Categorisation, Liminality and Transformation in Constructing the Monster in Neil Gaiman's *The Graveyard Book*

Jutta Turunen
University of Tampere
School of Language, Translation and Literature Studies
English Philology
Master's Thesis
April 2015

Tampereen yliopisto
Kieli-, käännös- ja kirjallisuustieteiden yksikkö
Englantilainen filologia

TURUNEN, JUTTA: Categorisation, Liminality and Transformation in Constructing the Monster in Neil Gaiman’s *The Graveyard Book*

Pro gradu -tutkielma, 96 sivua + lähdeluettelo 5 sivua
huhtikuu 2015

Tutkielmassani tarkastelen hirviön rakentumista kolmen ulottuvuuden varaan Neil Gaimanin lastenkirjassa *The Graveyard Book* (2008). Pyrin osoittamaan, että hirviön tunnistaminen teoksessa vaatii sen tarkastelua epävakaana hahmona eikä niinkään esimerkiksi päähenkilön pelkoon samastumista. Nämä epävakauden ulottuvuudet ovat epäonnistunut kategorisointi, liminaalisuus ja liike sekä muodonmuutos. Teoriaosuudessa käyn läpi, kuinka nämä hirviön ulottuvuudet murentavat keskiöksi kutsuttua tilaa, joka ympäröi hahmon tarkastelijaa. Tutkielmani kannalta on myös merkittävää, että hirviö käsitteenä on niin monimuotoinen ja vaikeasti kuvailtava, että sen määrittäminen muuttumattomien tekijöiden kautta on joko harhaanjohtavaa tai liian rajoittavaa. Näin ollen nimenomaan hahmon muuntautuminen ja epävakaus ovat sen määritteleviä tekijöitä.

Pohjateos kuvaa lapsipäähenkilöä, joka perheensä murhan jälkeen päätyy kummitusten ja muiden kauhugenren perinteisten hirviöiden kasvattamaksi. Päähenkilö kohtaa elävien maailmassa uhkia kuten väkivaltaisen salaseuran, ahneen pikkurikollisen ja koulukiusaajia. Koska kirjan tapahtumia tarkastellaan päähenkilön näkökulmasta, joka on lapsuudessaan tottunut kuolleisiin, vampyyreihin ja ihmissusiin, hirviöt eivät muodostu niinkään sen kautta, mitä päähenkilö osaa pelätä. Hypoteesini onkin, että teoksessa hirviöt pitävät sisällään jonkin tai kaikki esittämistäni kolmesta ulottuvuudesta ja että jokaista kolmea ulottuvuutta käytetään verrattain yhtä paljon teoksessa.

Teosta tarkastellessa nousee silti esiin, että kategorisointi sekä sen vaillinaisuus, ristiriitaisuus ja epäonnistuminen määrittävät hirviötä eniten, ja että liminaalisuus ja liike sekä muodonmuutos ovat pienempiä tekijöitä, joiden pohjalle hirviö rakentuu. Hypoteesi toteutuu siltä osin, että kaikissa tarkasteltavissa hahmoissa on havaittavissa kaikkia näitä kolmea ulottuvuutta. Kolme epävakauden ulottuvuutta esiintyvät hyvin eri tavoin tarkasteltavissa hahmoissa. Gaimanin kirjan voidaan todeta keskustelevan hahmon epävakaudesta, mutta etenkin kategorisoinnin ongelmallisuudesta.

avainsanat: hirviö, kategorisointi, liminaalisuus, muodonmuutos, Neil Gaiman

Table of Contents

1.Introduction ... 1
1.1 Background ... 1
1.2 Premises and Aim of Thesis ... 5
2 The Monster ... 11
2.1 Significance of the Monster ... 11
2.2 Monsters in Children's Literature and Fairy Tales ... 15
2.3 Ontology of the Monster ... 21
2.3.1 Monsters and Categorisation ... 22
2.3.2 Monsters and Liminality ... 26
2.3.3 Monster and Transformation ... 32
3. Analysis ... 39
3.1 Nobody Owens ... 40
3.2 Silas ... 47
3.3 The Man Jack and Jacks of All Trades ... 53
3.4. Miss Lupescu and the Large Grey Dog ... 63
3.5 The Ghouls ... 72
3.6 The Indigo Man and the Sleer ... 79
3.7 Liza Hempstock ... 85
4. Conclusion ... 92
Works Cited ... 97

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Horror as a genre is an interface where the monster character is most often met. Arguably, the monster can even be considered to be a significant part of the genre's foundation, because it functions as the catalyst for the emotion that defines the genre. After all, Holly Lynn Baumgartner and Roger Davis note that the character "provokes an intense, immediate, if not categorical, response: revulsion, fear, terror" (2008, 1). However, in order to be petrified in the face of such a danger, the danger must be recognised. What, then, directs this process of recognition; what are the characteristics that reveal who or what a monster is? The genre contains a vast number of different creatures from mutated animals to armies of the undead. In the face of art and media representation that borrows from older fiction, combines it with modern stories and constantly produces new creatures to be afraid of, it might be necessary to discard the practice of taxonomy that relies solely on observing the features of the monster. Instead, the observations of such a character should extend to include the relation it has with the person who reacts to it.

Understandably, the creatures that go bump in the night are widely integrated in the art forms directed at children and youth. Perhaps Harry Potter, a teenage wizard and a world-wide popular literary phenomenon, is not what could be called an epitome of everything that monstrosity presumes, but the Wizarding World contains the potential to produce and retain horrible creatures. Some of them are inherently malicious, dangerous or alien, such as the happiness-eating Dementors or the mythological basilisk, but arguably the worst yet are the likes of the Death-eaters or Voldemort himself – ordinary witches and wizards gone mad with hunger for power or with the fear of death. This book series that sold millions undoubtedly profited quite substantially from employing certain classical nemeses and inhuman miscreants in its narration.

Just as *Harry Potter* and the reinvention of witches proves, the monsters of old are not necessarily the savage brutes they were in past literature. In addition to the villains and adversaries

and the things to be afraid of, children's literature of the 20th and the 21st century has also adopted a motley crew of monsters to provide its readers with altogether new roles, like the hero, the underdog and the comic relief. *Twilight* saga popularised vampires as harmless pseudo-vegetarian champions and glittering first-lovers, creating a new demand in the business for supernatural romance and adventure genre for youth. Another example, for a much younger audience, is *Sesame Street* that introduced Cookie Monster, a monster advocating healthy eating habits, and Count von Count, a math enthusiast, that both are as far as possible from their original role models. The list is quite extensive, but it seems that we are without doubt brought up with the idea of a being that lies beyond or, perhaps, in between humans and animals.

In relation to various instances of popular culture mentioned earlier, it must be, nonetheless, said that neither "popular" nor "monster" entail something that is only for the purposes of entertainment or the thrills and thus completely void of morality or teachings. Marina Warner, for example, calls this sudden fascination for monstrous things "a monster mania" that "has obviously been fostered by commercial interests" (1998, 15). Albeit a current favourite mode in youth and children's literature, horror and monster stories highlight a variety of problems that affect its target group. The advantage they bring to commercial quarters is just as coincidental as commercialisation of any popular subject. Most often than not, the monster stories for children might emphasise the triumph of love over hate, or friendship and social interaction over isolation and loneliness, but sometimes they also, covertly or openly, bring to light the problematic representations of minorities or generate allusions to our own grim and brutal history. This is the case, for example, with the *Harry Potter* series that examines racism, prejudice and holocaust with the stark differentiation between Muggles and Wizards and the Wizarding War (Rana 2009).

Be the monster story a thrilling narrative for older teens or a bedtime story for smaller children, the tale where the monster is far from its daunting origin as a foe momentarily questions the commandments of the real: it propels the reader from the usual, established course and leaves them

in an imaginary state where new ontological rules abide and "the normal" is something rather strange and perhaps not even wanted. This lies again behind the above mentioned popular series, as "Harry's experiences are dependent upon his removal from the official, from the normal world of muggles" (Hall 2011, 80). The Wizarding World is a sphere governed by the traditional villains of Hansel and Gretel and Snow White, but instead of abhorring witches and wizards, the reader is invited to identify with them and thus granted "a time-out" and "a temporary dislocation of the child from parental protection" (Hall 2011, 80). This "time out" and "dislocation" – in other words the monsters and whether they are truly monstrous – is the background for the main work I will discuss in this thesis, Neil Gaiman's *The Graveyard Book*.

Gaiman's monster tale *The Graveyard Book* won both The CILIP Carnegie Medal and Newbery Medal, the prestigious awards for children's literature, in 2009 and 2010. It is a reimagined version of *The Jungle Book*, as even the title suggests: an orphaned child is raised beyond traditional domestic realm by extraordinary parents and is ultimately destined to return to the human world as a champion. The difference, though, between the 19th-century classic and *The Graveyard Book* is that in the latter, instead of being fostered by a wild animal, the main character is raised by the dead. The reason why I have so far been referring to the *Harry Potter* series is because Rowling's books as well as the book by Gaiman both portray a child hero that saves not only the surrounding community but the world order while coming to terms with their identity.

Monsters and child heroes are not in any way novel for Neil Gaiman's works. Perhaps one of the best-known and celebrated children's book by Gaiman is *Coraline* (2002) that according to David Rudd realises the G.K. Chesterton's famous quote: "Fairy tales are more than true: not because they tell us that dragons exist, but because they tell us that dragons can be beaten" (2008, 160). In this particular book the monsters, especially the other mother, are employed to help the main character live out a fantasy, but in the end reconcile with the reality and her family, while she "negotiates [her] place in the world" (Rudd 2008, 160). The similar kind of scenario is explored in Gaiman's Gothic

picture book *The Wolves in the Walls* (2003) where Lucy is the only one in her family who is aware that ghost-like wolves are prowling inside the walls of their home. After a dramatic entrance of the supernatural wolves and a hurried eviction of the family, she encourages her family to become the monsters instead and creep inside the walls to frighten the new inhabitants and their former evictors.

In addition to weaving tales for children, the author has written horror and fantasy stories for adults that are riddled with strange creatures and dangerous individuals, one of which is the latest novel *The Ocean at the End of the Lane* (2013). This work is said to be "that relative rarity, a book for adults written from a child's point of view" as Lev Grossman described it in his article (2013). In the book, a suicide of a petty thief draws in a malevolent spirit that begins to torment the main character and his sister with cruel violence and seduction of their father only to be destroyed by the three mythological women in the neighbourhood: the grandmother, the mother and the young daughter. Mythology is also at the core of the Americana novel *The American Gods* (2001) that centers on different religions, cultures and fairy tales as well as a disparate company of gods, monsters and magical creatures.

In this light, it is possible that categorising Gaiman's books to belonging to either literature for children or literature for adults is a challenge. After its publication, *Publishers Weekly* addressed the issue of marketing *The Graveyard Book* for a varied audience, stating that the Newbery Medal on the cover does not necessarily sell it for the adult readers. This is the reason why two versions targeted for different audiences were issued. (Corbett 2011). The same duality of audience was touched upon by the author himself in his acceptance speech for Newbery Medal:

> I had set out to write a book about a childhood – it was Bod's childhood, and it was in a graveyard, but still, it was a childhood like any other; I was now writing about being a parent, and the fundamental most comical tragedy of parenthood: that if you do your job properly, if you as a parent, raise your children well, they won't need you anymore.
>
> (Gaiman 2009, 10)

Despite the possibility of observing the book from the position of an adult audience, I choose to analyse the monster in *The Graveyard Book* especially as a creature in a children' book. This angle

in itself does not exclude anything from the analysis, but rather broadens the field from which the theory basis is compiled of and allows to operate within such genres as children's literature, fairy tales and bedtime stories.

1.2 Premises and Aim of Thesis

As the main character is growing up between two different societies, the dead and the living, the need to differentiate between the monster and the norm can be considered to percolate through the whole narration. I will observe the monster from the viewpoints of categorisation, liminality and transformation. Firstly, I will analyse how the characters, in a single act, tend to categorise certain beings as monsters or how the failure of their categorisation attempts induces fear in the characters. Secondly, I will observe how liminality as movement and the rupturing of boundaries are connected to monstrous Otherness in the book. Finally, transformations will be also examined in relation to certain monstrous characters that tend to change their form or disguise their true physical shape. These three dimensions function as "the chemistry of the monster", its atomic makeup so to speak, and thus my main objective is to draw attention to how in Gaiman's *The Graveyard Book* the three dimensions characterise monsters prominently.

The premise for this thesis is that even though the monster is an irregular variable in fiction, there is something in the concept that allows its recognition for what it is. One angle to recognising it could be that the consumers of horror are conditioned to fear what the fictional protagonist fears. This thought is discussed by Noël Carroll as follows:

> But, of course, in consuming horror fictions we are not only involved in relations with horrific beings; we are also in relations with fictional protagonists. In this context, one wonders whether there is something special about our relation to the protagonists in horror fiction. Do we, for example, identify with these characters – is our fear of monsters their fear of monsters? – or is the relation one other than identification?
>
> (Carroll 1990, 59)

To answer Carroll's question, I argue that the relation is indeed something else. After all, a monster is a monster even before the protagonist is made aware of it; the monster might be hidden or mistaken

to be safe, but it is undeniably still a monster. Thus the consumer of horror, be it a reader or a viewer, has to have a paradigm that leads to recognising the monster, sometimes even before the protagonist does. This paradigm does not negate identification with the protagonist, but acknowledges that the reader has access to more information about the monster than any characters in fiction do. This premise directs my thesis: I argue that in Neil Gaiman's *The Graveyard Book* the monster is born as a product of a failed categorisation process, movement between spaces, and transformations. Perceiving these three dimensions make up the paradigm necessary to identifying the monster in the book.

