel, but it does not necessarily explain why the Creature judges himself for his appearance. Therefore, it seems that Fiona Kumari Campbell's discussion of internalized ableism is more relevant and meaningful while close reading this text. Campbell asserts, "Instead of embracing disability at the level of beingness (i.e. as an intrinsic part of the person's Self), the processes of ableism, like those of racism induce an internalization of self-loathing which is disablement" (20). The Creature is aware that he is not wanted within this society and he internalizes this idea. Reading this primary text with Campbell's discussion of theory shows that the Creature has internalized the "why" from the historical context of the period. He learns to judge himself like

the other characters within the novel. Using a disability studies lens help to uncover "how" the historical and cultural context are working within the primary texts.

One of the best ways to uncover the "how" is by closely reading the primary texts for potential instances of the cultural and historical context. Silva and Altschuler acknowledge that disability studies has contributed to early American literary studies field, but at times generalized theory is not as specific as it needs to be for their field. However, there has been a recent change that they are excited about: "In recent years, the historical study of disability has involved locating instances of where and when disability appears in the record as well as addressing specific literary concerns such as how disability is represented and narrated—in short, how and what signified disability in the past" (4). By using the "why" revealed by the historical and cultural context, literary contexts can be looked at more closely to study "how" the ideas and practices during these periods were operating. Using disability studies theory broadly can be helpful, but to prevent it from generalizing, it should be analyzed within specific periods and texts. Therefore, to see how disabled people were treated during the nineteenth century, close reading the primary texts from that period with disability studies theorists as a frame and then supplementing that with historical and cultural context can offer the in-depth lens that Altschuler and Silva discussed.

Overview of the Upcoming Chapters: Disability Studies Close Reading and New Historicist Close Reading

In the first chapter, I close read *Frankenstein* using a disability studies lens. At times, historical and cultural contexts come into play, but they are brief compared to the presence of disability studies theory. With this approach, I specifically discuss how Fiona Kumari Campbell's definition of "internalized ableism" manifests itself throughout the text while

supplementing with other disability study theorists. By looking closely at this text with disability studies, I show "how" the Creature is being "othered" because of his disability. In the second chapter, I close read *Frankenstein*, *Poor Miss Finch*, and *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* through a New Historicist lens. Using *Embodied Selves* and Robert Bogdan's exploration of the "freak," I offer medical and psychological context while close reading all three of these texts. By using a historical lens, the potential "why" behind the characters' inhumane treatment of the disabled characters is discussed. By showing "how" and "why" disability operates with these two approaches leads to a fuller understanding of these texts and shows how "othering" people within these texts can lead to the demise of other main characters as well.

Chapter One: The Creation "Disabled": Uncovering the "How" of Ableism and Disabling in *Frankenstein*

An Accomplishment of Physical Failure: The Ableist Judgement of Shelley's Creature

If society repeatedly calls someone an outsider, does that person begin to take on the label despite their previous identity? In Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, the Creature begins to realize he is a monster after multiple traumatizing encounters. One of the most traumatizing events for the Creature is when he is forced to leave the DeLaceys. After his banishment, he pauses to see his reflection for the first time in a pool of water. He openly studies his appearance: "At first I stared back, unable to believe that was indeed I who was reflected in the mirror; and when I became fully convinced that I was the monster that I am, I was filled with the bitterest sensations of despondence and mortification" (Shelley 85). In addition to society judging him for his appearance, the Creature begins to judge himself as well. He realizes that he does not match the normal appearance of the cottagers. Therefore, he knows that he can never attain the normal standard of appearance. He begins to hate himself because of his inability to fit into nineteenth-century British society. After this point in the novel, the Creature's demeanor changes. He realizes there is no hope for him to blend in with this society, so he begins to embody the actions that nineteenth-century British society believes he is capable of.

When disability studies scholars discuss the Creature, they often do so through the framework of David Mitchell and Sharon Snyder's concept of "narrative prothesis." This approach argues literature either uses disability as a convenient metaphor for Romantic ideals and relative goodness or villainy of the character or the stock and poorly developed "scary figure" used for spectacle in the science fiction novel, alongside its sibling the horror genre. Narrative prosthesis provides insight into what Shelley's text says about the ethical consequences

of pursuing the scientific unknown. Scientifically engineering a being without thinking of how society will treat or react to it is careless. Ultimately, this is what Victor does with the Creature. Although this theme is important, Fiona Kumari Campbell's discussion of internalized ableism calls attention to how society makes "disabled" people adopt the ways that "able" people categorize them. Therefore, as Jamie McDaniel writes, the focus turns attention from an emphasis on the individual impairments that might reproduce negative stereotypes and "from the victim, or impairment and redirects it toward the strategies used to define the standards of an ideal, non-deviant, and ableist body" ("Deviance" 628). When the Creature sees himself for the first time, he sees himself as the monster that society believes he is. Society is no longer the only one that thinks the Creature does not belong. The Creature believes he does not belong either.

Although Victor has accomplished what some would say is a scientific miracle, he is ashamed of his reanimation project because he created a being that does not fit society's standards. When he looks at the Creature, he can only see its physical failures. The Creature cannot control what he looks like, so Victor's reaction minoritizes the Creature as he continues to be judged and marginalized by his bodily appearance. Victor and the other characters in the novel treat the Creature as someone with a disability in the nineteenth century. They disable the Creature by not allowing him to be a member of society because he cannot follow the standards in place for what is socially constructed as a healthy human body or mind.[1] In *Frankenstein*, Shelley uses the Creature to show how society treats disability through the physiognomic descriptions of the Creature, the resulting emotional and physical treatment of the Creature, and the Creature's own self-loathing. As the Creature continues to take this abuse, he internalizes the

[1] Rosemarie Garland-Thomson discusses how the body is set up to standards by society. Society learns these standards from the time they are small children. If someone cannot follow them, they are labeled as someone with a "disability" (6).

idea that he is "disabled"[2] and the failed adaptation of the original "perfect" human creation. This is how the Creature becomes classified as the "Other" in this nineteenth-century British ableist society. Studying this text by identifying the ways internalized ableism is manifested in society allows disability studies to have a richer understanding of how Shelley was challenging her audience to think about the way disabled peoples were being treated during her time period. As long as society continues to "Other" those who are qualified as different, everyone is at risk of being cast out from society as this obsession grows.

Physically Unacceptable: The Failure of the Adaptation to Emulate the Societal Norm

In Victor's first description of the Creature, he automatically "disables" him because his features are not the "norm" and they are associated with negative physiognomic traits. In the early nineteenth century, the study of physiognomy was beginning to emerge. This pseudoscience led to a theory that stated peoples' physical appearances were indicative of their moral character (Vrettos 80). As a result of studying multiple body types and facial features, pseudoscientists categorized people according to how they looked. Victor follows the same practice when he witnesses the Creature awaken for the first time. Despite knowing that the Creature is made of mixed animal and human parts, Victor hopes for a masterpiece when he is finally able to reanimate the Creature. His description of the Creature is grotesque as he is in shock and suddenly realizes its ugliness with its "yellow skin," "shriveled complexion," and "straight black lips" (Shelley 37). The Creature does not appear to be someone from England. Instead, he looks like an outsider. His skin is blemished and not properly sewn together. Also, his skin is yellow and not the standard pale white. This enables Victor and society to associate him

[2] Dan Goodley defines the phenomenon known as "disablement" or "disableism" as society's discriminatory response to disability (3). I demonstrate what that phenomenon does in Frankenstein, but I use the verbs "disable" and "disabled" to describe it.

with someone who does follow their standard of "normal." Possibly, they distinguish him as lower class or as a being from another country besides England.