A part of the horror that the monster induces lies in the very human need to classify the surrounding events and objects to make sense of the world. Almost everything we witness in our lives is something we think we can neatly set in a class or a category: our scientific practices insist that there are mammals and reptiles and insects out there that we can experience with our senses of sight, hearing, smell, touch and even taste. Sometimes the world is rationalised by splitting it up in dichotomies, most often with problematic or tragic consequences: if something is not good, then it clearly must be bad; if someone is not a woman, then that someone surely must be a man. What, then, happens when we encounter something that defies our categorisation or is completely elusive to the whole process? Though often been discussed in passing and only momentarily defined in most sources, in this thesis the categorisation is dealt as a process that for some part or in its entirety fails. Perhaps the most crucial parts of this theory section are based on sources that explain the underlying significance of categorisation process for human beings (Hahn and Ramscar 2011, 1) and the possibility of endlessness and the horror it produces (Schneider 1993, 6–7).

The second aspect of the monster character that will be dealt is the monster's ability or tendency to remain between either physical or socially constructed spaces or to move between them. Thus, liminality is the one of the key concepts in this thesis. The main viewpoint will be similar to that of Klapcsik's poststructuralist approach, where the movement and the process of movement is

continuous and the borderlines ambiguous (2012, 14). Otherness is also discussed in relation to the movement between spaces and Other spaces, loci that are preserved for the Othered individual. When it comes to horror, these terms are encountered with monstrous humans and monsters that temporarily but repeatedly are allowed to dwell within the society but sent back to the margins. The monster that visits the realm of ordinary and safe, such as the vampire rising from its grave to haunt the living world, threatens the physical and mental borderlines of the society.

The third dimension of monsters that will be observed in this thesis is the transformation of the monster. The problem of categorisation when approaching the monster sometimes lies in the creature's ability to mutate and altogether change physically; in other words, the being is not necessarily stable enough to be subjected to strict categorisation. Furthermore, it should be stated that even though the transformation can be considered to fulfil the parameters of an event that takes place once, it is disconnected from categorisation: the being that undergoes a metamorphosis might have been a categorised creature before its transfiguration, but because of its alteration it reorganises the variables with which it is circumscribed. This change is paramount to such canonical monsters as zombies, werewolves and vampires. In my theory section, I will observe various sources that discuss how these canonical monsters and their transformations are presented in fiction. A significant notion is brought up by McGinn, who observes one monstrous transformation as a revealing process that only incarnates the latent possibility of instability (2012, 13).

As these dimensions all contain a certain fragment of perceived instability and an agency of someone else who regards the being as a monster, it is necessary to contemplate them more closely to make distinctions between them. The main element that these dimensions have in common is the observer, or the spectator that recognises the monster; as was pointed out earlier, this might be the protagonist, some other character but it also might be the reader who is given textual cues. The observer has a position, a point of view from which they observe the monster. The position is a centre, but not necessarily the centre of the narrative. As I am about to analyse later in this thesis, the

protagonist in *The Graveyard Book*, for instance, does not inhabit the centre in question from the point of view of many other characters even though his point of view is central to the story. Instead, he exists outside the world that would be recognisable to the reader and most human characters and in order to recognise the monsters in the story, the reader is required to identify different centres available in the story. This centre, opposed to the monster, is seen as stable; while it necessary is not stable in reality, it is perceived as something that can be categorised for good, it is transfixed to its place and pertains a certain unchanged form.

When the observer categorises something, they study the object from their position and then extend their power to name the object as something. The power of categorisation is what creates the centre for the observer; in this act, the boundaries of the centre are constructed on the idea that an individual can at all times control the world with categories. It is essential to note that categorisation is done to all objects, be they monsters or not. Categorisation is directed by the observer and focuses on the object that as a monster may accept the categorisation and later return to revoke it or dismiss it instantly. This dismissal does not necessarily require any agency from the monster, as the position from which the observer names objects might be too limited or fallacious; whatever the monster is, it is precisely that before, during and after the categorisation, but what changes is the observer's knowledge of its object. The categorisation as a process is twofold: it can be either a question "what are you" or a statement "this is what you are". The centre, the position of authority, is based on being infallible in categorising and is in turn dismantled by the monster that cannot be put in a category.

Liminality in relation to the monsters and the centre does resemble categorisation in that it requires a recognition of what belongs to the observer's centre and what belongs to the object. The theory regarding liminality is extensive and in this thesis I will concentrate on movement between spaces or remaining between them. The centre is a limited space for the observer; limited in the sense that its boundaries are either mentally or physically demarcated as extant. The space beyond the boundaries of the centre is the space that the object populates or at least frequents. Despite the

boundaries, the object is actively moving between its space outside the centre and the centre itself and even remain on the threshold of the space. This is different from categorisation where the object stays in the line of the observer's sight and can remain inactive for the duration of the categorisation process. In liminality, however, it is precisely the active movement of the object that defines it for the observer.

Finally, the matter of transformation in relation to the monster includes some features of the two dimensions above. As the basis of the transformation is the process of categorisation that the observer performs. The process might be a successful one in that the object has features that meet the requirements of the category it receives. As such, the monster's transformation involves an inherent successful categorisation. The situation begins to change with the emergence of the object's ability to transform; even though the object was successfully categorised and made safe before, its transformation invalidates the safety of the object. Even if the categorised object was safely included in the centre after the initial categorisation, the subsequent transformation sends it over the boundaries. That is to say, the observer rejects the object after its transformation and pushes it outside or remodels the boundaries so that they do not include the object. Whatever the changes that happen in the centre, they are only initiated by the transformation of the object.

Even though the three dimension of the monster's instability are separate dimensions, in text they do overlap and commence sometimes simultaneously. The encounters between the observer and the object can be analysed from various points of views, but the encounter has consequences and produce the reaction in the observer. The reaction produced by any of these occurrences is the recognition of the monster; the monster predates the observation, but the observation produces the horror and repulsion. However, the aim of this thesis is not to demonstrate that all these dimensions exist in every single character that can be considered a monster. My hypothesis, on the contrary, is that the paradigm to recognise the monster in *The Graveyard Book* requires that the monster displays

one, two or all three dimensions. Moreover, my hypothesis contains the assumption that these traits are evenly distributed throughout the book.

Finally, it should be noted that *The Graveyard Book* is an illustrated book. Each of the eight chapters are introduced with an illustration that can be said to represent the key characters or the events of the chapter. However, for this thesis I choose to study the monster as it appears in the text and not in visual representation. This does not mean that illustrations would not add to the characters in any manner. On the contrary, as there are two different editions of the book that bear different illustrations by different illustrators, analysing the complementing relationship between the text and pictures would be an avenue to be investigated. In this thesis, the scope is outlined to include only the text.

2. The Monster

First of all, it must be stated that defining the concept of monster is very much the same as trying to explain the class of mammals in the animal kingdom. It is an umbrella term for dissimilar and divergent creatures that have a few, but very significant similarities. However, other than by referring to those similarities, these beings do not form a straightforward unit and describing them as such might produce a limited picture. This obscure biodiversity is thus naturally encountered when trying to carve out the secure boundaries of what it is usually meant with the word "monster". Instead of even trying to give the subject matter a precise taxon, I will approach it from the point of view of a brief history and of the various forms in which the monster has appeared in the Western arts. Moreover, I will discuss some of the readings these beings have and have had in culture and literature in subchapter 2.1. Secondly, in 2.2, I will observe how these beings populate fairy tales and the fiction for children. Then later on in subchapter 2.3, I will address the elusiveness of monster's ontology from the point of view categorisation, liminality as movement, and transformation.

2.1 Significance of the Monster

If history of monsters can reveal something notable of the character's significance, it must be the manner in which the meaning behind the word has changed over the course of centuries. Nowadays, a look at a dictionary gives the being a somewhat varied premise, starting from its peculiarity and arriving to descriptions of size, form or even its intentions. *Collins Dictionary,* for example, lists *monster* as "an imaginary beast, such as a centaur, usually made up of various animal or human parts" or " a cruel, wicked, or inhuman person" (s.v. *monster* n., sense 1), while *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary* also brings up its largeness and strangeness (s.v. *monster* n., sense 3). *Bloomsbury* delves deeper into its origins and explains the word as describing "a large ugly terrifying animal or person found in mythology or created by imagination, especially something fierce that kills people" (s.v. *monster* n., sense 1). Even these explanations seem to define a multifold being, and most

likely consulting more dictionaries would lead to even a broader definition. Nonetheless, it seems that its lethality, danger or the feeling it induces is on the forefront of the explanation.

In addition to similar entries as was related above, *The Chambers Dictionary* provides a glance into what these things could have meant before they merely became particularly large animals and dangerous persons. According to this dictionary, the obsolete etymology of the word is "miraculous" (s.v. *monstrosity* n.) or "a prodigy" (s.v. *monster* n.). That is to say, *monster* has presumably lost in the process its divine connotations and allusions to a godly birth. This is the loss of meaning Stephen Asma also refers to when discussing the history behind the word: "*Monster* derives from the Latin word *monstrum*, which in turn derives from the root *monere* (to warn). To be a monster is to be an omen." (2009a, 13). Thus the monster, in addition to riddling folktales and mythology and sometimes even the real world, depending on the reference, is a highly symbolic being. The question that naturally arises from this approach is as follows: what does the being and its symbolism then signify in our culture?

Matt Kaplan claims that the humanity began to produce monsters into mythology to represent the essential fears and threats to society and to carry forward the knowledge that would ensure the survival of the population. He also adds that it is the shared fears and the danger that are located at the very core of the monster. (2012, 6.) Thus it seems that the monster became a point of imitation for all the things in the human being's surroundings that would hinder the maintenance of peaceful life or that would eradicate life itself. The problem of analysing the old monsters is the concept's location in the past and the difficulty of seeing clearly what the conditions were that the monster forewarned of. Precisely in relation to this spatiality and conditions, Jeffrey Jerome Cohen states that each monster is born "as an embodiment of a certain cultural moment – of a time, a feeling, and a place" (1996, 4). To me, this means that when encountering a monster, it is, in effect, the space-time and the fear embodied in the society that we are facing.

It should be noted that not always is the monster and its resistance of social norms considered a wholly destructive force in literature. For instance, the Gothic, "the fiction of the haunted castle, of heroines preyed on by unspeakable terrors, of the blackly lowering villain, of ghosts, vampires, monsters and werewolves" (Punter 1980, 1), tends to lean against some monstrous creatures and cruel, dangerous characters. The mode, according to Maggie Kilgour, allows the violation of rules, rejoices in its chaos, but in the end returns to the established order "by punishing it, with death or damnation" (1995, 8). Horror literature, then, is a space where such beings and the disruption they bring upon society are welcomed due to the cathartic experience left in the wake of the chaos it brings: the monster introduces danger but is punished in the end to restore the order. Yet the character also contains an innate duality that not only happily condemns the monster's behaviour but engages the reader into an undisguised admiration. David D. Gilmore discusses this oscillation between the two completely separate reactions in his book:

> Yet the monster, in all its guises, is also and paradoxically awe-inspiring, admirable in a perverse way. As depicted in folklore and fiction, terrible are impressive exactly because they break the rules and do what humans can only imagine and dream of. Since they observe no limits, respect no boundaries, and attack and kill without compunction, monsters are also the spirits that say "yes" – to all that is forbidden. There is, obviously, a certain ambivalence here. (2003, 12)

Projecting all that is off limits in the actual world, monsters are surrogates for the humanity's unbridled imaginative behaviour.

In addition to being *enfantes terribles,* scapegoats and hecatombs sacrificed for the sake of the narrative's teaching, these creatures have even more to offer for the functions of storytelling. Monsters can be considered to operate as literary catalysts that introduce the hero. The hero story fundamentally involves an obstacle in the form of a monster that then is vanquished as the story progresses (Gilmore 2003, 11–12). Asma captures this process in his two phases of the monster story: the threat phase, which reminds the reader of their mortality, and the hero phase, in which the threat is conquered (2009b). The monster story thus has the necessary element that forces the reader to fear

for the stability of circumstances; it is an indispensable point in the narrative that taunts the certainties of life, but it also presents the character that has the ability to control the havoc and subdue the peril.

Where heroes serve as a remedy against the evil beings inside the story, the reader or the watcher of a monster story is in charge of empowerment outside the text. This can be seen, for example, in the research recounted by Kaplan that asked students to rate things such as hot dishes, rollercoaster rides, and also tales of horror. Simple explanations as to why some people enjoy these things cannot be given, but the researches assume that "[t]he enjoyment. . . comes from a sense of mental mastery over the body that is responding in a knee-jerk reaction". (2012, 2–3.) The story provides a sense of control and even a promise of survival, even though not all monstrous creatures are real. Asma discusses precisely the make-believe nature of the situation, calling the monster "a virtual sparring partner for our imagination" that forces the person to experience an imaginary crisis and to map out all the possible outcomes and solutions for it (2009b).

Despite its role as a rogue that undermines society and shakes its foundations, the monster can also depict humanity's darker side. They can function as surfaces to which the current society is reflected upon and then evaluated:

> The uses of monsters vary widely. In our liberal culture, we dramatize the rage of the monstrous creature and Frankenstein's is a good example--then scold ourselves and our "intolerant society" for alienating the outcast in the first place. The liberal lesson of monsters is one of tolerance: We must overcome our innate scapegoating, our xenophobic tendencies.
> (Asma 2009b)

In these certain kind of stories the monsters are not the villains or foils for heroes, but victims, although dangerous at that, of the cruel intentions of human beings and the product of the thoughtlessness of the humankind. Precisely as Asma states, possibly the most famous case in point is Frankenstein's monster who cannot be tamed by his creator and can be read as a symbol for uncontrollably changing scientific field of that time (Tallon 2010, 37).