Despite these visual shortcomings, Victor studies the Creature and he attempts to see the triumph of his project, but his assessment of the Creature's facial features ruins his vision: "the beauty of the dream vanished, and breathless horror and disgust filled my heart" (Shelley 37). Right after this account, Victor immediately abandons the Creature as he recognizes what he thinks will predetermine the Creature to have a corrupt moral character. His appearance sets him apart and establishes an appearance to be loathed. In Fiona Kumari Campbell's *Contours of Ableism*, she explains that trying to keep the "norm" creates a divide. She states, "The desire to emulate the Other (the norm) establishes and maintains a wide gap between those who are loathed and what which is desired" (24). Therefore, as he witnesses the Creature's physical traits, he does not offer to be a companion who could protect him from the society that he has been born into. He cannot associate with the Creature who is out of the "norm" because he fears being condemned as the creator of these horrific traits.

In addition to Victor's already viewing the Creature as a morally corrupt monster, he sees him as a deformed child that he cannot accept as his own. Many audiences choose to view Victor as the father figure to the Creature. This is understandable because Victor's anticipation before the Creature is "born" is somewhat similar to a parent's expecting a child: "A new species would bless me as its creator and its source; many happy and excellent natures would owe their being to me" (Shelley 34). His perfect visions of "creator" disappear as his creation is not what he expected. Instead, the new species is not a species that he wants to know or continue to create. He wishes it never existed. Scott Juengel explains that Victor tries to see the beautiful aspects of his creation before he breaks into an exclamation of horror (357). However, no matter how hard

Victor tries to see the Creature as just a being, he cannot look at him without seeing him as a monster that he has created. His reaction to the Creature cannot be positive because it is already predetermined by what Victor's society associates with the Creature's appearance.

Victor's societal ideals label the Creature as someone who is not beautiful and possibly someone who is a foreigner, and he gives him the label of a "disabled" being as well. Whether characters believe he is human or not, Victor's response to his creation is a dramatic account of a common disability experience. Martha Stoddard Holmes connects Victor's rejection of the Creature to a parent rejecting a disabled child (374). He cannot accept the child with its flaw, so he rejects it, leading Victor to abuse the Creature. His rejection of the Creature continues despite the Creature's approaching him a second time at his bedside seeking companionship, as a toddler might wake up their parent: "[W]retch—the miserable monster whom I had created. [….] His jaws opened, and he muttered some inarticulate sounds, while a grin wrinkled his cheeks" (Shelley 38). Again, instead of seeing the Creature as just a curious child who looks physically different, he sees the Creature as an abomination. Although Victor is commonly judged for his reaction to "his child," he believes he must abandon the child because he knows how the nineteenth-century British practice of physiognomy will cause others to view his offspring and judge him, as well, for creating a being that cannot emulate the "norm."

Victor's creation does not directly match the creation that he was aiming for: a physically "normal" human being. In this society, they are operating using a moral model of disability that Dan Goodley defines in *Disability Studies* as a "moral stance [that] perceives disability as a sin (a punishment from God forgiven through divine intervention)" (7). Because of physiognomy, the study of features to reveal someone's moral character, Victor and society immediately judge the Creature's future actions. Therefore, Victor's adaptation is seen as a failure because it does

not match the physical traits of a normal human being. Although it seems logical to realize that these mangled parts would not create the perfect body that Victor is searching for, he gets so wrapped up in playing God that this factor does not cross his mind. Instead of recreating the original exactly the same, his adaptation is unfaithful to the image of a standard nineteenth-century British human being.

However, creating something new does not have to create a problem. In "Adaptation and Cultural Appropriation," Pascal Nicklas and Oliver Linder argue, "The content seems to be transported to the new form in a way that leaves it still recognizably the same. How this mysterious transubstantiation takes place cannot be explained here, but it forms the central contention in the indignation stemming from disappointed expectations of fidelity" (2). Victor is disappointed because he thinks that his project has failed. However, he does not take time to get to know the Creature. If Victor would take a moment to study the Creature, then he would realize that his creation is physically and mentally superior to man despite his grotesque appearance. Therefore, the Creature acts as a metaphor that the "norm" is not necessarily the only kind of being society should be seeking. The Creature is the advancement that society should be looking for. However, Victor represents society as he cannot looks past the physical flaws of the Creature. Yes, it might have some similar features, but it is not something that he can show his colleagues, friends, or family. Suddenly, Victor is consumed by his failure and desperately distances himself from the Creature so he is not associated with him. His unrealistic expectations of his adaptation show his inability to accept others who deviate from his nineteenth-century British concept of "able."

Victor's reaction to his creation is how *Frankenstein* demonstrates to the audience how flawed Victor and the nineteenth-century British society he lives in is. Even though Victor

believes that he has created a monster, he has done something miraculous. To create a being from dead parts of other humans and animals is a scientific revelation. Victor's actions compel the audience to learn from their previous ways of thinking. Their flawed way of thinking can be examined by looking at genetics. Kamila Elliott states, "Genetics has not simply allowed for more precision in evolutionary biology; it has also exposed errors in prior thinking and introduced a panoply of new ideas and discoveries" (154). In "The Adaptation of Adaptation: A Dialogue Between the Arts and Sciences," Elliott discusses the connection between adaptations in the arts and sciences. Adaptation is not meant to be stagnant. However, adaptations show the flaws of society and propel them to move forward and be better. When the Creature wakes and Victor abandons him, the audience should see this as problematic. Victor's errors are exposed in his actions because he does not stop to observe, to care for, or to celebrate the new being he has created. As a result, Victor does not evolve from this creation, but the novel should prompt the audience to evolve their way of thinking about others by seeing how Victor treats his adaptation.

Mental Manipulation: Internalizing Ableist Ideals to Create the "Other"

As the Creature's physical traits cause him to be dismissed as the disabled child and already morally corrupt being, his categorization throughout the novel continues with derogatory names making him the "Other." First, consider that the Creature does not even have a name that society would deem as normal. His "father" decides not to name him. However, Victor produces numerous derogatory names for the Creature. Although he uses many, including "deformed," "demon," "devil," "fiend," "fiendish enemy," "monster," and "wretch," these names all serve a similar purpose. They indicate to the Creature that he does not belong and that he is a failed and undistinguishable adaptation. None of the characters are ever described using these names. As a result, they are words that show he is the "Other." Postcolonial theorist Abdul M. JanMohamed

describes a type of colonial literature that is "imaginary" in that it does not describe the people who are being colonized as they actually are, but as some dangerous "Other" and something that should not replace the original. Hence, it looks upon the colonized persons' difference from colonizer at their "worthless alterity" (65). His theorizing about the colonized "Other" can be usefully appropriated for use in Disability and Adaptation Studies. According to Jan Mohamed, the works of imaginary colonialist literature, whether they do so consciously or not, separate the colonized out as a category that is "evil," "savage," or "uncivilized." They cannot live within a culturally normal society and they are labeled as, in the worst case, "brutes" (65). Similarly, Victor and other characters decide that the Creature is a threat, an "Other," who cannot be a part of "normal" society because his differences constitute a dangerous and "worthless alterity" or otherness. Despite multiple encounters with peoples other than his creator, society affirms that the Creature should stay hidden because he only causes destruction to the "perfect" nineteenth-century British race.

The Creature becomes the embodiment of the "Other" because his appearance as well as his behavior do not match what is "acceptable" in nineteenth-century British society. Before the Creature and Victor reunite after his "birth," the Creature kills William and frames Justine for his death. As Victor attempts to process the grief and guilt for this incident, he suddenly knows on whom to place blame. Without concrete evidence, he concludes it is the Creature: "Nothing in human shape could have destroyed that fair child. He was the murderer. I could not doubt it" (Shelley 53). Although the testimony of the Creature could speak for itself within a few pages, he immediately knows it is the Creature because he is not "human." Therefore, Victor and his society attach a stigma to the Creature because he cannot physically be classified as human. This is similar to the judgment that is assigned by categorizing someone as the "Other." In addition to

Campbell's definition of internalized ableism and its tactics, she claims that when society stares and visually assesses others, this can be positive or negative. A person who stares at someone else can either accept a person as following the norm or assign stigma to that person for not following that "norm" (44-46). Victor assigns stigma to the Creature because of his physical appearance.[3] As he returns to where William was murdered, he sees a flicker of the Creature in the lightning, and he is reminded of what he thinks the Creature's physical appearance makes him capable of (Shelley 53). From this stigma, he affirms the Creature as the "threat" to the social norm. This continues the Creature's role as the "Other" because in addition to his "monstrous" physical appearance, he is a criminal.

Adding to the mental abuse inflicted by being classified as the "Other" who is cast away from society, Victor and others inflict physical abuse upon the Creature. Despite his innocent intentions, multiple characters besides Victor associate the Creature's visual appearance with his potential actions. It is important to consider that the Creature has learned what he can only from others. Victor did not raise him, but he abandoned him. From the beginning it seems that the Creature has a good moral compass, but it becomes tainted because of the behavior society expects from him. At first, despite being classified as "inhuman," he is still able to do what this society would classify as "correct." For example, while he is traveling through the woods, he saves a girl who has suddenly fallen into the water. Although she would have died without the Creature's intervention, her caretaker is not happy with the Creature's saving her, and he indicates his dismay by grabbing the girl and then shooting the Creature (Shelley 108). This reaction does not reinforce the Creature's understanding of positive behavior, and it shows him

[3] Political philosopher, Frantz Fanon, mentions something similar to the colonizer's gaze and people staring to assign stigma. In his work, he talks about how these stigmas are assigned to someone who is not of the "dominant" or "accepted" race.

that his altruistic efforts are somehow worthy of condemnation. In the previously mentioned incident, the Creature is actually the hero, but the man does want him to view him that way because he does not believe it is the Creature's place; he sees the Creature as a freak whose intentions in saving the girl must be devious or deviant. Similar to Victor, he does not want to relate or begin to think of the Creature as a "good" being. This incident makes the Creature realize that regardless of positive actions, his physical appearance will attach a stigma to him.

At this point, he internalizes the idea that he is the "other" and "disabled." As a result, the Creature must act like a criminal because that is how society says he should act. Campbell asserts, "Instead of embracing disability at the level of beingness (i.e. as an intrinsic part of the person's Self), the processes of ableism, like those of racism induce an internalization of self-loathing which is disablement" (20). The Creature does not believe that his difference is valuable. Instead, he realizes that it makes him an invaluable target. This causes him to blame himself and hate himself. Momentarily, he only hates himself, but eventually he learns to hate society as well. Sadly, when he finally realizes that he has been "Othered," he thinks that he should treat humanity like it has treated him, like an enemy: "'I had feelings of affection and they were requited with detestation and scorn. Man, you may hate; but beware!'" (131). Although the Creature realizes how Victor and society has categorized him, the society the Creature lives in does not acknowledge its own faults. Either they are unaware of them or they continue to act the same way because they are afraid of what the Creature represents. If only the Creature's companion had survived, she might be someone he could confide in because she would be minoritized as well.

For the second half of the novel, the Creature embodies the criminal behavior that society believes he is capable of because of his physical appearance. Before the second half of the novel

begins, Shelley introduces the binary of blind and not blind to call attention to the judgment of the Creature's physical appearance. During his time alone, the Creature meets the DeLacey family. Within this family, there is a blind man. Over time, the Creature begins to realize that the blind DeLacey might be the only person who can accept him because he cannot see him. Before this, he has been rejected by other villagers because they see him and either faint or run away (Shelley 78). However, the blind father that Shelley puts in the DeLacey family finally offers the Creature potential for acceptance. Fusion Wang comments on Shelley's intentions: "She abruptly literalizes the accumulated hypothetical discourse of blind by placing the creature face to face with real visual impairment, not Frankenstein's selective blindness […]" (7). The Creature is not trying to convince the blind character that he is actually good looking. Instead, he is trying to convince him that he is a "good" person who deserves a chance despite his appearance. DeLacey does not automatically assume he is evil because DeLacey is blind. The Creature is convinced that by using spoken language, he can get DeLacey to sympathize with him. Marchbanks argues, "The education in language and social customs the creature acquires from his momentary position as powerful subject, provides him with the tools he needs to request what he desires even more than a means of communication: an emotional connection and a friend" (28). Therefore, as the Creature is "disabled" by his appearance in society, only another physically impaired person—one who cannot see—can give him the opportunity to be accepted as DeLacey has been accepted. The blind DeLacey has an advantage in two ways because he is not subject to the automatic judgment that people with sight practice and he is a "disabled" person who is supported within his family.

Creating the "Other": Effectively Dispersing the Creature by Keeping Him Alone

The Creature internalizes the ableism that his society has imposed on him. According to the Creature's actions, he blames himself and society blames him for his appearance and his actions that happen as a result. Instead of focusing on society, the Creature focuses on himself and thinks that he is the problem. Again, returning to when he looks at himself in the pool, he focuses on himself: "I had admired the perfect forms of my cottagers […] but how terrified I was when I viewed myself in a transparent pool! […] I became fully convinced that I was in reality the monster that I am" (Shelley 85). Here, he is "Othering" himself and pointing out all his faults. He knows that he is alone in these faults. As far as he knows, he has never met anyone else who has had to go through the same problems that he has. He thinks that he is the only disabled creature in the world because no one else looks like him or accepts him, not even DeLacey, the other "disabled" character. Temporarily, he puts all the blame on himself and accepts that he deserves less because of his disability. To fix the problem that he thinks he has created, the Creature asks Victor to create someone equally as ugly as himself: "What I ask of you is reasonable and moderate; I demand a creature of another sex, as hideous as myself" (Shelley 112). The Creature does not dare ask for a beautiful creature to share his companionship. He believes that he is not worthy of receiving love from someone beautiful, but instead she must be "hideous" like him, so they can relate to one another. Therefore, the Creature focuses on what he comes to believe are his own individual flaws instead of the social flaws in nineteenth-century British ableist society that defines people with disabilities as "Other" and worthless in their otherness.

Although Victor is agreeable to the Creature's idea of the female at first, he cannot follow through with it because he believes it will taint the human race, which he believes to be superior.

One would think Victor's biggest fear would be the male and female Creatures' mating would populate the earth. Despite this thought, he seems to be afraid of a greater problem when he creates the female: "[…] and a race of devils would be propagated upon the earth, who might make the very existence of the species of man a condition precarious and full of terror" (Shelley 129). Victor fears that they might intermix with the human race or repopulate so much that they make the human race not superior anymore. He wants to make sure that the Creature is alone with no one to reproduce or relate with. His reasoning demonstrates the tactic of dispersal that is described by Campbell: "The consequences of dispersal generate internalized ableism in that mixing with other people with impairments is interpreted as a negative inadvisable choice" (23). Victor cannot follow through with this choice because he knows the consequence might mean the Creature and someone like him uniting against him and the society in which he lives. Letting the Creature reproduce would only make Victor's problem worse because it would provide relief and life for the Creature. Although Victor decides to see the Creature as "inhuman," the Creature is obviously a being that is more than capable of acting physically and mentally as a human would act. In this instance, he identifies the Creature as the "Other"; once again he is a threat to the social norms he is used to. As he continues this line of thinking, he continues to place blame upon the Creature and not the world's ableist perception of him. Placing blame on the Creature is easier for Victor than finding himself at fault.