The most recent development in the role of the monster appears alongside the emergence of fictional monstrous humans, serial killers and tyrants. When the earlier function of non-human

creatures was to antagonise the hero and serve as the conquerable enemy, modern fiction and pop culture employs the character as a hero itself. This change is dealt with in Tony Woodlief's article. He argues that now it is the monster that rescues human beings from themselves (2011, 18). This new hero-monster works just like the victimised monster by showing what is wrongful in the society, only in a different manner. He claims also that in the modern American fiction the evil monsters are but a moral deviation and that "[m]onsters are no longer, in other words, inherently monstrous" (2011, 16). Woodlief seems to make a distinction here between what it means to be a monster and the deeds that could be described as monstrous. This suggests also that the monster needs to be analysed in connection to something other than its deeds.

To conclude, it can be stated that the monster is given a multifold significance in Western culture. The dictionaries point to a character that has very few common denominators other than its size, abnormality and the danger it imposes; as such, it cannot be exhaustively described as a class. The monster can be said to offer a mirror that reflects the collective anxieties of the society it is born into, and a scapegoat that offers resistance for the hero character. It is used in fiction to offer a safe opponent for entertaining mental threat scenarios that most often result in managing the fear. After the accelerating scientific progress it has come to symbolise the cruelty of the human kind only to emerge in the latest fiction as the heroic character.

2.2 Monsters in Children's Literature and Fairy Tales

At first, it would seem that children are in general protected from horror and monsters in media, and the things that can be terrifying are somewhat isolated from the quotidian sphere of culture for children. Most European countries, for instance, have begun to employ Pan European Game Information (PEGI), a comprehensive rating system for game material that notifies about the game's contents and helps the consumer to purchase age-appropriate games (PEGI info, see link). In countries such as Finland, these ratings have been expanded to include also films and TV programs (National

Audiovisual Institute, see link). One of the rating indicators in the system warns the consumer about something frightening and scary for children. This is the main approach in assessing whether some material is too terrifying and thus detrimental to development of children in the 21st- century Europe.

The will to protect children from material on the basis of the terrors it depicts is somewhat older in Europe. Horror comics were imported to Great Britain after the Second World War. They contained graphic violence and gore and they "though not especially directed at the young, . .were read by many children". These comics finally led to the passing Children and Young Persons (Harmful Publications) Act in Great Britain. (Carpenter and Prichard 1984, 261). The horror in games and such comics in question here, however, deals with graphic horror. As was observed in the dictionary explanations of the monster, the being's horror appeal is very often connected to its appearance, but despite this not all monster stories contain gory details of violence. The war, at the same time, can be thought to have also another side in horror in children's literature, as is recounted later in this subchapter.

Existing in parallel lines with unsuitable and possibly harmful material, children's literature, and in the modern days, children's games and films, have always hosted something horrible. In fact, the fairy tales are mostly built upon some terrifying creature that antagonises the hero, usually a child, and thus introduces the plot; Jack fools the bloodthirsty giant, Hansel and Gretel kill the evil witch, and the princess escapes the serial murdering Blue Beard. As a matter of fact, fairy tales were not originally a genre specifically for children, but they were exposed to the stories alongside with the adults (Zipes 1997, 3). As a consequence of defining fairy tale as children's literature and in the wake of introduction of Christian morals into them, fairy tales began to experience considerable changes. For instance, the erasure or rationalisation of violence and abuse saw to that the pushing witch into the oven in Hansel and Gretel was disapproved of and the story was changed into versions where the children had got lost in the woods due to their own actions instead of malice and negligence of their parents (Zipes 1997, 56–57).

Ideologies and religions change the mood presented in fairy tales and children's literature, but so do politics. As was mentioned before at the beginning of this chapter, gore comics as a by-product of war initiated a law procedure against horror and violence material deemed unsuitable for children. The era of warfare, however, arguably brought something completely antithetical in its wake, as well: first the emergence of new anxieties and then perhaps new monsters. The dramatic changes in politics and security on a global scale can even be seen as a conclusion to a Romantic idea of an innocent childhood, as Gregory Pepetone recounts:

> Two World Wars, a Cold War, and now a "War on Terror" have undoubtedly shaken our adult sense of security and ordered wellbeing. Something, it seems, is indeed rotten in the state of America (as well as rest of Western civilization) though die-hard "conservatives" refuse to admit it. These traumatic events, difficult enough for adults to process, must have utterly transformed the inner life of children and perhaps even signaled an end to the romantic cult of childhood. While it is true that the young have always been early casualties of political conflict, disease, and natural disaster, the modern era has added significantly, if not to the quotidian catalogue of childhood terrors, at least to the level of childish awareness that modern communication technologies have rendered inescapable.
>
> (2012, 3)

He goes on to describe how the environmental threats and the hardened military measures, as well as the changing family sphere and the randomness and inexplicability of violent acts seep into the narratives of the post-war era (Pepetone 2012, 3) The horrors have expanded their realm from the faraway lands of fantasy into the home environment and undoubtedly generated some additional creatures to be afraid of. Fascism, persecution and holocaust, for instance, has, in my opinion, given some of its attributes to monsters and villains in such horror or Gothic books as Riggs' *Miss Peregrine's Home for Peculiar Children* (2011) and Bradbury's *Something Wicked This Way Comes* (1962). In these books, it appears that the monsters have taken a shape of something that controls the masses or annihilates systematically groups of people.

In addition to the outside world of adults that creep into the children's literature, most often the horrible and the terrifying has inhabited the everyday life of children. For instance, the school story that dominated the British children's literature for the middle class in the 19th century (Clark

2001, 7) has taken a grim turn from a secluded realm of adventure and mystery to a horror story. The genre which was perhaps popular due to its "potential for creating a location largely insulated from the outside world, one in which young characters can have a considerable degree of initiative, while adults appear in a secondary role" (Rudd 2010, under word "school story", 238) have retained its rule of children but incorporated a new danger. For instance, in the *Harry Potter* series, the school is the primary location for the monstrous encounters. In Jack Prelutsky's poem "The Ghoul" there is something waiting for children outside the school and eats the careless ones, rendering the school an uncanny place of possible monstrous encounter (Jackson et al. 2008, 10–11).

Jackson et al. consider this transformation from a safe place to an unsafe place the reason why the ghoul, in the end, can be considered a Gothic monster (2008, 11). Whereas the original Gothic monster of Romantic era dwelled in the outskirts of the everyday realm, just as was stated in the previous subchapter, the monster in the children's literature subjugates the familiar grounds: the schools, kindergartens, parks and inevitably the home. Anna Smith's opinion is very similar to that of Jackson et al. and adds that connecting stories and space is a part of childhood (2008, 131). The places known to the child are generally few and in order to bind the horror into reality and to make it seem possible regardless of how impossible it is, the narrative must be staged in the place of familiarity to the child.

The monster is evidently found skulking in the familiar spaces of the childhood, but in some pieces of children's literature the uncontrollable, unmanageable and refractory creature lies even closer than just in the surroundings. In one of the most read children's book, *Where the Wild Things Are* (1963) by Maurice Sendak, the child protagonist himself becomes not only the monster but the king of monsters for a while. According to Bruno Bettelheim, the monster is a child's externalised coping method with which they must learn to live with the negative aspects in themselves (1976, 120). Just as was mentioned about the sparring partners in the previous subchapter, the monster is then an imaginary adversary for a child that empowers them and mentally arms them against the traits

and qualities in them that are not necessary in the next stage of development. This is the case, according to Coats, in Sendak's book as the protagonist takes the role of a monster because of his behaviour towards his mother, but in the end the relationship between the child and the caregiver is restored and the status quo is re-established (2010, 83).

In fact, when observing Bettelheim's approach to the monster, it becomes clear that the child character as a monster in the children's book is not necessarily the only manifestation of the child. As a matter of fact, the monster does not necessarily have to be the rebellious child in the text, but any other character that just symbolises the fears the child reader might be experiencing:

> Those who outlawed traditional folk fairy tales decided that if there were monsters in a story told to children, these must all be friendly – but they missed the monster a child knows best and is most concerned with: the monster he feels or fears himself to be, and which also sometimes persecutes him. By keeping this monster within the child unspoken of, hidden in his unconscious, adults prevent the child from spinning fantasies around it in the image of the fairy tales he knows. Without such fantasies, the child fails to get to know his monster better, nor is he given suggestions as to how he may gain mastery over it. As a result, the child remains helpless with his worst anxieties – much more so than if he had been told fairy tales which give these anxieties form and body and also show ways to overcome these monsters. If our fear of being devoured takes the tangible form of a witch, it can be gotten rid of by burning her in the oven!
>
> (Bettelheim 1976, 120)

As criticism it must be stated that whether a child can learn to come to grips with inevitable human failings is not necessarily dependent on the monsters and evil creatures in fairy tales, as Bettelheim suggests. However, it is one of the readings as to why children's literature offers such beings in narrative. All the same, as McCormick states, "monsters are disfigured versions of ourselves, fun-house mirrors of our own frail and sometimes monstrous humanity" (1996, 39).

In a wider sociological frame, the monster story functions as a viewpoint to what is expected of an individual in the society of the now or perhaps what was in the past. In the style of books directed at the general adult audiences, children's monster story is a mirror which reflects our anxieties and norms in the society, and thus "monsters can provide educators with a critical tool with which to facilitate the re-examination of cultural and historical prejudices" (Browning 2013, 41).

Before this stance, in 19th-century American and England, the endeavour behind the horror story for children was really two-fold: "to indoctrinate youngsters with the morals of the day and to expose superstition as a false belief system perpetuated by the foolish and the wicked." (Kendrick 2009, 20). Thus a horror story has undergone a change, even though the element of moral judgement is present; it has moved on from being a means of idealism in the late Enlightenment era to expose social bias that still affect modern times.

Yet, the stories do not necessarily offer any clean solutions or clear statements even in the children's literature. This is exactly the point of view the researcher of fairy tales, Jack Zipes, criticises in Bettelheim's approach to fairy tales: he states that "like many cultural censors of morality, Bettelheim believes that only literature which is harmonious and orderly should be fed to the delicate souls of children who should be sheltered from harsh reality". In contrast, Zipes sees that myths, fables and legends, unlike fairy tales, do not offer hope or solutions to problems. (2002, 184). In times when monster stories are drawing inspiration from ancient myths and legends, this is an important notion. For instance, Pepetone considers the *The Dark is Rising* series ending with a lesson about how good prevails, but the cost of the battle against dark creatures is grave even for the forces of light (2012, 34). Children's stories do very often end in the triumph of the protagonist and the annihilation of the monster, but sometimes at a great price. The eradication of terrifying creatures do not always leave the reader feeling gleeful, either; if they are like us and if they represent some aspect of the child as well as the adult, then does it not stir empathy and pity?

If the monster is a depiction of some of the child's qualities, embodied as a horrible, active, whole character, then the latest culture for children has taken this identification with the monster further than before. Along the vogue of dystopian literature, children at the moment seem to revel in stories in which the protagonist is called a monster, as is proven by the bestsellers. *Publisher's Weekly'*s bestseller list for children's frontlist fiction and picture books both include various articles in their top 25 where monsters are the main subjects, and subsequently the protagonists: Riggs'

Hollow City and *Miss Peregrine's Home for Peculiar Children*, Riordan's *The House of Hades,* Mead's *Vampire Academy* and Bright's *Love Monster*, to name a few (2014, 16). As stated before, the previous villain or a victim has become the hero of the story. David L. Russell states in his introduction to horror fantasy that "not all stories with ghosts are horror stories – some are just a bit chilling" and that the task of the supernatural or monstrous is not to induce fear but interest (2012, 210). However, the monster as a literary trend goes beyond a chilling interest; the creature has become the point of identification for children and youth and the problems the monsters face are not unlike the problems these groups face. In the midst of fighting against the forces of evil, the monster protagonists deal with infatuation, bullying and problems with family, as they do in the bestsellers mentioned above.

Children's literature in relation to horror has been repeatedly objected to the shifting moral views of the society and the changing politic climate. This is evident in various protective measures decreed by the society but also as more inconspicuous changes in the plots of traditional fairy tales. The direction of the effects to the horror and the monster in children's literature is somewhat changeable; on one level, the unstable worldwide situation is made aware through the ever-present media. At the same time, fiction for children concerns mostly the everyday and known areas of the children's lives, such as the school and home. Just as is with the monster tales in general, the monster tale for children functions on many different levels. The monster is an educational tool that teaches empathy, but it is also the medium used to deal with individual's own possibly negative attributes. Bettelheim and Zipes seem to disagree whether horror tales always provide a peaceful conclusion for the reader, but all the while the current monster fiction has developed along the same lines as the monster fiction for adults: the monster has become the hero and the protagonist of the story.

2.3 Ontology of the Monster

In this subchapter I will observe the three main factors that precipitate the inherent instability of the monster character. The first of these factors is the categorisation and its imminent failure as a singular

event; how the monster is put into defining mental boxes and what happens when it becomes evident that the box cannot contain the creature. After this I will examine monster as a liminal being and an Other in relation to physical boundaries and spaces, and its liminal ability to move within them and out of them. The final subject that I will be dealing with in this subchapter is the monster and its ability to transform and thus in its unsteady form induce horror. All of these dimension deal with two sides: the creature that is observed and the point of observation.