Defensive Othering: Victor "Othering" the Creature to Avoid Being the "Other" Himself

As Victor keeps denying his involvement with the Creature, he becomes obsessed with making him the "Other" as he realizes that the Creature is making him challenge his ideas of cultural norms. In his work on the psychology of colonization, JanMohamed claims that colonizers project all the negative, debased, or evil traits that they possess upon the colonized as

an existential "Other" so that they do not have to acknowledge them in themselves (65). Therefore, if we think of this psychology of projection in the nineteenth-century British time period, we can say that Victor projects onto the Creature all those traits that he and his culture wish to deny themselves. As a result, the Creature represents all those aspects of Victor that he does not want to acknowledge. Suddenly, the "monster," all the elements of Victor's being that he feared and attempted to cast out through a process of projection, are standing in front of him and make him attempt to reevaluate his thoughts. This is the challenge that "monsters," "others," pose to society if society takes a moment to listen to them. Jeffrey Cohen discusses how monsters reveal something about the society that created them. He states, "They ask us to reevaluate our cultural assumptions about race, gender, sexuality, our perception of difference, our tolerance towards its expression. They ask us why we have created them" (20). Despite a brief moment in which Victor tries to sympathize with the Creature, he cannot get past the physical norms that the Creature cannot fulfill: "I compassionated him and sometime felt a wish to console him; but when I looked upon him, when I saw the filthy mass that moved and talked, my heart sickened, and my feelings were altered to those of horror and hatred" (Shelley 113). Victor instead lives in fear of the qualities within himself that he projects upon the Creature, and then perceives with dread and loathing. Similarly, the other people within this novel fail to sympathize with the Creature. They have failed to ask themselves why the monster exists. Therefore, Shelley directs her audience to reflect upon why the Creature becomes who he is.

As society fails to ask why the Creature was created and why he is acting the way he is, Victor's fear accelerates into phobia as he can no longer defend himself by "Othering" the creature. Throughout the novel, Victor protects himself because he can effectively emulate the norm that calls attention to the Creature's differences instead. Campbell states, "Defensive

Othering occurs when the marginalized person attempts to emulate the hegemonic norm, whiteness or ableism, and assumes the legitimacy of a devalued identity imposed by the dominant group" (24). Although it is hard for the audience to see Victor as marginalized because he is the protagonist, he is alone himself and his state of mind throughout the novel is questionable. He is an easy target for a society that has expectations for a successful man and scientist. As a result, society begins to target Victor instead and make him the "Other" because the Creature is not around as much to take the attention off of him.

On Victor's wedding night, he fails to meet the societal standards of the "norm" and he is judged because he cannot focus on his bride. Victor discovers his new bride dead before he was able to consummate the marriage. In this case, it seems he has failed to follow the social expectation of normative heterosexual relations with his wife. After the villagers help Victor look for the murderer but find nothing, they pass their own judgments on him: "After passing several hours, we returned hopeless, most of my companions believing it to have been a form conjured by my fancy" (Shelley 155). They see him as delusional. His nervous pacing back and forth and then sudden desperation to find the Creature despite knowing his capabilities in the woods shows that Victor is mentally struggling. He is desperate to rid himself of the Creature because he is obsessed with what it might cause him to question. As a result, Victor is never the same after this incident. He becomes so filled with dread of the Creature that he only functions out of fear. Therefore, he is deemed as the "Other" and cast out by society: "For they had called me mad; and during many months as I understood, a solitary cell had been my habitation" (Shelley 156). Similar to the hovel that the Creature resided in, Victor must now live in a cell. Even though he eventually is let out, he never returns to society, but finds his way to the wilderness like the Creature. Victor's fate shows that he has failed to change society's

expectations and he too must suffer the consequences of becoming the "Other." Hence, he and the "Other" are different but the same. Shelley exposes the very process of projection as delusional to create a devalued "Other."

A Call to Action: *Frankenstein* Challenges How British Culture Treats Disability

Frankenstein effectively shows that society classifies individuals as "Others" in a way that makes people monsters. As a result, society should take a closer look at whom is made a monster because it should cause society to question its standards. The Creature's experiences in society, including the judgment for his physiognomic traits, the physical and mental abuse he endures, and the inability to love himself because of his physical appearance, reveals society's cruelty towards people they categorize as "disabled" and hence, an existential "Other." Many argue that *Frankenstein* primarily shows the scientific ramifications of reanimation, but I argue that this work goes a step further by showing the consequences of creating a being that is subjected to a cruel society that judges only according to physical appearance. As the novel progresses, Victor's physical adaptation of the creature shows that an oppressive society's obsession with creating the "Other" consumes it. Both the oppressor and the oppressed suffer the same fate. Deemed by society as worthless in their alterity, Victor and the Creature have become the "Other."

Chapter Two: Twins and Doubles: Medically and Culturally Constructed Freaks of Amusement to Contrast the "Abled" and "Disabled"

Being Blind But Still Judging Physical Appearance

In *Poor Miss Finch,* Lucilla partially bases her love for Oscar on his white skin. As the story progresses, Oscar develops a dark blueish skin as a result of his epilepsy medication, silver nitrate. Aware of Lucilla's dislike for the dark and dark colors, Oscar begins to feel awful for having blue skin and seeks to hide the color of his skin from Lucilla. At first, one would think this is kind of easy because of Lucilla's blindness, but she overhears conversations about this "blue" skin. The second time Oscar is caught in this situation, he explains that his brother, Nugent, is the one who has the blue skin. Lucilla's reaction to Nugent after this news is problematic because despite her blindness, she is terrified to be near the man with the dark blue skin: "'I think I understand' she went on, 'why Oscar was unwilling to tell me' […] 'what is in you is not like other people. He was afraid my stupid weakness might prejudice me against you'" (Collins 158). Lucilla acknowledges her own prejudice, but that does not make it go away. Even though she cannot tell the difference in the skin color of Oscar and the skin color of Nugent because she is blind, she still believes the idea that his blue skin makes him less than others: "I might have reconciled myself to his brother, if I had ever known what his brother was like. And yet I felt there was something strange in him, without being told, and without knowing what it was" (Collins 161). She connects what she thinks of Nugent's blue skin color to explain why she does not like him. In this case, she is connecting the disability of the blue skin to his moral character. The audience knows this judgment is not accurate because Oscar has the blue skin, but it is inaccurate anyways because disability is not an indication of moral character. Despite her

blindness, Victorian ableist society has engrained the idea in her that physical characteristics, especially ones labeled "not normal," can indicate someone's moral character.

Another blind character in *Frankenstein* practices the same ableist ideas that separate someone with a physical difference. Previously mentioned in the first chapter, the Creature watches a family of cottagers. Staying in his small hovel, he overhears and observes this family. As he continues to watch them, he learns about language and human interaction, but he learns another important lesson from watching them. The Creature realizes that the people he is looking at are physically acceptable. He knows that his appearance will frighten the cottagers. As a result, he thinks through language he can convince the one blind cottager that he is a good person despite his horrifying physical appearance. Before he finishes talking with DeLacey, other members of the family burst in and banish the Creature from the cottage. Although DeLacey cannot make this distinction himself when he is alone with the Creature, his family quickly helps him realize there is something physically wrong with the Creature. In the first chapter, I talked about this scene in relation to modern theory, but this chapter looks at it through a different lens. When I discussed this passage with modern disability studies, it revealed how able-bodied people attempt to "other" those who are deemed as "disabled." However, the historical and medical context of these texts reveal what the author and audience's definitions of disability during the nineteenth century would have been. Similarly, these definitions of disability could "other" disabled peoples as well, but many of these medical ideas were common practice throughout the nineteenth century.

Historical and Cultural Contexts Creating "Others" From Those Who Adopt the Ideas

When these blind characters judge others based on their physical appearance, they show how nineteenth-century medicine and culture has associated physical appearance with moral

character. As a result, these ideas are circulated by medical professionals and people who believe their theories. Because of Lucilla and DeLacey's blindness, they are told or shown what these distinctions are in an attempt to keep them "safe." Able-bodied characters within *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, Frankenstein,* and *Poor Miss Finch* judge the characters who are deemed "disabled" because of their physical appearance or impairment. The difference in their physical appearance is heightened because the authors use twins and doubles to display the two sides: the "able" and the "disabled." Respectively, each person in the duo shows what is accepted by a nineteenth-century ableist society while the other shows what is not accepted. In addition to the influences of scientific and medical assumptions during the nineteenth century, a common form of public entertainment was the freak show, which displayed disabled people as a "freak" to the audience, something to be horrified at for entertainment. According to Robert Bogdan, conjoined twins, also known as Siamese twins, were a common form of entertainment used in the freak show whether they were real or not (9). As a result, doubles and twins would have been known as something "different" or something to be looked at for entertainment. These shows were most popular from 1840 to 1940, but before this they began early as individual acts so an audience would have been aware of the myths associated with twins to draw attention for a freak show. Using the cultural context of the "freak," with the medical assumptions of physiognomy, twins, and the duality of the mind during the nineteenth century, these ideas reveal why characters might act or believe the way that they do, allowing the audience to more closely analyze and understand the primary texts. In the following two sections, I will briefly explain these contexts and how they create the dichotomy between the "abled" and the "disabled."