2.3.1 Monsters and Categorisation

The problematics of placing the monster into any already existing natural class is admittedly very much a part of the underlying meaning of the character. Categorisation of the character will be dealt separately here in this subchapter as categories are a rudimentary part of *The Graveyard Book*. As was alluded earlier, the monster is a puzzle and deciphering whether it simply is evil or just functioning as a means of expressing the taboos of a culture is challenging. If the social aspects and fears that the monster portrays are cast aside, what can be said of the being itself? Even Western culture alone has produced a substantial menagerie of horrendous beings both imaginary and real, making any concrete outlining challenging. But if the etymological aspect is once again brought into the discussion, it becomes evident that the monster is beyond nature and thus highlights the dilemma whether any human-made taxon can capture the being. *The Chambers Dictionary,* after all, explains *monster* in the following manner: it is "an extraordinary, grotesque or gigantic animal, as told of in fables and folklore; an abnormally formed animal or plant; anything gigantic or abnormally large; anything of abhorrent appearance or behaviour; anything deviating from the usual course of nature" (s.v. *monster* n).

In order to understand what is meant by "abnormal" or "deviating", it becomes essential to contemplate how humans as a species rationalise the versatility of the surrounding world. Psychology and social psychology refer to a certain cognitive process performed to sort objects into various

classes and bands as *categorisation.* Most often applied to explain such phenomena as xenophobia or racism or employed as a tool in biology, categorisation as a theory endeavours to clarify the basic factors that direct procedures of classification. For example, Ulrike Hahn and Michael Ramscar state that this process underlies human knowledge, but, like most of scientific fields, categorisation is divided into various theories. These include most prominently classical categorisation, which involves a belief that nature already contains ready-made classes that only need to be recognised and then applied, and conceptual categorisation that believes categories to be human constructs founded on previous experiences. (Hahn and Ramscar 2011, 2.)

To put it very simply, the process of categorisation entails a comparison to some kind of a baseline that an individual has established. It can be a prototype or a previous example, but the main thing to be considered is that when the individual approaches a new object, they after more or less thorough observation itemises all its characteristics and then classifies it (David J. Schneider 2004, 66–68). Essential to the process, in the end, is to determine the details that settle whether something belongs to one category or another (Hahn and Ramscar 2011, 3). The power over these details and the name they entail is yielded by the observer, an individual looking to make sense of the surrounding world; this is the active agent who identifies and names objects. Categorising something means giving a name to something in order to succinctly describe the object's contents. This is the process of categorisation. Thus categorisation is a viewpoint into what the observer believes to be observing and what they wish to claim about the object. As such it does not change the object in reality.

In relation to the monsters, it is not perhaps necessary to take a stand on which of the many process theories is more accurate, as the more significant questions in this thesis concern the failure of the process. This matter, however, seems to be a less studied one and most deductions on the subject must be made by negating the consequences of a successful process related by researchers. For instance, David J. Schneider notes that categorisation helps with completing the gaps in any information left by the limited human senses and gives the individual a "predictive control over the

environment" (2004, 64). Moreover, the process aids us to "communicate about, draw inferences from, reason with, and interpret" any objects in our surroundings (Hahn and Ramscar 2011, 1). Hanna Roman notes that naming is not necessarily a matter of practical classification that makes objects easier to remember, but "a metaphysical matter, among so many attempts to create, identify, and understand knowledge" (2013, 239). Consequently, if the whole categorisation as a cognitive event falls through, how can any predictions be made of any given object, and how should they be communicated about?

This problem of not being able to estimate a creature's future behaviour or form of existence is approached by Kirk J. Schneider whose theory is perhaps best compressed into the following quote: "Take almost any deviation from customary experience, stretch it far enough, and you produce horror." (1993, 6). He argues that it is the boundlessness and the infinite nature of some things that makes observers experience the skin-creeping unease and, finally, terror:

> Deviation from the familiar, then, prompts discomfort. Extreme deviation, on the other, or what I term "contradiction", prompts *horror*. That which begins as a cure for nervousness, for example, winds up as *paralyzing*. That which starts as a casual fling ends in *obsession.* That which is initially wondrous turns *monstrous*. These are the earmarks of horror.
>
> But we cannot stop here. Contradiction taken to its logical conclusion brings us to *infinity*. Why infinity? Because, as we have seen, the more a thing differs, the less manageable it becomes; the less manageable it becomes, the greater its linkage to extremity, obscurity, and, ultimately, *endlessness*.
>
> (1993, 6–7)

This suggests that the only reason human beings are afraid of all things unusual or "abnormal", as was put in *The Chambers Dictionary*, is that once they transgress the bounds of normality, they slip beyond any form of mental control, or the predictive control noted by David J. Schneider. Not being informed about all the details of an object or a creature, after all, can mean that an individual cannot make rational choices concerning it and, thus, losing predictive control can mean vulnerability. This is the second dimension of the categorisation: the object that the observer attempts to name or even predict is not obligated to remain within the parameters of the category given.

Admittedly, human beings have developed a certain endurance for things that are unknown. Joseph Grixti explains that, when face to face with unsettling inconclusiveness, an individual is able to rewrite schemes of the reality and embrace new details into the already existing arrangement of data: this is what he calls flexibility (1989, 151). Even so, if horror is produced by grasping the commonplace material and stretching it beyond apprehension, then it also confronts the possibility of being able to adapt forever. Grixti adds that in the case where such mental resilience is not obtainable or it is not connected to the world's actualities, a human being, especially children, can produce constructions of knowledge that build upon magical thinking or superstition (1989, 151). As a result, the safety harness that was designed to protect an individual in the face of uncertainty becomes a trap that transfixes the source of unease and attaches it to imagination and art and fiction. Thus while trying to fend it off, the monster is offered a place in the culture. Because such creatures cannot be explained and they are abhorred, they cannot be abandoned from the mental landscape, as Baumgartner and Davis explain: "At the moment we abject the monster to preserve conventional order, we consciously or unconsciously deny the presence of the possible disruption of that order, casting the monster into the liminal space created by our own fears or denials. From this space, the monster irrupts into the stability of the normal order." (2008, 1). This means that the observer, in attempt to remain within the realistic boundaries of their surroundings, denies the possible terrifying characteristics of the object. The object retains it characteristics and creates even more horror when the given category and the object's being come into conflict and the categorisation fails.

If the monsters do not exist outside the storybook's pages and the dark nooks of human minds, it could seem that these beings are rendered completely docile. However, it is not the physical wellbeing of a reader or their survival that monsters continues to challenge – imaginary as they are − but the foundations of the categorisation process and the mental practices. Cohen considers this insurgency to be the defining element of the monster and that the threat that it imposes is to be found in its intermediary state: "And so the monster is dangerous, a form suspended between forms that

threatens to smash distinctions." (1996, 6). This threat then actually reaches beyond literature and art, for the monster becomes the symbol for all the discrepancies existing in cognitive processes. If such a literary character is able "to dismantle knowledge, to destroy structure, to resist classification", as Baumgartner and Davis put it (2008, 2), then can there be some other beings even in the real world that cannot be reasoned with the traditional classifications? The final result of this chain of experiences is that information gathered by categorisation becomes endangered. Monsters are, in Carroll's words, "threats to common knowledge" (1990, 34). Assuming that they are essentially nothing as a category, they have the power to be almost anything. This means that if the monster does not have recognisable boundaries that would define it to the observer, they are completely unpredictable. Thus, in all their boundlessness, monsters can be considered to be a surface that conceals its essence until the threat it imposes decides to re-emerge. This endless possibility creates the tension between the observer and the object when the first mentioned endeavours to categorise the latter.

2.3.2 Monsters and Liminality

Where the failure of categorisation threatens the centre and produces fear in the observer because its power position based on categories is at stake, the dimension of liminality and movement endanger the centre because its borderlines are rendered irrelevant. This section deals with the spaces of the observer and the monster, but more importantly the travelling between these spaces or even resisting to exist permanently in either one. This movement will be discussed with the concept of liminality but also Otherness in connection to spaces. The connection between the physical and the mental are interactive, when it comes to spaces; the boundaries of these spaces are physical areas with physical borderlines but they have mental significance. In other words, the centre can be a physical space of the observer, but it is the mental concept of having right to a space and borderlines that the monster questions.

The idea of inhabiting a space but also visiting others can be addressed through a concrete domain by employing the concept of *liminality*. This theory contains the notion of an individual's process from a state to another just as the individual is crossing the line between the states. One of the fundamental theorists of the 1900s, Victor Turner, has noted that liminality is any situation "betwixt and between" (Thomassen 2014, 89). Even though it could be seen as containing only the threshold phase of the process, the journey from the point A to B, I consider the situation where the object visits the centre, the space of observer, as being liminal. It is the visitation and the eventual withdrawal that changes the straightforward progress from one point to another into an ongoing liminal process; the visitor never really reaches the centre as it cannot stay there. This view on liminality is a postmodern one. Sandor Klapcsik notes that even though the postmodern liminality contains in-between states to a certain extent, "it ceases to refer to a temporary situation in a finite and teleological process". In other words, the process does not necessarily end, but continues to contain multiple situations that recur infinitely that Klapcsik describes as being "an endless, oscillating movement". (2012, 13).

The concept of liminality manifests often spatially, even though it does involve a scope of mentality. It is contained in areas of crossing: specific places and thresholds; areas, zones and "closed institutions"; and countries or larger regions and continents (Thomassen 2014, 91). Thus reality would seem to encompass actual physical spaces that reflect these mental or social processes or rituals, as ethnographer Arnold Van Gennep considers the situation: "Van Gennep clearly saw territorial border zones or border lines, thresholds or portals, as structurally identical with the intermediate period of a ritual passage: spatial and geographical progression correlates with the ritual marking of a cultural passage" (Thomassen 2014, 91). As an example, this would mean that the physical crossing from the space of the object into the space of the observer cannot be necessarily separated from its social dimension of movement.

Physically this liminality can also manifest as roaming. A liminal individual seems to be distinguished from the observer by its ability to traverse and perhaps even resist belonging to a certain physical space or landscape. This unfixed Otherness is described by Carol E. Leon when she discusses a nomadic indigenous people travelling in the outback of Australia and their considered Otherness and peculiarity established by the colonisers (2009, 107). In other words, the Other does not necessarily have a space of its own; it does not start from the point A and progress to point B but constantly travels because it does not belong anywhere. Considering this in connection to the observer and its centre as well as the space outside the centre, the monster that does not have a space of its own proves to the observer how synthetic and changeable the notion of having one's own space is.

In order to discuss the connection between the physicality of the space and the mental states, I shortly introduce the concept of Otherness. It relates to the idea of having a certain ownership to the space that excludes someone else. According to Luce Irigaray, it is essential to the Other that its subjectivity cannot be subsumed into the subjectivity that is "I" (2012, 108). "I" seems to have somewhat clear boundaries that dissipate everything foreign further away and into another space that is not I. Emmanuel Levinas presents that this Other is only defined through oneself: "[The Other] is what I am not". He also adds that in all possibility the Other can be weak, but also "the stranger, the enemy and the powerful one" (1978, 95). Once again, as with categorisation, there is a set of constituents that are to be evaluated in order to form a positional model: a pattern that explains what kind of being is on the inside and what kind of being is left outside. Brian Treanor points out that defining the Other leads to discovering the peripheries of "I", too, and raises the question of what can be truly understood of the Other from the vantage point of "I" (2007, 199). The observer defines the Other, the object, but unlike with the process of categorisation, they also define themselves. In fact, in Otherness, the only point of definition required when observing the object, is the limits of the observer's "I".

Despite the fear and apprehension that is produced by the monster, there seems to be something submerged in the character that attracts the spectator or the reader and undermines the terror. Baumgartner and Davis argue in their introduction that it is precisely "the absolute other" that provokes the fearful reaction, but they also state that it alienates to the point where the spectator turns away from the creature (2008, 1). While this action must be a significant part of surviving the real life monstrosities, it is not true when facing the monster in a book or a film. Perhaps the intrigue towards the strangeness of monster is one of the main reasons behind why the monster tale continues to sell till this day. Asma considers this twofold experience to be a key feature of the monster and the monster narrative (2009a, 6). The observer is fascinated by the strain between the self and the not-self and cannot turn away.

Perhaps the intrigued experience is tied to the Otherness and dual attitude towards for it, as is described by Irigaray as follows:

> Yet we forget the other who participates in our most daily and intimate life. That which is closest to us becomes invisible, imperceptible to us. We now make a single body, a single soul, a single home. Sometimes we look through the window to see if someone is coming from the outside, a someone who will confirm us in our well-being when becoming two in one. If this someone does not arrive, we are bored, a little asleep, and quarrel with each other to stimulate ourselves. Perhaps we speak together about the other, this someone from the outside whom we both expect and refuse. A possible guest, for whom we are waiting, preparing a room, a place at our table. An other who could help us remain together thanks to an empty place which allows us a possible mobility without any disagreement. This guest will remain external to our world, even when s/he is in our home. This guest only represents one part of ourselves that we have not recognised as such.
>
> (Irigaray 2012, 109)

Without taking much stance towards whether monsters always represent something in ourselves, they, as has been stated before, problematise the societal fears in the human-made world. The actual Otherness of the monster, then, is not found in what it represents, but in the reaction it produces: we leave a space for it by imagining it in literature and arts and it stimulates fear, yet it will be pushed back to the outside by making the story safe in the end. Representation craves for a monster, the absolute Other that in its unfamiliarity leaves enough room in the society to actualise the Self: the empty place that pronounces all other behaviour than Other belonging to "I" and thus permissible.

We can announce ourselves to be human because there is something monstrous out there that is not us. The invitation to the Other that leads to its arrival but also, in the end, to its expulsion are part of the oscillating movement between these spaces. This is where the Otherness and its space introduced by Irigaray above links to liminality.