Introducing the "Freak" and Studying the "Disabled" Body with Physiognomy

Another study emerging during this time was the study of physiognomy, which influenced all of these works. The study of physiognomy was the reading of facial and bodily features to make conclusions about a person's moral character. At first, this practice seems like it would be beneficial for people because they could prevent themselves from future hardship. However, this practice is not reliable and not scientifically sound. Other than its lack of validity, this practice could lead to already marginalized groups being judged for their "dangerous" physical appearance. There are "scientific" diagrams from this practice that showed the "good" and "bad" characteristics of a person and it is obvious that they are created with sexist, racist, and ableist tendencies. Any physical characteristic deemed by this practice as abnormal could be read by a physiognomist. Instead of getting to know the person and connecting their physical appearance with their actual moral character, which might be somewhat logical, the physiognomist used their imagination to make a conclusion about their moral character according to their physical appearance. Johann Kasper Lavater, whose work contributed greatly to the practice of physiognomy, claimed, "Imagination is necessary to impress the traits with exactness, so that they may be renewed at pleasure; and to range the pictures in the mind as perfectly as if they were still visible, and with all possible order" (10). This is problematic because "exactness" and "imagination" are not related. Instead, this allows the physiognomist to subject the person to their own bias about what a person should look like. The creation of a "good" and "bad" appearance is shown in these works by creating a set of twins or doubles with one twin/double who is deemed "abled" because of their acceptable physical appearance and one twin/double who is deemed "disabled" because of their unacceptable physical appearance. Additionally, these physical characteristics are linked to the actions they are capable of.

Medical Context: Twins & Duality of the Mind

Only one set of characters from these works are actual twins, but the ideas about twins during the Victorian time period can still be applied to all the characters because each set of characters are so closely related. The portrayal of twins and doubles was common because twins were beginning to be studied during this time period. Darwin's half-cousin, Francis Galton, did significant studies about twins and how they exist and function in society. Specifically, twins are two people who are born at the same time. Many people are fascinated by twins because of their rarity and numerous myths about their physical and emotional connections outside of the womb. Before the terms "identical" or "fraternal" twins were created, Galton was gathering information about sets of twins from twins themselves and their families. From this research, he was making conclusions from emerging patterns.

Galton drew two significant conclusions for this discussion about twins and disability during the nineteenth century. First, he concluded that most twins usually contracted a similar illness to the other twin, or they faced a similar death. The twins are linked so much that they contract the same physical and mental illnesses. Galton claims, "In no less than nine out of thirty-five cases does it appear that both twins are apt to sicken at the same time. This implies so intimate a constitutional resemblance that it is proper to give some quotations in evidence" (397). He continues with many stories that show twins can be physiologically linked even when they are no longer in the womb. The other twin suffers from whatever the less healthy twin contracts. As a result, the sickness, which is seen as weakness, affects the other twin possibly without the one twin ever knowing the other twin was sick. In addition to their physical and mental wellness, according to Galton's research, he thought their personalities could be linked as well. Galton concludes, "These differences belonged almost wholly to such groups of qualities as these: the

one was more vigorous, fearless, energetic; the other was gentle, clinging, and timid" (400). From this conclusion, the twins can be a complement of one another. Therefore, the twins are so different from one another that it is likely that one becomes preferred over the other depending on society's standards. With both of these conclusions in mind, a paradox occurs as the twins are individually separated by personality, but jointly linked by the fate of their physical and mental well-being.

To add another layer, and to further Galton's assumptions, it was thought that the brain's hemispheres could be controlled by two different sets of thought. This is known as the "duality of the mind." Similarly, it was thought people could have what is known as "double consciousness" where a person could be split by different mindsets and not share the same thoughts with the "other side" for him or herself. Therefore, if either of these ideas were applied to twins, scientists and medical professionals of the time would understand twins as possessing two different mindsets. Arthur Ladbroke Wigan, a doctor and writer in the nineteenth century, believed that the brain had two separate cerebra capable of separate thoughts. He claimed, "Even as furious mania, this double process may be generally perceived; often it takes the form of a colloquy between the diseased mind and the healthy one, and sometimes even resembles the steady continuous argument or narrative of a sane man more or less frequently interrupted by a madman" (125). The words "diseased" and "healthy" create the same divide as "abled" and "disabled." As demonstrated in the narratives discussed in this essay, both characters who are a part of the double or set of twins possess two different mindsets, one that is acceptable and one that is not.

In the following close readings, my intention is to highlight these nineteenth-century ideas and assumptions because they are present in *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*,

Frankenstein, and *Poor Miss Finch* to create the "abled" and "disabled." Approaching these texts with "why" should provide reasoning behind the "how" that was discussed in Chapter One. By looking at these cultural, medical, and historical contexts, I argue that the readers of these primary texts can more fully understand the text and the unconscious and conscious choices of the author. Equipped with this understanding, readers of this text can potentially understand the thoughts and actions of characters within the text to analyze "why" they treat physical difference and double mindedness with such hostility.

The Creature, The "Freak" with Apparently Imperfect Physiognomic Traits

Within this section, I discuss one of the same sections from *Frankenstein*. Within the previous chapter, I focused on how the Creature becomes the "Other" because he is Victor's failed creation. After reading the first section of the novel, Victor's treatment of the Creature might be difficult to understand because the Creature has not deceived or kill anyone yet. When the audience first meets the Creature, he is harmless. He is simply trying to survive and relate to anyone he can because Victor has left him alone. The Creature is intelligent and empathetic despite how others have treated him. Regardless, Victor is not interested in the Creature's features after he views his physical appearance. By applying a historical and cultural context to this text, the focus switches from Victor's supposed failure to what causes Victor to believe he has failed. Without knowing how physiognomy might cause Victor to automatically judge the Creature, an audience might just assume that Victor is mad because he has failed what he wanted for his experiment. This does not justify Victor's actions towards the Creature, but it provides context for what could be causing Victor to automatically judge the Creature for his physical inadequacies.

As Victor and the reader encounter the Creature for the first time, they are challenged to read his features and assess what they believe is his moral character when he is staring back at them. It is important to mention that there are few detailed descriptions of the Creature in Shelley's text. The texts describe him like this: "His yellow skin scarcely covered the work of muscles and arteries beneath; his hair was of a lustrous black, and flowing; his teeth of a pearly whiteness; but these luxuriances only formed a more horrid contrast with his watery eyes" (Shelley 37). Although it seems that some of these features would be desirable, Victor decides the combination of these features is undesirable. As these features are right in front of him, Victor makes his own conclusion about the Creature through physiognomy. Additionally, the audience makes a decision about the Creature as well: "These visual moments, frequently marked by detailed descriptions of the monster's physiognomy, function like close-ups or portraits, forcing the reader to confront acknowledge and linger over an imagined face" (Juengel 354). The book never offers a full description of Victor to its readers, but there is a sense, at least for a little while, that the audience is supposed to trust Victor's physiognomic perspective because he is the primary narrator. Also, Victor has accomplished something that people thought was previously impossible; he is the creator of the Creature and he has created a "spectacle" by bringing something previously dead back to life. In this dynamic, Victor is the "abled" who assigns stigma, while the Creature is the "disabled" forced to live with the conclusions that Victorian ableist society makes about him.