Leon states when she introduces the notion of the Self in her work that individuals are prone to think about their identities through physical plains of existence: “Place has an immense psychological impact on an individual. It is a relationship that is complex, at once binding and fragile. A place defines the individual” (2009, 3). If a place truly defines the individual, then there must be places or areas for the observer that are frequented by the object with the ability to transgress boundaries. When describing the labyrinth as a device in literature, Maria Beville dons a term for the locus inhabited by the Other: *the Other space* (2012, 212). Though not necessarily bound to a certain territory, the monster is known to occupy a space that reflects it. A firm belief that there must be a continent for monsters and odd creatures prevailed in the time when natural sciences and taxonomy were just being shaped: mare incognita and terra incognita were drawn as real locations in the old maps.

These places, as Asma recounts, were not only domains of monstrous beings, but also territories of minorities that the time’s racist and xenophobic policies pushed into the Other space (2009a, 123–124). Like with the menacing wilderness, the Othered native people and the colonisers’ will to “tame” them (Richardson 2010, 19), the monster is often as coalesced with its surroundings and expected to reflect the space. These landscapes are the neglected or deformed ones; a castle, a foreign palace, an abbey, a vast prison, a subterranean crypt or a graveyard (Hogle 2002, 2) that somehow manifest its residents’ animosity, ill will or chaos and reside outside the everyday space of the Self. The mental features of the monster, the objects, are perceived as reflecting in the physical domain.

The observer remains in one place and one identity, but outside them is the object, who is able to move beyond any limit and yet return to the realm that not only is able to sometimes contain the moving object, but also reflect its Otherness. Margrit Shildrick notes that the movement makes the monster dangerous, to the extent that they “are deeply disturbing: neither good nor evil, inside or outside, not self or other” (2002, 4) and yet they are “particularly rich in binary associations” (2002, 28). In other words, the monster is able to exist in the non-space from the observer’s point of view as it is neither inside the centre or the outside space. Thus, there seems to a spectrum or a continuum along which the monster is able to move. Compared to the question of categorisation and the monstrosity, where the main issue is comprised of the potential endlessness, liminality especially in connection to Otherness and monstrosity establishes a line segment where the other end belongs always to the absolute Other and the opposite end to the “I”. The line can be operated by the monster, bringing it sometimes very close to the “I” in some respects and by doing so, pressurising the borders of permissibility.

Even though the movement usually requires a physical space where it takes place, the boundaries can be constructed as mental concepts. Thus the Other spaces might be included in the spaces of Self but all operators in the space are aware of the borderlines that separate the spaces. Michel Foucault called these spatial manifestation of state of mind as *heterotopias*:

> First there are the utopias. Utopias are sites with no real place. They are sites that have a general relation of direct or inverted analogy with the real space of Society. They present society itself in a perfected form, or else society turned upside down, but in any case these utopias are fundamentally unreal spaces.
>
> There are also, probably in every culture, in every civilization, real places—places that do exist and that are formed in the very founding of society— which are something like counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted. (1984, 3)

In other words, most spaces in reality are merely constructed by social contracts, as I noted before in relation to Van Gennep’s ideas; sometimes the psychological boundaries in our consciousness are manifested as real-life limits and spaces. What the psychological need that the society expresses in a

heterotopia varies, as they serve different purposes in different societies (Foucault 1984, 5). Being the spaces of resistance and inversion, heterotopias can contain, isolate or seise the Other of the society. Being a heterotopia does not negate the physical aspect of a space, but highlights the mental dimension in a society as realised in our surroundings. It also contains the possibility of having an Other space within the space of Self, but still mentally separated.

The freedom to move lays also the basis for the horror induced by such creatures as succubi, ghosts and vampires, as they can, given certain conditions, cross boundaries to the safe haven of the Self and enter the familiar atmospheres and even homes. They are as creatures also free in the cultural sense, since some of them are not confined to any cultural area but permeate human cultures extensively: such are, for instance, vampiric monsters (Cavallaro 2002, 180). The unwillingness to remain introduces, then, one of the main characteristics of the monster: liminality and movement between spaces. Liminality can be seen as the continuous travelling between the spaces and even staying on the threshold. These spaces, even though most likely physical spaces, are charged with mental suggestion that spaces reflect and belong to someone.

2.3.3 Monster and Transformation

As was established in the previous subchapter, the monster is a shifting creature in the terms of its location and reluctance to abide to bounds. However, the motion is not the monster's only manner of shifting: the body of the monster is most often given an option to transform into something completely different than what it was when first encountered. Evolving and transforming is not of course an unheard-of process in nature; in fact, it could be stated that it is one of the most fundamental phenomena in everyday observations of human surroundings. An element such as water is subjected to an alteration in different temperatures, whereas most insects undergo a complete transformation during their lifespan. These changes are quite commonplace and very rarely inspire terror. What, then,

makes some transformations of the horror stories an undeniable property of the monster? This is the question that will be dealt next.

The tales of changing creatures or people are a part of classical lore and mythologies of Western world in different manners and degrees. *Metamorphosis* is an occurrence where one form is altered into another, usually just once and only into one other form for a longer period of a narrative. *Polymorphy,* on the other hand, is applied to a progression or a chain of changes or even multiple simultaneous forms. These are the distinctions that Istvan Czachesz makes when he discusses Christian stories of crucifixion as stories of transformation. (2012, 117). Sometimes the change can be seen as a sequence or a process: Genevieve Liveley describes the fundamental transformation story of Daphne in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* as if the change itself was a scene in a film, shot frame by frame with different foci (2010, 14). Yet other times the only thing presented in the narrative or portrayal is the final outcome of the change and the events leading up to the new form are left untold, as is in Kafka's text *Metamorphosis*: "As Gregor Samsa woke one morning from uneasy dreams, he found himself transformed into some kind of monstrous vermin." (2009, 29). Bringing the idea of the observer and the object once again into foreground, transformation contains an angle where the change is observed and a substance that begins to change. The observer, however, might not witness the change, but is able to deduce it or is later informed of it.

However, the fact that the observer is not present to witness the change does not mean that the creature observed has not been a monster before its change, as it is the change that makes it visible. It has been a monster from beginning, as it has had the potential to change and transform to begin with. The transformation is the process that only reveals the instability to the observer. This is how Colin McGinn interprets the transformation from a human being into a fly in Cronenberg's *The Fly* (1986): the unstable predicament of our DNA revealed in the form of a fly. He states that perhaps the main tragedy of the transformation in the film does not originate in the deterioration from a human to an insect, but in the fact that it has been possible and probable all along: "[t]he tragedy then is not the

end result but the starting point". (2012, 13). In other words, the monster is born when the observer realises the possibility of an instable form; labelling something a monster is thus a reaction to the realisation that from the beginning forms are possibly changeable. The monster is born out of the perception of its observer.

When Richard Buxton examines the Greek myths of transformation, he notes that "most traditional metamorphoses are *alternatives* to death, alternatives which come into play because the events which precipitate the changes of form are so extreme that death would be too conventional a conclusion for the lives of the individuals concerned." (2009, 240). From this point of view, it seems that metamorphosis is a trope in stories preserved for distinguished characters who have too extraordinary lives. The divine intervention and a close escape from death, as the transformation seems to have been in the Greek tales according to Buxton, seem to lie somewhat further away from the monstrous and horrible creatures. Nonetheless, some Greek myths and even older ones might have a more terrifying appearance: Leslie A. Sconduto recounts how in the stories of *Gilgamesh* and *Actaeon*, the transformation is cruel blow of revenge dealt to those who dare insult gods and which eventually leads to the victim's demise. However, in these stories it is not the monster, but the victim of the god, who has to change their form. (2008, 8)

The divine intervention continues to reign the transformation stories of medieval Europe when it comes to monsters and terrifying creatures. Vampires, the monsters that once were human beings but after burial turned into blood-eating creatures, became the implement of ecclesial punishment for those the society deemed sinners. As Laurence Rickels formulates it, "[t]he vampire was by definition a dead person who, since not eligible for proper Christian burial in hallowed ground, was on the rebound" (1999, 2). The difference between the victims of Greek gods and these social rejects who were buried outside the consecrated land is that vampires used their new form to plague the very people who cast them out. The typical vengeance of the returned dead was to produce more monsters by biting new victims: in the neck, on the nipple, or between the eyes (Rickels 1999, 3). The change

became a form of revenge or a threat that pestered the society that did not take measures to prevent it. The transforming entity and the object of observance is thus sometimes intentional in its change.

When approaching some other myths of transforming monsters, though, it becomes evident that some of these classic creatures still are victims of some other devices than gods. The origin of transformation is just not always divine, but is rather found in science, as is the case with Frankenstein's monster or giants like Godzilla. The monster is transformed only once, or rather made once, and in its new form wreaks a havoc. Frankenstein can be analysed as an outcome of modern advances, "spurred to some degree by scientific discoveries such as galvanism and electromagnetism" (Gilmore 2003, 63). Godzilla, a mutated reptile character born in post-war Japan, became to embody the nuclear radiation and the horrors of such terrifying weapons as atom bombs (Brothers 2011, 36–37). Though not an intentional product of a scientific test, as Frankenstein's monster is, the giant dragon-like reptile is "a victim of man's tampering with forbidden Promethean knowledge" (Brothers 2011, 38). Though these beings cause damage and casualties, the moral of the transform lies in that the maker is the real monster, not the creature itself.

Essentially, when analysing such creatures made by humans, two discernible loci of horror arise: the monster that produces horror and the monster that produces the monster. Although the transformed being is able to breed destruction and death in itself, the threat continues to exist as long the powers that organised the transformation subsist. The transformed creature, especially in the fiction of nowadays, might require a catalyst in the form of human hubris. Kaplan notes that perhaps such creatures as vampires and werewolves were born out fear of other human beings (2012, 155): after all, they take a human form at some point. Then the underlying ground zero of monstrosity is not the transformed, but the transformer and the endless possible transformation processes. These stories lead the reader to question whether such anomalies are the true villains and point to accuse the master behind the process of transformation. The observer might not be terrified by the object that transforms but the authority that enables such transformation.

Compared to the unholy birth of a vampire and the mishaps of the modern science, the werewolf, one of the pinnacles of transforming monsters, is somewhat more of a product of folklores and magic combined with the mundane fear for predators. Most myths and folklore concerning werewolves involved wearing the skin of the animal as a portal for the transformation from a human being into something else. (Beresford 2013, 73–74). Thus the terms usually also contained the source of the change; such names as *eigi einhamir* ("not of one skin"), *hamrammr* ("skin-changer" or "shapeshifter") (Beresford 2013, 73 and 76) and *versipellis* ("turnskin") (Sconduto 2008, 1). The skin of an animal is a catalyst behind the ability to change and perhaps the horror of such power originates from the amalgamation of forms, the human form and some other animal form. This amalgamation orbits also the failure of categorisation and Otherness: it is the creature that transforms into an in-between shape that produces horror. This shape is the indicator which makes the observer aware of any process of transformation that has occurred out of sight.

Even though ferocious powers as such sound terrifying, the real terror in the ability to change resides once again in the possibility. Endless prospects that are present in the failure of categorisation, as well as powers of creation mentioned with scientific transformations also haunt in form of the transformed monster. In the case were the transformation is a voluntary, possible repeated act by the monster itself, then it can alternate between its dangerous and non-dangerous forms and take its victim by surprise. Kaplan considers the transformation as a weapon in a hunt for victims:

> The fears behind vampires and werewolves are very much the same. With both monsters there is the transformation of a relatively mundane human into a killer. On the face of it, this fear of a human becoming a predator is similar to the fears behind the Nemeon lion, but it is taken a step further. In ancient Greece, lions were nocturnal hunters often not seen until it was too late. However, they were not common in towns, and people often felt safer near their homes. Werewolves and vampires made the monster human and, to a reasonable extent, allowed it to move among us disguised as a mortal.
>
> (2012, 155)

The deceitfulness of the transformation is a fundamental part of the transformation of the monster. This could also be underlying the before mentioned name for werewolves, *versipellis*, whose translation nowadays implies a traitor and a deserter of a cause. The source of fear lies in that the

monster is essentially a monster that has disguised itself before but can reveal itself even after it has been deemed "safe". This questions the stability of the centre, as observation proves to be an unreliable method to uphold the centre in the presence of a creature that can change the parameters that it is categorised with.

Sconduto points out that attitudes towards whether these monsters are inherently evil have changed through centuries: medieval literature, for instance, regarded werewolves as either heroes or victims, but not as the malefactor of the story (Sconduto 2008, 1). However, according to some sources of the past, ability to transform entails a certain recession away from the classification of human. Menghi states in *Compendium* that "unlike us, devils are not subject to their bodies. On the contrary, their bodies are subject to them. Devils in fact transform them into whatever form they wish." (Maggi 2010, 1) This implies that the worst part of the transforming creature is the fact that the observer might have been correct about the categorisation of the entity in the beginning. The failure of categorisation contains the endlessness of the object or the observer's inability or unwillingness to follow through the process of categorisation. In transformations, the object simply changes from the logical form after which the new form negates the original definition: it had boundaries and characteristics that would have made categorisation possible at first, but it is able defy them by transforming.

In this chapter, I have argued that the monster is ontologically constructed through its inherent instability. This means that the character is marked by its resistance to certain conventions; it cannot be defined through conventional categorisation process, it does not remain stationary and it has the ability to change the limits that at first would seem to be reliable enough for categorisation. The failure of categorisation produces horror because the process itself aims to produce predictability and the sense of control. It also introduces the possibility of infinity and reveals the frailty in the categorisation process. The monster also questions the boundaries of the spaces, as it is able to move between spaces and even remain on the threshold. Poststructuralist approach observes the liminality

as a permanently continuous movement in a between-space instead of a single phase when moving from A to B. In addition, the concepts of Otherness and heterotopias are present in the analysis of liminal monsters, as the spaces it frequents are suffused with mental notions of Self and Other. Lastly and somewhat in relation to categorisation, the monster is an unstable character because it entails a possibility to change forms with which it displays distrust towards the initial categorisation. The transformation makes the monster perceivable, exhibiting the existence of the monster from the beginning.