As the text continues, Victor's descriptions of the Creature diminish to the names of "deformed," "demon," "devil," "fiend," "fiendish enemy," "monster," and "wretch." Similarly, Bogdan explains that freaks were called many names as well (6). One the most significant names in relation to this text is "nature's mistake." The Creature's abnormal appearance is what sets

him apart from others. He realizes that he is in a society where nobody wants to care for him because he is a "freak," a mistake. As he stares at his reflection he concludes, "At first I stared 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 85). The Creature's feelings only continue to worsen because he does not receive what he believes can make him happy, a companion. As he continues to witness how Victor's family loves and care for him despite his faults, the Creature's revenge grows because he cannot receive the same love due to his abnormal appearance.

Even if the Creature would have been able to participate in Romantic society, it is likely his experience would not have been positive, and he still would have described as the "freak." Although the Creature is not physically or mentally handicapped, he is qualified by society as "disabled" because of his physical appearance. Therefore, Cindy Lacom explains that there are only two ways that the Creature could have participated in a nineteenth century ableist society. He would have had to work in the workhouse or he would have had to join a freak show (548). However, these options do not interest Victor, who would be the one to introduce or take him to find these places. Victor is partially to blame for the Creature's abandonment, but the circulation of the medical practice of physiognomy is to blame as well. After being abandoned by Victor, the Creature encounters multiple villagers, the DeLaceys, and Victor's brother, William. None of these characters approach him and offer him help or ask him to provide an explanation. They are programmed to assess his physical appearance and, thus, conclude their physiognomic assumptions. In this work, Shelley makes the divide between the "abled" and "disabled" obvious because of the Creature's lack of support from his creator and Romantic ableist society.

The Blue Face: Its Physiognomic Implications and Varying Personality

Collins uses the twins in *Poor Miss Finch* to demonstrate the separation between the "abled" and the "disabled" when Lucilla is asked to distinguish the difference between Oscar and Nugent despite her blindness. From the beginning of the novel, Lucilla thinks she can identify light or dark colors with the touch of her hand. Regardless of her idea, the audience knows how feeling operates. Feeling an object does not show its color, but seeing an object illuminates its color. When Lucilla is asked to distinguish between Oscar and Nugent, it is a losing game of physiognomy. According to Lavater, sight is the most important sense to the practice of physiognomy: "His eye, in particular, must be excellent, clear, acute, rapid, and firm. Precision in observation is the very soul of physiognomy. The physiognomist must possess a most delicate, swift, certain, most extensive spirit of observation" (10). It would already be difficult for someone with sight to live up to these standards to distinguish the facial and bodily characteristics of identical twins, but it is impossible for Lucilla to physiognomically assess these twins. However, when she plays this game throughout the novel, she realizes there is a right and a wrong answer, which she believes should come easily to her. At first, Lucilla claims, "'The likeness is wonderful' she said. 'Still, I think I can find a difference between them" (Collins 143). Despite her hopes, Lucilla cannot perceive the difference between the "freak," who is her blue lover, and his twin brother by touching their faces. Her impairment frustrates her as she thinks she is missing out because she cannot participate in the practice of physiognomy (Flint 160-161). Instead, she must use her hand, which focuses on physical attraction and not physical appearance. Because there are "right" and "wrong" answers to this game, it indicates there is a difference between the "abled" and "disabled" because the only physical distinction between the two characters is Oscar's blue skin, which sets him apart from his twin brother.

Madame Pratolungo makes distinctions between Oscar and Nugent according to their personalities and different skin colors. Their skin color is the only physical difference between the two brothers, but many characters, especially at the beginning of the novel, believe that it is extremely significant:

> The one difference which made it possible to distinguish between them, at the moment when they first appeared together in the room, was also the one difference which Lucilla was physically incapable of detecting– the terrible contrast of colour between the brother who bore the blue disfigurement of the drug, and the brother who was left as Nature had made him. (Collins 134-135)

She can see that he does not look how a "natural" person should look especially as he stands beside his "natural" looking twin brother. Her fascination of the twins' likeness is obvious as she describes them, but it is not long before she focuses on the blue skin. She already did not think Oscar was a fit companion for Lucilla, but this confirms her feelings about him. Suddenly, when his brother arrives, she realizes that he is an acceptable suitor because he is Oscar's somewhat physical opposite despite being his identical twin. One of them is physically "acceptable" for Lucilla while the other is "unacceptable."

If we return to Galton's ideas about twins in the beginning, she sees their personalities as a complement to one other. Although this is partially based on Oscar's undesirable blue appearance that Madame Pratolungo knows Lucilla would dislike, she also makes a distinction between their personalities: "His enormous self-confidence was, to my mind, too amusing to be in the least offensive. I liked the spirit and gaiety of the fellow. He came much nearer than his brother did to my ideal of the dash and resolution which ought to distinguish a man on the right side of thirty" (Collins 148). Despite not knowing Nugent for long and Lucilla's negative

perception of him, Madame Pratolungo likes him because she thinks he is a worthy replacement as Lucilla's suitor. She does not see him as weak and sensitive like Oscar, but as a strong and confident man. Although her thoughts of him change over the course of the novel because his true intentions and character are revealed, this is still how she first judges people. By pushing for the "abled" twin instead of the "disabled" twin to be Lucilla's suitor, Madame Pratolungo shows the appearance and personality that would be "acceptable" in Victorian ableist society.

Two Sides to One Story Double Consciousness and Physiognomy Shrouded in Mystery

Many of the ideas discussed within this section are similar to the discussion of *Frankenstein* within this chapter. There is a brief but horrific description of both the Creature and Mr. Hyde. Also, there is an undeniable connection between Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde and Victor and Frankenstein. With both of these similarities, these texts can be looked at by referencing physiognomy and double minded or double consciousness. Considering both of these concepts, the "why" can be investigated within both of these texts. Other than the similar concepts that appear within these texts, it is important to note that both of these texts end in a similar manner. All the characters die at the end of each work because they could not control their negative desires. Victor's obsession with the Creature leads to his death on the ship in the artic. The Creature's death is not clear, but his arctic exile might as well be his death. In addition, Dr. Jekyll kills himself to kill Mr. Hyde. With all these characters facing a similar demise, it seems that Shelley and Stevenson were making similar choices within their literary texts to convey the negative consequences that these medical and cultural contexts could cause.

In the *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, the two characters are divided by their physiognomic differences. While Mr. Enfield is recounting the story of Mr. Hyde to Mr. Utterson, Mr. Enfield attempts to describe the man. Oddly, Mr. Enfield struggles as he cannot

fully describe his looks: “He is not easy to describe. There is something wrong with his appearance; something displeasing, something downright detestable” (Stevenson 34). Similar to Victor’s inability to describe the Creature in *Frankenstein*, Mr. Enfield struggles to describe a man that he has never seen like this before. Although Mr. Enfield claims that Mr. Hyde is not easy to look at or distinguish, he quickly understands that his physical difference must be negative: “To observe, to be attentive, to distinguish what is similar, what dissimilar, to discover proportion, and disproportion, is the office of understanding” (Lavater 10). Despite Mr. Enfield not explaining his physiognomic practice, it is easy to tell that he categorizes using this method as he makes assumptions about Mr. Hyde’s actions later in the story. However, the only person who suspects something is suspicious about Dr. Jekyll is Mr. Enfield because of Jekyll’s connection with Hyde. Physiognomy does not detect Dr. Jekyll’s “savage” thoughts and he stays “under the radar” because he maintains his physical appearance: “[A] large, well-made, smooth-faced man of fifty, with something of a slyish cast perhaps, but every mark of capacity and kindness” (Stevenson 43). It is easy to describe Dr. Jekyll as his looks are “marked” and recognized as “normal” and “healthy” according to the physiognomic standards of an Englishman (Lavater 11). By juxtaposing the physical appearance of these two characters, Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde represent a physical appearance that is acceptable and not acceptable according to physiognomy. Therefore, people who use this medical method associate physical appearance with being “able” or “disabled.” As a result, this causes the duo not to be associated with one another at first because it seems impossible that two people with such varying qualities of “ableness” could not be associated with one another.

Although Hyde’s physical actions are a result of Jekyll’s desires, their actions and situations are respectively associated with the physiognomic assessments of them. Postcolonial

theorist Abdul JanMohamed describes a type of "imaginary" postcolonial literature that does not describe the person being colonized as they actually are, but as some dangerous "Other" (23). This causes others to look at the "Other" as less than the people colonizing them. Although many critics like Emily A. Bernhard Jackson have acknowledged that this could be connected to Hyde's Irish appearance, Stevenson takes the difference between the two even further as he shows how the two different beings are treated based on physical appearance, which is then associated with disability (79). As Mr. Enfield drags Mr. Hyde back to the conflict to make him answer for what he has done, he does not offer Mr. Hyde a chance to explain his actions. Instead, Mr. Enfield and the crowd begin threatening what they will do to him if he does not make this right: "We told the man we could and would make such a scandal out of this, as should make his name stink from one end of London to the other. […] I never saw a circle of such hateful faces; and there was the man in the middle with a kind of black sneering coolness—frightened too" (Stevenson 32). The mob forms around Hyde as they categorize him as the "Other" because of his physical appearance, meaning that he must have trampled the little girl on purpose. Although money gets Mr. Hyde out of this unexpected situation, the "cheque" that is provided only makes him look worse because they conclude he must be blackmailing Dr. Jekyll (Stevenson 33). For the moment, the crime is still associated with Mr. Hyde despite his double trying to make it right; therefore, Hyde is only judged by physical appearance.

At the beginning, the two are divided by physical appearance, which implies that one is "healthy" while the other is not; however, both Jekyll and Hyde become the same as they become overwhelmed by their "savage" desires. Returning to the idea of the "Other," JanMohamed argues that colonizers made the people they were colonizing the "Other" because they represented the behavior that they were afraid of in themselves. When it is revealed that

Jekyll and Hyde are two sides of one person, Jekyll explains that he was using Hyde to quench those desires that he could not resist when he attacked a victim: “I saw my life to be forfeit; and fled from the scene of excesses at once glorifying and trembling, my lust of evil gratified and stimulated, my love of life screwed to the topmost peg” (Stevenson 91). As part of a double, he can act upon his “savage” actions because they will be associated with Hyde instead of with Jekyll.

Despite Jekyll’s ability to keep his desires at a distance for some time, they recur and eventually overwhelm him. In this condition, it seems like there was no cure for someone affected by the duality of mind. As a result, even if Dr. Jekyll would have been diagnosed, there would not have been much to help him. This particular disease of the mind is described as: “That when the disease or disorder of one cerebrum becomes sufficiently aggravated to deft the control of the other, this is then one of the commonest forms of mental derangement or insanity” (Wigan 124). Besides, some people had already made their conclusions about him and decided not to be further associated with him: “[I]t is more than ten years since Henry Jekyll became too fanciful for me. He began to go wrong, wrong in mind; and though, of course, I continue to take an interest in him for old sake’s as they say, I see and I have seen devilish little of the man. Such unscientific balderdash” (Stevenson 36). Instead of checking on Jekyll or asking more about his experiments, Mr. Utterson simply ignores Jekyll’s actions. As Jekyll continues to receive no help for his self-inflicted illness, it begins to consume him. Despite Jekyll and Hyde’s different physical appearances and personalities, they are forced to become one person (Bernhard Jackson 78). Eventually sharing one mind, Dr. Jekyll is forced to fight his other side, but loses when his “Othered” self consumes him. This shows the consequences of an “abled” double associating with the “disabled” double’s thoughts.

Consider the Endings: Conclusions about Victorian Social Ideas and Practices

None of these works has an entirely happy ending. For example, Victor and the Creature die at the ending of *Frankenstein*. They are consumed in their hatred for one another and that becomes their lives' only purpose. Similarly, in *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr.Hyde*, Jekyll commits suicide because he could no longer control his "savage" desires, which is embodied in Hyde. Both of these endings are brutal and show the detriments of creating the "disabled" through the practices and ideas of physiognomy, the duality of mind, and the "freak." It seems that Shelley and Stevenson were influenced by these ideas and practices in their works and realized how damaging they could be; hence, they created an "unhappy" ending. *Poor Miss Finch* is the text that is difficult to categorize. Although it has twins and there is a distinction between the "abled" and "disabled" in their portrayal, the "abled" character dies after he goes away when his "evil" plot is not successful. Therefore, it seems like the "abled" and "disabled" division shifts as the work progresses. Despite the shift, the work still shows the detriments of physiognomy and the influence of the medical assumptions about twins. Although written at different times, all these works create a dichotomy between "abled" and "disabled" by using twins or doubles as the "spectacle" in their works. These twins and doubles show society's influences on the distinction between "abled" and "disabled" as one twin/double is "Othered" while the other twin/double is deemed as acceptable. Society decides the "freaks," the "Others," and the "disabled," and by acknowledging and challenging societal influences, these marginalized groups can escape these stereotypes and be received without judgement.

Conclusion: Looking to the Future of the Disability Studies and Historical Literary Texts Fields

When I first started closely studying these texts two years ago, I was primarily focused on close reading the texts and making my conclusions based on those findings. However, as the project progressed, I began to integrate disability study theory. With disability study theory and close reading of the text, I could clearly detect "how" each text treats disability. When I was studying the "how," many of the scholars who specifically talked about *Frankenstein* discussed its connection with Mitchell and Snyder's narrative prothesis. This approach showed how the characters within the text labeled "disabled" characters because of their appearance. Although applying this theory to the text is accurate, I was intrigued by the Creature's own hatred for his appearance. The other characters in the text were not the only characters contributing to the concept of "disabled," but the Creature was contributing to it as well. He hated himself for his own inability to be like other characters within the text. As I studied *Frankenstein* through the lens of Campbell's internalized ableism, I was still not getting the entire context that I needed. It was important to discover the "why" behind the actions of the characters.

Simultaneously, I was looking at *Frankenstein*, *Poor Miss Finch*, and *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* through a historical context. In this study, I was applying some disability study theorists, but my main focus was "why" characters treated "disabled" characters in a certain way. Studying the psychological and medical context of the nineteenth century provided me with some ideas of what the characters within the text may be thinking. For example, Johann Kasper Lavater's created the pseudoscience of physiognomy, which determined a person's personality traits by their physical appearance. It is possible that not everyone believed in the pseudoscience, but the circulation of these ideas was bound to affect the author,

the characters within one of these texts, and the readers during the period. Physiognomy can explain why many of the characters within these texts are so hypersensitive to the appearance of the characters they view as "disabled." Similarly, Arthur Ladbroke Wigan's ideas about the duality of the mind introduce an explanation for the characters' tendencies between the right and the wrong. If the brain can operate with two separate trains of thought and the negative side takes over, there is not much that can be done for the inflicted. As a result, "disabling" these characters because of their inflictions from these ideas would have been common for some people because of these ideals.

After reading the introduction to *Early American Disability Studies*, I was compelled to combine the "why" and "how" approaches to these texts. Without the historical context, a reader cannot fully know the medical, psychological, or cultural ideas that could have potentially influenced the author and their decisions within the text. Similarly, these texts must be looked at with modern disability studies theory as well to know "how" these historical ideas operate with the text. By combining both the "why" and "how" approaches, we can contribute to the field of disability studies and we can contribute to the understanding of disability within historical literary texts. With a deep understanding of these texts, we can start to look beyond the text to see where the ideas originate in discourse, how they are perpetuated in our society, and what we can do right now to eliminate circulating stigmas and judgements about peoples who are deemed as "disabled."