3. Analysis

In this chapter, I will analyse some of the characters in *The Graveyard Book* from the points of view presented in the theoretical background. I will deal with one character at a time. First, I will examine how certain characters endeavour to categorise others and how this categorisation fails with the consequence of branding that person as a monster. In the second part of my analysis, I will concentrate on how some characters that are in the margins of the society and yet can move in between and in the periphery can be read as monsters. The final part of the analysis deals with the monster character's ability to transform. The primary stress in the analysis rests on the examination of characters' reactions, depictions and lines, but from time to time, it is essential to also analyse these factors as they are observed in the text and appear to the reader. Even though most of the characters appearing in the text could be observed as having some or all of the three characteristics, I have narrowed the analysis to comprehend only some of the main characters. These characters, who usually have their own chapters or constantly appear in the narrative, are as follows: Nobody Owens, the protagonist; Silas; the man Jack and the Jacks of All Trades; Miss Lupescu; the ghouls; the Indigo Man and the Sleer; and Liza Hempstock. For the sake of brevity, *The Graveyard Book* edition used in this thesis is often referred to as GB in the references of the analysis.

As was stated in the introduction, the events in Neil Gaiman's *The Graveyard Book* unfold in a world that is more or less cleft in two for the main protagonist: the living and the dead. This division is already evident in the premise of the book: the protagonist is a living boy who, after the murder of his family, is left to live and to grow up with the ghosts in the nearby graveyard, while conscious all the time of the outside world that he was once born into. During the years of his upbringing, Bod is taught by a vampire and a werewolf, encounters an ambiguous monster underground and must survive the outer world of the living people, all the while hiding from a secret society that has infiltrated the living world and seeks to kill him. On his adventures, which are separated into chapters, the protagonist is accompanied by sometimes a witch and sometimes a living child. In the end, the secret

society of Jacks gains on him and in defence of his home graveyard, his family and himself, Bod eliminates the men, but with a cost of losing his friendship with the living girl. The book ends in Bod's departure from the graveyard and the disappearance of the dead people.

I analyse the characters in the order of how much they appear in the *The Graveyard Book*. Nobody "Bod" Owens is the child protagonist, who survives the murder of his family and whose upbringing and growth is followed in the chapters. In addition to having ghost parents, the protagonist is taken care of and protected by a vampire, Silas. The villains of the story are the man Jack and the society he represents, Jacks of All Trades. These three characters appear throughout the story. The four other characters are somewhat minor characters, but have their own respective chapters in which they appear. Miss Lupescu and her werewolf form, the grey large dog, work also to protect to protagonist while teaching him about both of the worlds. To foil the werewolf, the story introduces the ghouls, who abduct the protagonist and attempt to turn him into one of their kind. The Sleer and its scarecrow-like manifestation, the Indigo Man, is a creature found in the graveyard that protects a treasure and waits for its master. Finally, I will analyse the witch character, Liza Hempstock, who Bod befriends during a search for a headstone for her. As was mentioned earlier, I will observe the three dimensions of monstrosity in the characters in relation to how the text describes them and how they themselves react to other characters. This means that I will observe the names and definitions given in the text but also in the dialogue. The manner in which their appearance, their locations and movement are described is also one of the main focus of my analysis.

3.1 Nobody Owens

Even though the protagonist is not a murderer like book's main villain, the man Jack, or a canonical creature from the horror genre like Miss Lupescu, the werewolf, or Silas, the vampire, Bod can be observed as a monster in the book. Unlike most of the monster characters in *The Graveyard Book* who rarely confront actual observers from the living world, Bod is often the epicentre of horror as

emotion. The child of a murdered family and raised by a host of dead people, he is established from the beginning to be a character that has no clear category or a name. Upon his arrival to the graveyard, the inhabitants seek to name him by drawing connections to different people they knew in their past lives. The name is quickly decided by Mrs Owens, the adoptive mother: "[h]e looks like nobody but himself,' said Mrs Owens, firmly. 'He looks like nobody.' (GB, 19). Thus the child is named Nobody Owens. At first such a name functions as a cover against the Jacks, as they are looking for the only surviving member of the Dorian family. Becoming nobody, Bod is protected against the people looking for him.

Being nobody and being something other than a human being in relation to monsters comes into play later in the book as the protagonist attends school and becomes involved in a feud for standing up against bullies. Containing a threat and overcoming it by using Gothic is apparent in Gaiman's book *Wolves in the Walls*, where the ghost-like wolves come out of walls and invade the protagonist's home. According to Coats, the Gothic horror elements are used to "dress up a childhood fear" which is defeated with humour and the protagonist's "assertive agency in the face of that fear" (2008, 83). The childhood fear in *The Graveyard Book* is that of the powerlessness against other children in the school world and like with Lucy in Gaiman's other book, the protagonist assumes agency in the face of the threat. The agency, however, comes in the form of becoming something even more terrifying than the bullies. Bod outsmarts the bullies at school, but also makes him the target for these two children who intimidate and blackmail younger students. After a confrontation, Bod is forced to escape them to the nearest graveyard. There he, by using his ability to disappear, reveals to Mo and Nick, the bullies, that he has abilities beyond the regular human capacity.

The fear induced in Mo and Nick in this sequence does not well from the bullies' recognition of Bod as not belonging to the category of human beings. The knowledge of the fallacious category as such is an outcome of haunting and fear, and they confront Bod about it only later. But nonetheless, it is naming that introduces the horror in the sequence. When Nick tries to hit Bod, he disappears out

of their sight and leave Nick perplexed and Mo convinced that he would have not been able to run away. Then Bod infect these children with "a Frightening" (GB, 176) where an inexplicable fear seises its victim:

> It was twilight in a spooky churchyard, and the hairs on the back of her neck were prickling. 'Something is really, really wrong,' said Mo. Then she said, in a higher-pitched panicky voice, 'We have to get out of here.'
>
> 'I'm going to find that kid,' said Nick Farthing. 'I'm going to beat the stuffing out of him.' Mo felt something unsettled in the pit of her stomach. The shadows seemed to move around them.
>
> 'Nick,' said Mo, 'I'm scared.'
>
> Fear is contagious. You can catch it. Sometimes all it takes is for someone to say that they're scared for the fear to become real. Mo was terrified, and now Nick was too.
>
> (GB, 174)

The situation becomes unreal, impossible and as such "wrong" for Mo and her fear begins to escalate. The source of the fear remains unknown, but by naming the emotion Mo transfers it into her partner. It is as if the emotion does not exist per se before Mo recognises what it is that she is feeling and then names it. The emotion that Bod induces does have parameters; the unsettling sense of something being wrong which takes over as almost a bodily sensation. The fear in this sequence, however, is realised once it is uttered aloud, and Bod remains undefined to them.

Producing the unknown but yet terrible is later shown to be Bod's main weapon against these bullies; when he visits Nick's dreams later, he forces the bully to meet something that Nick does not know and as such cannot control. The unknown produces the expectation of the worst possible threat, because even though Nick cannot say what it is exactly that is haunting his dream, he becomes "utterly, completely certain that whatever it would turn out to be would be the most scary terrible thing he had ever – would ever – encounter" (GB, 182). Thus unknown and unnamed takes the worst possible form in the children's minds in this book. Nick, from his point of view, cannot define what it is that looms at the edges of his conscious dreaming and thus whatever awaits for him outside his centre must be the worst threat.

When Bod appears to Nick in a dream, Nick is quick to state that the unknown man figure in his dream must be "that kid", thus trying to categorise the figure and make sense of the nightmare he

is having. Bod, however, denies Nick such power over his nightmare by stating that a definition "that kid" will not render him safe: "'I,' said his captor, 'am Nobody. And you need to change. Turn over a new leaf. Reform. All that. Or things will get very bad for you'". (GB, 181). Bod's agency in the sequence is that he resists definition and becomes nobody. As he is nobody, Bod's teachers cannot seem to be able to keep the concept of him in their minds, which makes him even more threatening to Mo (GB, 192). It seems to be relevant to Bod that, while others cannot remember him, to Mo he is the child that made her afraid:

> 'I'm not frightened,' she said, aloud.
> 'That's good,' said someone, standing the shadows, by the rear door. 'It seriously sucks to be frightened.'
> She said, 'None of the teachers even remember you.'
> 'But you remember me,' said the boy, the architect of all her misfortune.
> (GB, 192)

Where Nick was faced with his worst unconscious and unsaid fears, Bod makes Mo question the lines between herself and the monster that Bod is capable of being. When he promises to haunt her, he asks whether she has "looked in the mirror wondering if the eyes looking back at you were yours" or if she has ever questioned whether an empty room might not mean that one is alone (GB, 193). Bod, a nobody, makes it clear to the other bully that he has no boundaries and thus can be everywhere. In this sequence he even seems to lack the boundaries that would separate him from Mo and which would separate him from the centre position that Mo has assumed for herself or, in other words, her identity.

While Bod chooses to employ the ambiguous boundaries of himself to induce terror in the bullies, categorisation also works against him and by becoming the terrible, undefinable monster he loses one of his friends. When Scarlett and Bod meet for the first time, he points out that he is a stranger to her. The five-year-old Scarlett is eager to give the stranger boy a definition that carries their relationship to the end of the book: "You're not [a stranger],' she said definitely, 'you're a little boy.' And then she said, 'And you're my friend. So you can't be a stranger.'" (GB, 35). Later in the

same chapter, when Scarlett's parents decide to move to Scotland, she states that Bod is the bravest person she knows and that she does not care even if Bod is an imaginary friend (GB, 53). Who Bod is to her is completely defined by Scarlett and the categories she has decided to give him when they were young. Scarlett has then assumed that she is capable of making such definitions and these categories are also the fundamental factor that causes her to be afraid of Bod in the end.

In the end of the book, Bod injures and kills most of the Jacks that are after him and also gives the man Jack to a monster waiting inside a tomb in the graveyard. The fate of the main villain is witnessed by Scarlett, even though she cannot see the monster. This is the event where Scarlett is forced to encounter the limitations of her categorisation. The fact that Bod is able kill his enemies seems to be in contradiction with her idea of a human being and thus she is forced to re-evaluate Bod: "Scarlett took a step away from him. She said, 'You aren't a person. People don't behave like you. You're as bad as [the man Jack] was. You're a monster." (GB, 268). Not fulfilling the parameters given to him at first is what makes Bod a monster in Scarlett's eyes. The fear and repulsion are caused by the fact that Scarlett has constructed their friendship on the basis that she has a power over categorising Bod who cannot meet the standards given to him. That is to say, Bod deconstructs the boundaries of centre Scarlett has built around herself and their friendship.

Bod as a character is able to move beyond most borderlines; after all, he is the protagonist and as such the point of view to all the adventures presented in the book. Unlike the living, he is able to fully operate in the graveyard, but also unlike the dead, he is not bound by its borders. When observing Bod's movement, it should be noted that while he can transgress boundaries, most often he is propelled into Other spaces because someone else takes him or because he is send on a quest to help someone else. Having moved outside the human world into the ghouls' realm discussed later allows Bod to open the ghoul gate again and destroy the Jacks. Nevertheless, he himself does not move across the boundary, just keeps the portal open so that he can use the Other space to his advantage. (GB, 254–255). He is also able to move to a non-physical dimension that no other character in the

book can travel to: the dreamworld. When the protagonist confronts Nick in his dream, terrified Nick deduces that the confrontations does not happen on the level of reality. To this, Bod answers that naturally the bully is dreaming, because he "would have to be some kind of monster" if he was able to do such things in reality (GB, 181). However, the fact that the protagonist is able to cross into someone's dreaming consciousness proves what kind of borderlines Bod is able to transgress. In other words, his ability to invade such a personal space as the dreaming is what makes him a monster, contrary to his own beliefs.

At the end of the book, Bod loses the citizenship of the graveyard that has allowed him certain ghostlike abilities. The loss of this Freedom of the Graveyard results in that he cannot see the ghosts and he must leave the world of the dead. For example, he cannot slip through walls and objects, the physical boundaries for human beings but insubstantial to the ghosts (GB, 277). While relocating outside the graveyard gives Bod the opportunity to travel around the world and see every place the dead have told him about, he loses his ability to visit the Other spaces or at least experience them as such (GB, 285). Moving permanently from the graveyard makes the protagonist a human and the inability to perceive any other realm takes away his monstrosity; his monstrous ability to move and control the borderline to the red realm of ghouls is replaced by the very human ability to travel. However, it can be questioned whether Bod ever had a space where he would belong and to which he would return. After all, he is a living child inhabiting a space of the dead that cannot sustain his needs. The living world, on the other hand, is the world that is for the duration of the book a life-threatening space for him and considers him strange. This means that the protagonist constantly roams between the two spaces.

In addition to becoming invisible in order to frighten the bullies at school, the protagonist does not often have the ability to change his form in reality. In fact, the only transformation that he undergoes is presented in Nick's dream, and even then the process of change is left abrupt and unclear. The "dead-faced man in pirate costume" that carries a sword makes Nick afraid, but when he realises

that the figure seems familiar and is fact the boy from the school, Bod turns into himself. The change from a pirate to a boy as well as the change of environment from a pirate ship to school is left undescribed and happens between sentences. (GB, 181). The transformation in the dream sequence is firmly connected to the dimension of naming and once the figure is defined as Bod, the spell of the transformation is over. The horror mood induced by these changes is shattered when the bully realises that Bod returns to his vulnerable form, the physical form that Nick was able to hurt before by stabbing the boy with a pencil. Bod in the dream resembles too much Bod in the reality, the fear dissipates and the protagonist must turn to his other abilities to terrify Nick. That is to say, as a transforming monster Bod fails: by his own standards, as he is bound by the dreamworld and cannot really change is form in reality, and by Nick's standards, as the form he returns to is the vulnerable form. The centre that Nick inhabits in relation to form is left intact, as he regains power over Bod's transformation; he knows that it is not happening in reality and thus it gives him control.