Moving forward, I would like to establish a more theoretical framework for my argument. Throughout the two chapters, it is difficult to identify exactly who is perpetuating all the ideas about what makes the "disabled." Discourses are circulating, but they are coming from medical, historical, cultural, and societal ideas. Therefore, many people are perpetuating the

ideas of what makes someone "abled" and "disabled." Possibly, I could use Michel Focault's ideas about power and the soul and the body to connect with disability. His concept of the "microphysics of power" investigates how ideas circulate within society. Foucault's concept would not allow me to identify one specific person or group, but it would allow me to analyze multiple groups and institutions who contributed to the understanding of the "disabled" during the nineteenth century. Additionally, using Focault's dichotomy of the "body" and the "soul" would connect with Goodley's models of disability. It is possible for the body to be examined as an indicator of disability, but disability can be viewed as part of a person's morality as well. Examining what "abled" people might think about "disabled" peoples' "soul" and how it has been subject to punishment would pair well with this project.

Other than using Foucault, it would be helpful to examine these primary texts with Bill Brown's *The Material Conscious*. Brown's text examines ideas circulated within culture and within common literary texts to analyze how they impact an audience. With his text, I could use it as a piece of theoretical framework for my second chapter. The theory would contribute to my discussion of the "why." By further examining the cultural and historical contexts behind the primary texts, I can possibly explain how these influences would have affected the readers of the text and the way the text was represented. The author and the readers might not even realize that they are being influenced especially if Brown explores parts of this discourse that I have not explored yet. I briefly explore Robert Bogdan's definition of the "freak" within the emerging freak show, but I could consider emerging cinema, photographs, and other types of media that might contribute to ableist ideas.

Using Foucault and Brown to contribute to my theoretical framework would solidify and expand my first two chapters, but there is enough information with this topic to create a third

chapter. The third chapter would focus on adaptation studies. Specifically, I would expand on what I briefly explore in Chapter One. In addition to examining the Creature as an adaptation himself, I would want to study how *Frankenstein* has been adapted in films, comics, graphic novels, other novels, etc. Some primary texts that would potentially offer worthwhile discussion include *Depraved* directed by Larry Fessenden, *The Poor Things* by Alsadair Grey, and *Frankenstein* by Junji Ito. Looking at all these texts would reveal how the adaptations of the Creature have changed over time and as a result how the term "disability" has changed over time. These primary sources could contribute to both my understanding of the "how" and the "why." Looking at recent texts would help me to argue how ableist ideas are being perpetuated in discourse to contribute to the ideas of someone who is "disabled." I look forward to continuing this project as it expands in terms of theory and modern and historical contexts.

Works Cited

Bogdan, Robert. *Freak Show: Presenting Human Oddities for Amusement and Profit*. The U of Chicago P, 1988.

Campbell, Fiona Kumari. *Countours of Ableism: The Production of Disability and Abledness*. Palgrave Macmillian, 2009, pp. 16-29.

Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome. *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*. U of Minnesota P, 1996, pp. 3-25.

Collins, Wilkie. *Poor Miss Finch.* Oxford UP, 2008.

Elliott, Kamilla. "The Adaptation of Adaption: A Dialogue between the Arts & Sciences." *Adaptation and Cultural Appropriation: Literature, Film, and the Arts*, edited by Pascal Nicklas, and Oliver Lindner, De Gruyter Inc., 2012, pp. 145-161. *ProQuest Ebook Central*, https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/radford/detail.action?docID=893143.

Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Translated by Richard Philcox, Grove Press, 2008.

Flint, Kate. "Disability and difference." *The Cambridge Companion to Wilkie Collins*, edited by Jenny Bourne Taylor, Cambridge UP, 2006, pp. 153-167.

Gallagher, Deborah. "Hiding in Plain Sight: The Nature and Role of Theory in Learning Disability Labeling." *Disability Studies Quarterly*, vol. 30, no. 2. Retrieved from https://dsq-sds.org/article/view/1231/1278.

Galton, Francis. "The History of Twins, as Criterion of the Relative Powers of Nature and Nurture." *The Journal of Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, vol. 5, 1876, pp. 391-406. *JSTOR*, https://www.jstor.org/stable/2840900. Accessed 14 Nov. 2019.

Garland-Thomson, Rosemarie. *Staring: How We Look*. Oxford UP, 2009.

---. *Extraordinary Bodies*. "Disability, Identity, and Representation: An Introduction." Colombia UP, 1996, pp. 5-18.

Goodley, Dan. *Disability Studies: An Interdisciplinary Introduction.* SAGE Publications, 2010.

Holmes, Martha Stoddard. "Born This Way: Reading *Frankenstein* with Disability." *Literature and Medicine,* vol. 36, no. 2, 2018, pp.372-387. *Project Muse,* doi.org/10.1353/lm.2018.0019. Accessed 11 Oct. 2019.

Jackson, Emily A. Bernhard. "Twins and Twinship, and Robert Louis Stevenson's 'Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde." *Victorian Review,* vol. 39, no. 1, 2013, pp. 70-86. *JSTOR,* https://www.jstor.org/stable/24497000.

JanMohamed, Abdul R. "The Economy of Manichean Allegory: The Function of Racial Difference in Colonialist Literature". *Critical Inquiry,* vol. 12, no. 1, 1985, pp.18-23, 59-87.

Juengel, Scott J. "Face, Figure, Physiognomics: Mary Shelley's Frankenstein and the Moving Image." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction,* vol. 33, no. 3, 2000, pp. 353-376. *Ebscohost,* doi: 10.2307/1346169. Accessed 29 Oct. 2019.

Lacom, Cindy. "'Time is Sick and Out of Joint': Physical Disability in Victorian England." *PMLA,* vol. 120, no. 2, 2005, pp. 547-552. *JSTOR,* https://www.jstor.org/stable/2548612.

Lavater, Johann Kasper. "On physiognomy." *Embodied Selves: An Anthology of Psychological Texts 1830 – 1890,* edited by Jenny Bourne Taylor and Sally Shuttleworth, Oxford UP, 1998, pp. 8-17.

Marchbanks, Paul. "A Space, a Place: Visions of a Disabled Community in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* and *The Last Man*." *Demons of the Body and the Mind Essays on Disability*

in Gothic Literature, edited by Ruth Bienstock Anolik, McFarland & Company, 2010, pp. 23-34.

McDaniel, Jamie. "'You can point a finger at a zombie. Sometimes they fall off.': Contemporary Zombie Films, Embedded Ableism, and Disability as Metaphor." *The Midwest Quarterly*, vol. 57, no. 4, 2016, p. 423.

---. "Disability and Deviance: Dario Argento's Phenomena and the Maintenance of Ableness as a Critical Framework." *Culture, Medicine, and Psychiatry*, vol. 37, no. 4, 2013, pp. 625-637.

Mitchell David T., and Sharon L. Snyder. *Narrative Prosthesis Disability and the Dependencies of Discourse*. The U of Michigan P, 2000, pp. 47-64.

Nicklas, Pascal & Oliver Lindner. "Adaptation and Cultural Appropriation." *Adaptation and Cultural Appropriation: Literature, Film, and the Arts*, edited by Pascal Nicklas, and Oliver Lindner, De Gruyter Inc., 2012, pp. 1-13. *ProQuest Ebook Central*, https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/radford/detail.action?docID=893143.

Shelley, Mary. *Frankenstein.* Pearson Education, 2007.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde and Other Stories*, Penguin Classics, 1979.

Vrettos, Athena. "Victorian Psychology." *A Companion to the Victorian Novel*, edited by Patrick Brantlinger and William Thesing, Blackwell Publishing, 2005, pp. 67-83.

Wang, Fuson. "The Historicist Turn of Romantic-Era Disability Studies, or *Frankenstein* in the Dark." *Literature Compass*, vol. 14, no. 7, 2017. *Wiley Online Library*, https://doi.org/10.1111/lic3.12400. Accessed 30 Sept. 2019.

Wigan, Arthur Ladbroke. “The duality of the mind.” *Embodied Selves: An Anthology of Psychological Texts 1830 – 1890*, edited by Jenny Bourne Taylor and Sally Shuttleworth, Oxford UP, 1998, pp. 124-127.