All in all, the protagonist is a monster, even though he cannot be explicitly connected to the canon monsters in the horror genre. It is his resistance to categories and ultimately also his inability to fulfil the category given to him that mainly make him such a creature, in addition to some instances of movement and transformation. Being Nobody by name gives him the possibility to be no one and thus unbound by definition. In this regard, the protagonist resembles his enemy, the man Jack, as will be observed later: both of them are given names that have no substance that would provide others a predictive control over them. However, where the man Jack's ambiguous name is a cover for his actions, Bod requires an agency through his monstrosity that enables him to defeat his bullies. The categorisation and its failure works against Bod when he cannot conform to Scarlett's expectations; being something else that his friend expected induces fear in Scarlett. Bod as a character is able to move beyond borders to visit different spaces, but more significantly, his ability to open the gate between the graveyard and the ghoul world is what undoes the Jacks. In the end, he loses this dimension of monstrosity, when he relinquish the Freedom of the Graveyard and leave his home in

order to join the humanity. Finally, it should be stated that while Bod does not use transformation more than once, he uses it to terrify another child. The process of change is not presented in the text. Even though he is not able to change in such a manner in the waking world, it does not make Nick's horror less real. Thus the transformation does make Bod a monster; a one that fails because recognising him as Bod renders him safe to Nick.

3.2 Silas

The protagonist Bod is from the beginning of the book protected by Silas, a character who is powerful enough to control the man Jack and who is respected by the whole graveyard. Though the book does not leave the character's connection to a canonical horror figure ambiguous in terms of description, it is a significant constituent of Silas that he is never directly mentioned to be a vampire. Establishing that he is a vampire requires the observation of the character throughout the book, as every sequence where Silas appears contains cues to some canonical features of vampires. Most obvious of these cues relate to his diet, lack of reflection, sleeping and supernatural abilities to control minds and fly. For instance, when Mrs Owens asks the man what bananas taste like, Silas admits to not knowing, as he "consumed only one food, and it was not bananas" (GB, 22). At the end of the book, it is noted that the guardian does not have a reflection in the polished table-top at a restaurant (GB, 272). Silas as a character carries out the basic process of categorisation where the category is deduced from separate features that are put together to form a whole. Regardless of these features being evident in the text and to the other characters in the book, a name for the category remains unrevealed. The protagonist even asks about how Silas could be classified and Miss Lupescu hesitatingly states that he is "a solitary type" (GB, 63). The classification of Silas does not fail in this regard, but the process of categorisation is left unfinished, questioning whether categorisation serves a purpose here. After all, he is "a solitary type" and does not as such represent any larger group of beings. Classifying Silas

would give him a name, but would not help to make sense or predict any other beings in the society of the book.

Despite being solitary, Silas does have a group of creatures he belongs to, though no other such being presents itself in the book. The text often refers to Silas' "kind" when Silas explains to Bod how he exists or functions. Silas does exist between categories or "on the borderland between [the dead] world and the world they had left" (GB, 23) that make the people of the graveyard wary but also respectful. As such, the character contains the dilemma of how to categorise such a being that is neither but has features of the both. Counterstating this idea, Silas comments that his existence and the existence of his kind hold very little room for oscillation or contradictions: "'I,' said Silas, 'am precisely what I am, and nothing more. I am, as you say, not alive. But if I am ended, I shall simply cease to be. My kind *are*, or we are *not*. If you see what I mean.'" (GB, 166). With this statement Silas refers to the inhabitants of the graveyard who though deceased continue to make choices and continue their, if not living, their existence in the graveyard. To Silas' kind, there are only two poles of being: existing, which is what he is doing at that current moment, and not existing.

Bod does not consider Silas as an instance of any particular group of beings, but he does think about his guardian in terms of an ambiguous "kind". To him, Silas' indeterminate traits concern their parent-child relationship and the terms of how to show affection to some like Silas. Bod notes that while hugging his guardian would be possible, it is not something they would do: "there were people you could hug, and then there was Silas" (GB, 139). The ambiguity of Silas does not stir terror in the protagonist, but redefines their family bond and communication. Bod's fear of Silas is related to abandonment and the child-like fear of hurting the parent-figure's feelings: "His guardian looked almost heartbroken then, and Bod found himself scared, like a child who has woken a sleeping panther" (GB, 153). In other words, the fact that Silas and his reference groups stays some undefined even to Bod does not produce fear in him. The uncategorised existence of Silas does not threaten the

centre that Bod has created for himself, because he has not constructed the centre on the fact that he could ever define his guardian.

While the book does not call the character a vampire, it brings forward the question of what can be referred to as a monster. This dilemma is addressed by Bod, Mrs Owens but also Silas himself in the book. To the protagonist, who does not directly use the word “monster”, the question is not so much connected to what Silas could do as it is connected to their interpersonal relationship; the word does not refer to his actions but it is meant to hurt his guardian. He asks his guardian whether Silas is going to kill him if he does not obey the rules set by the guardian and later confesses to the witch that he said things to Silas that might anger him (GB, 180 and 184). Killing as connected to being a monster on an ethical level is later introduced by Mrs Owens, when Bod wonders why Silas did not simply kill the man Jack when they met: "He’s not a monster, Bod.’ (GB, 201). Here the definition of a monster and “monster” as a name is connected to the moral choice of killing someone and the fact that he did not kill the man Jack leaves Silas outside of the category of monsters for Mrs Owens. While Silas does seems to agree to a certain point with Mrs Owens that he is not a monster, he acknowledges that in the past he would have warranted the word:

> Silas said, ‘I have not always done the right thing. When I was younger… I did worse things than Jack. Worse than any of them. I was the monster, then, Bod, and worse than any monster.’
>
> It did not even cross Bod’s mind to wonder if his guardian was lying or joking. He knew he was being told the truth. He said, ‘But you aren’t that any longer, are you?’
>
> Silas said, ‘People can change,’ and then fell silent.
>
> (GB, 285)

To Silas, there seems to be a dimension beyond “monster”, as he states that what he did was beyond the deeds that would entitle the name. It is notable that here the monstrosity is connected to humanity and what can be possibly made sense with morally, but for Silas, the monster does not cover all unconscionable actions. While the change in this particular matter is not connected to a transformation, the parameters with which Silas was defined before have changed and the vampire character has become not a dreaded monster but a safe and dependable parent figure who according

to Mrs Owens always means what is best for the protagonist (GB, 200). Thus Silas refers to two different instances where he was subjected to the process of categorisation: before and now.

Silas being frozen between the dead and the living is significant when observing him from the point of view of movement and liminality. As was stated before, he considers his own existence to be relatively straightforward, whereas the denizens of the graveyard consider him to be somewhat unconnected to their world and thus treat him with "a certain wary awe" (GB, 23). When the protagonist strays into the graveyard and into the care of the family Owens, Silas is appointed as a guardian for his ability to move outside the graveyard (GB, 18), although his movement is confined compared to Miss Lupescu. For instance, as will be mentioned in the subchapter dealing with Miss Lupescu, Silas is not able to cross the boundary between the red realm of ghouls and the human world. Unlike Liza Hempstock, who can leave the graveyard but returns to her gravesite, the vampire does not have his own Other space. Even though Mrs Owens cannot leave the graveyard, Silas considers them fortunate: "'It must be good,' said Silas, 'to have somewhere that you belong. Somewhere that's home.' There was nothing wistful in the way said this" (GB, 23). Even though Silas sleeps in the graveyard's chapel, he does not have a return point from where he would visit human world. Like Bod, Silas is a roamer, moving between spaces but never having one that would be his.

As movement has been the distinctive factor in many of the monster characters in the book, Silas revokes the idea of liminality as appearing always as movement or transgression of boundaries. Both the dead society and the living society take part in Danse Macabre, an event where the two distinct worlds draw closer to each other just to return to their ordinary conventions: "[t]hey took hands, the living with the dead, and they began to dance" (GB, 147). This relates to Irigaray's idea of the Other visiting the Self and being a welcome guest that ultimately clears room for the Self to move; although the dance is presented as a tradition and what it gives to the living is left uncertain, the dead break free from the graveyard, which to the living is an Other space, and visit the living and their space. Silas, too, is an Other, but he is not an Other in the sense the dead are. Where the liminality of

the dead are established in this chapter by moving outside their given space, Silas excluded from their dance and stands still:

> *Everyone*, thought Bod, *everyone is dancing!* He thought it, and as soon as he thought it, he realised that he was mistaken. In the shadows by the old town hall, a man was standing dressed all in black. He was not standing. He was watching them.
>
> (GB, 149–150)

In this sequence that embodies the oscillating movement of liminality, the heterotopias are constructed on two different levels. The dead move away from their heterotopia, the graveyard, and approach the world of the living. Silas' Otherness, on the other hand, is defined by his inability to join the dance and the movement, where everybody else is participating in and as such, his Otherness in relations to movement differs from all the other characters in the book. He is pushed to the margin, the space outside the dance, but he remains still.

While Silas does not transform in the book more than once, it is a transformation that connects him to the some of the vampire stories. Dracula, for example, sometimes assumes the form of the bat and is thus "a cross between human and animal" (Gilmore 2003, 63). As the police arrest Bod and he is put into the police car, he realises that something flying is following them:

> He glanced out of the car window. Something huge was flying through the air, above the car and to one side, something darker and bigger than the biggest bird. Something man-sized that flickered and fluttered as it moved, like the strobing flight of a bat.
>
> (GB, 187)

Not much more is related of Silas' form as he flies to save his ward: just that it is larger than any bird and that he moves like a bat. Nobody else witnesses this form than Bod, but when the vampire dives in front of the car and collides with it, the other police says that it was not necessarily a human being they hit: "'I'm not sure what I saw,' said the larger policeman. 'You hit something, though'". In such ambiguous terms is Silas' transformed form dealt with and as the police approach the body lying on the ground, he is already in the human form. (GB, 187). The transformation serves only the purpose of flying to save Bod and outside the movement no process of change is apparent. The function of Silas' transformation is to protect the protagonist and leave the police in fear, but not in the fear of

his changing forms. As he flies in front of the car, Bod claims that Silas is his father and that the police run over him on purpose. The accusation leads the police to argue over what to do, which leaves Bod and Silas enough time to escape. The police are not afraid of a monster, but rather the repercussions of driving over a human being. Hence, the transformation that remains unseen by the police does not threaten their centres and as a consequence cause fear. The sole observers of the transformation are Bod and the reader, who is now made aware of Silas' ability to change.

When Silas is observed in the book, one of the most conspicuous components of the character is how he is never directly called a vampire. The reader has to deduce the character's connection to the traditions of the horror genre by piecing together features. Even though there are enough features to validate the category, no such direct connection is made, even though the protagonist wonders where Silas fits in the system presented by Miss Lupescu. The text implies that there are others like Silas, as he tends to employ a term "his kind" and as such there is a baseline or a group against which Silas could be categorised. To Bod, the guardians "kind" does not deal with taxonomy as such but questions how to relate to his guardian from a child's perspective. Where "vampire" is left unsaid, Silas is discussed as "a monster" in the book. The three character that bring out the subject deal with it from different perspectives: Bod from the point of view of hurting his guardian's feelings, Mrs Owens in relation to morality and Silas in relation to his past and something beyond a monster. Like Miss Lupescu, Silas is able to move between the worlds and for that, he was chosen as a protector, but unlike the werewolf, Silas' movement has limitations. In the chapter of "Danse Macabre", the character's liminality can be analysed in relation to the liminality of the dead who in turn are liminal in relation to the living; the idea of Other always moving is invalidated by the Other who cannot move. Lastly, it should be stated that transformation is not a significant part of Silas; he changes only once to save his ward. The transformation is very sudden and the description of his other form is ambiguous and vague. No process of change as such is described in the text and it is not his form that unnerves the police but the realistic scenario of running down a human being.

3.3 The Man Jack and Jacks of All Trades

The Graveyard Book begins with the introduction of the main villain who has just murdered the protagonist's whole family and is about to finish his mission by killing the infant protagonist. At first, it would seem that the murderer is a human being, considering that he is described as having used a knife as a murder weapon and has to track the escaped toddler by foot. Many of the monsters in the book, such as Silas, or Miss Lupescu, as will be discussed later refer to certain known monsters in the Western culture, even though it is their ambiguity and contradiction that causes fear. This villain has an appearance of a human and is, for example, susceptible to Silas' mind control ability. Nonetheless, in the absence of any references to canonical horror monsters or even cues, as is the case with Silas, it is the small details in the villain that bring forth the question whether he is an ordinary human being and whether he is capable of something supernatural. The villain introduced at the beginning and who frequently appears throughout the story, the man Jack is a character of no category.

The neat and immaculate appearance of the character is a factor that introduces the contradiction between the character's humanity and inhumanity; as a man with dark hair and dark eyes and thin black gloves, he is seems to have a guise of a meticulous person. This assumption is even more emphasised by the man Jack's own opinion of himself as a professional "who would not allow himself to smile until the job was completed." (GB, 4). Connections to high culture have been used before in relation to killers, especially with the consequence of elevating the characters in the hierarchy of criminals. Such cultural cues and the grotesque juxtaposition creates a suspension: "In the hands of these aesthete-killers, beauty gets redefined in terms of violence, creating a tension between culture and barbarism that inverts Matthew Arnold's notion of culture as a civilizing and humanizing force". (Fahy 2003, 28).

However, this tension between violence and civilisation is not necessarily the main dehumanising factor in the man Jack. Searching for the runaway baby, the man Jack has a set of skills

that begins to separate him from a category of an ordinary human. His eyes are accustomed to the dark and he has a keen sense of smell and an uncanny ability to discern between scents. The sense is so strong that he can even track the correct direction in which the baby escaped. (GB, 4–5). The beginning of the book gives the man Jack an animalistic nuance, as if he was a predator in the concrete sense of the word. In this manner, he could be close to something like the werewolf as monster: an agent that borrows traits from human beings and animals. This quality of the character is only revealed to the reader; in other words, the reader's position is the only position that is left to question whether the man Jack is a human being or not.

As the story moves forward, yet another side manifests in the character. When the greedy pawnshop keeper Abanazar Bolger and his accomplice contemplate whether to inform the man Jack about the capture of the protagonist, the murderer seems to be aware of the incident even though the men finally decide not to call him. The text describes him being alerted but not completely having knowledge what have just transpired:

> Two hundred miles away, the man Jack woke from his sleep, and sniffed the air. He walked downstairs.
>
> 'What is it? asked his grandmother, stirring the contents of a big iron pot on the stove. 'What's got into you now?'
>
> 'I don't know,' he said. 'Something's happening. Something. . . interesting.' And then he licked his lips. 'Smells tasty,' he said. 'Very tasty.'
>
> (GB, 127)

It is as if his knowledge of Bod's capture is a sensory stimulus to which the man Jack reacts with his senses. It is also notable that in the same chapter, as the shopkeeper first remembers that the man Jack and his associates are still looking for the baby they lost years ago, he considers "summoning" the man. There are instructions written on the black business card how to 'summon' Jack, even though Bolger notes that such a process can hardly be forgotten. (GB, 117). The word, though used to mean only to "call for" or "notify", has a more ominous connotation when combined with the horror genre. As summoning Jack has specific instructions written on a simple card, it almost gives the character a demonic overtone, and not an ordinary demon either. Bolger corrects his own thoughts and adds that

'invite' is a better word, as one does not "summon people like him" (GB, 117). However, what he is is never directly stated, just like Silas is left intentionally without a definitive name.

When the man Jack is faced with the monster Sleer during the final battle against the Jacks, he seems to be even more ambiguous in terms of what kind of a creature he is in the end. Bod's friend, Scarlett, like other human beings, cannot see or hear the Sleer, even though she can sense that the chamber holds something malevolent (GB, 49). However, when the man Jack enters Sleer's chamber, his humanity is questioned as he states that he can hear the snake-like creature:

> THE SLEER GUARDS THE TREASURE FOR THE MASTER.
> 'Who said that?' asked the man Jack, looking around.
> ' You heard it?' asked Bod, puzzled.
> 'I heard it,' said Jack. 'Yes.'
> Scarlett said, 'I didn't hear anything.'
>
> (GB, 261)

This establishes that the man Jack has other abilities that, like Bod, define him as a human being with extraordinary or non-human powers. However, this loss of definition does not give rise to fear, but rather makes the protagonist confused. Not being what the protagonist expected and being closer to the same category as the protagonist is what produces the confusion in this sequence. Bod assumed that the man Jack must be like Scarlett and this assumption and the centre created by it is put at stake; but rather than being different from Bod, the emotion is induced by being like him, which is something he does not anticipate.

As the story is centred on a life of a child, the themes of parenthood and family are brought to foreground. Instead of observing parents or stepparents as the source of evil, as some fairy tales do, the book approaches the subject from an unconventional direction. Just as the protagonist has to solve the mystery of who his biological parents are and what he was named, the man Jack too is briefly discussed in the terms of being someone's child. Monsters very often lack a background story that concerns a family or then it is one of the catalysts behind their monstrous deeds: Hannibal Lecter, for instance, had a sister whose death affected his murders (Gregory 2002, 104). The fact that such characters as the man Jack does not have a family or an ordinary origin is noted by Mrs Owens at the

beginning of the book, when someone mistakes the man Jack looking for a child for Bod's father: "'he dun't look like nobody's family, that one'" (GB, 9). Yet this notion is proved wrong to the reader as the man Jack's grandmother briefly appears in the text. Instead of being connected anyhow to the plan the man Jack and his order have, the woman is mentioned in very quotidian circumstances, in other words cooking. This, unlike his inhuman powers and abilities, bring the character closer to the class of mundane human beings, but does not restore confidence in the fact that the man Jack can be categorised as plainly human. Once again, the reader is left with the uncertainty of what kind of creature this character is.

How the main antagonist is able to do things that normal human beings cannot do is explained in the association with the whole group of Jacks. This set of villains is mostly mentioned throughout the first half of the book. Bolger notes that "a party" is looking for a small boy (GB, 118) and later, as an interlude to chapters that describes Bod's teenage years, the text presents a charity convention where men from all corners of the world have gathered to admire their "Good Deeds Done" as well as to plot the capture and murder of the protagonist. From this point of view, the villains are presented as gentlemen, dressed in black suits and involved in charity work. (GB, 155–157). It too creates the connection between the high culture and absolute violent acts in the society and juxtaposes their philanthropic endeavours with their murderous tendencies. The fact that they have taken poor children on holidays or bought expensive and life-saving hospital equipment is contradicted by their plans to take a child's life. The contradiction leads ultimately to question whether their actions can be reasoned with. The text reveals the imbalance of the categorisation and the features that define the categorisation: the weight of the murder as a single deed or a single defining action is far greater than the sum of these good deeds that would make them gentlemen or philanthropic.

What the Jacks do becomes relevant when observing them in relation to other monsters in the book: in many ways the Jacks can be compared the Sleer as a monster. It is a secret organisation that, like the snake monster in the graveyard, has persisted time and the change of societies, as Mr Dandy

tells the protagonist: “We go back extremely long way. We know… we remember things that most people have forgotten. The Old Knowledge”. This old knowledge is hinted to be something close to necromancy, “a magic you take from death.” (GB, 252–253). In addition to this, however, the organisation functions like the Sleer, as will be discussed later: it has a front end that appears to most people, and the far larger and terrifying back end that is revealed only when the monster is threatened. The Jacks use their charity work and other official connections as a cover that hides most of their work: “There was nothing official about the Jacks of All Trades, although there had been Jacks in governments and in police forces and in other places besides”. (GB, 244). This makes the Jacks a relatively dangerous group of monsters: most of the world does categorise them with the very limited knowledge available, while its secret parts infiltrate and uphold various institutions.

Having absolute power is constructed also by how the members of the secret society are named. The villains have such names as Jack Tar, Jack Dandy, Jack Ketch, Jack Nimble and Jack Frost and they are referred to with phrases such as “every man Jack of us” and “Jacks of All Trades” (GB, 157 and 244), the first meaning “every individual man” (the OED, s.v. *Jack* n., sense 2c). Some of the names signify how widely they have infiltrated into the society. Jack Tar can be read to represent armed forces, or more specifically the navy as it is an appellation for a sailor (the OED, s.v. *Jack-tar*), while Jack Ketch, a historical executioner, symbolises the justice system (the OED, s.v. *Jack Ketch*). Compared to these readings, Jack Dandy is more ambiguous one, as the name relates to a jack-a-dandy or a fop (the OED, s.v. *jack-a-dandy*), but it could be read as a reference to an upper middle class or middle class that gave rise to the particular gentleman culture. The two other names, however, have more to do with children’s rhymes and fairy tales: Jack Nimble refers to the traditional nursery rhyme “Jack Be Nimble”, whereas Jack Frost is connected to the personification of winter in the poem “Little Jack Frost: A Rhyme for Flossie” (Sangster 1875).

Giving such names to this band of gentlemen exposes the weakness of categorising with names: if names do not have any substance, they offer nothing in terms of categorisation and leaves

the object without a definition. The sole basis of naming people with proper names is to make distinctions between individuals in speech and to identify a separate entity (Pärli 2011, 199). The Jacks share a common proper name and are only distinguished by the added noun at the end, but other than that, they cannot be separated with naming otherwise. Considering that these people come from around the world, it is obvious that the names are cover names, and the identity behind the names is left unrevealed. As such, they cannot be reasoned with or construed as individuals but rather as a herd. They are basically every individual man which leads to the dilemma that if they are everyone, they can be everything at once and nothing at all, at least in terms of anything predictable. The children's rhyme names also mock the endeavour to categorise these men with names, as they are, like the characters they were named after, fictional and nothing but fallacious constructs to the observer.

The man Jack and the Jacks are not the types of monster that move through social or physical dimensions in the text as such. However, it should be stated that even if this secret society is not able to travel outside the human realm or at least is not demonstrated to do so or enjoy the privileges of the graveyard, they neither inhabit any space whatsoever. The ghouls for example, even though able to visit a multitude of spaces, return to their home, Ghûlheim, and the Sleer is bound to the tumulus, or the burial mound, despite the objects that can carry its essence outside the graveyard. The Jacks, being everyone, can also be analysed to be everywhere. After all, they are established to be ingrained in institutions and the societies of different countries. Thus, it could be stated that the Jacks do not have an Other space from which they could visit the space of I. But in addition to not belonging in any spatial dimension in particular, they are not connected to any temporal dimension either. The Sleer does exist in the modern era depicted in the book, but it was created in the past and it guards the past treasure. Miss Lupescu, as will be later discussed, is firmly connected to the history as she is referenced to belong into a certain utterance in the past of the Hounds of Gods, even though she functions in the now. The Jacks, on the other hand, have existed in the past but have evolved at the

same time: they received the prophecy about the protagonist "in pyramid days" but want to, by murdering the protagonist, "keep everything tickety-boo for another five thousand years" (GB, 253). They do not move between two times, but have become the ruling class of the modern era. I argue that the dislocation from time and geography creates a heterotopia for them and that Jacks then exist in the liminal space of the society. By this I mean that they appear to be temporarily infinite, as they have existed so long and yet as a group have adapted to the times and cultures and this separates them from other people who do not function outside the concepts of time and location-bound cultures.

The only notable movement of the Jacks is that of the man Jack. It does not involve any actual physical movement of the character, but rather a connection between the character and an object that carries him. As will be dealt with the Sleer, the sequence in question contains two different monsters that possess objects and move with them. Even though the man Jack is not physically per se present in the pawnshop, he is latched onto an item. This item in question is the business card that Bolger has in his shop. While it does not have a transforming surface and expressions like the snake-stone possessed by the Sleer has, the business card is a possessed object in a manner. When the protagonist observes it, he becomes unnerved: "Bod looked at the black-edged card with the word JACK handwritten on one side. It disturbed him. There was something familiar about it, something that stirred old memories, something dangerous". He also refuses to take it with him, but Liza recognises it as something important that should not be burned. This possibly refers to accidentally summoning the man Jack, but all the same, the protagonist touching the business card is what wakes the villain 200 miles away. (GB, 126–127). Thus the item is something that carries the man Jack and enables his surveillance even from long distances, but this is not revealed to the characters. Just as I analysed with some instances of categorisation, the man Jack's connection to the object is presented only the reader.

When observing these villains from the point of view of transformation, it can be stated that the Jacks as a group do not use any other forms to hide their identity, in addition to having cover

names. This is not the case of the man Jack, who, as the main villain and the most clearly distinguished of the Jacks, is able to transform. When Scarlett meets the amiable Mr Frost in the graveyard, he is described to be a man with thinning hair and a pair of glasses and dressed in a beige raincoat. She notes that with the glasses the man resembles “a friendly owl”. (GB, 205–206). This encounter creates the baseline for how Scarlett perceives the man Jack later in the book, as she considers him a harmless older man. It is notable that the physical appearance of Jack Frost is not going through as fundamental a change as the werewolf, but the changes are uncannily small and inconspicuous. At the beginning he wears black and has black hair, but as he himself note, “hair gets thin and goes grey, in thirteen years” (GB, 238). That is to say, the disguise seems to be natural. Another significant aspect of the man Jack’s looks is that people describe him to Bod as being something frightening and aggressive: “he had dark hair, very dark. And I was frightened of him. He had a sharp face. Hungry and angry all at once, he was” (GB, 201). The mien of the man Jack and Mr Frost differ extensively and the manner with which they carry themselves is a component of the change.

Where most characters in the book do change but do not undergo the change while being observed, thus leaving the process itself veiled, the man Jack does it in front of the protagonist. The line between these two forms of a man is drawn by using names; Mr Frost takes Bod upstairs to show him a letter hidden between the floorboards, but as he turns back to face the protagonist, the text refers to the man as the man Jack. This change in naming portends the change that Bod observes in the next paragraph: “Bod stared at him. It was as if Mr Frost had been a coat or a hat the man had been wearing, that he had now discarded. The affable exterior had gone”. (GB, 238). Even though the outcome of the change is apparent, in other words the friendly Mr Frost had disappeared in front of his eyes, Bod cannot describe the precise components that change. Instead, Mr Frost is considered as a piece of clothing or a skin that the man Jack has been using to gain the children’s trust. Even the ghosts of the graveyard cannot seem to pinpoint how the form of the character has changed: “He’s the one who’s been all around the graveyard for the last month. But here’s something different about

him" (GB, 250). Even to these observers, the ghosts, the change is something intangible and indefinable.

Alternatively, the text brings forth the children's horror aspect of a friendly neighbour turning into something dangerous. The possible danger of meeting a strange adult is earlier discussed in the book, as Mr Frost offers to take Scarlett home and she first refuses as she has been taught not to take a lift from strangers. Mr Frost seems to understand this and offers her his mobile phone as a token of mutual trust. Instead of turning out to be a dangerous man here and reaffirming the actual threat the situation can entail for children, Mr Frost remains unchanged until his meeting with Bod. The trust and affinity to the man is the reason why the initial change from Mr Frost to the man Jack does not terrify Scarlett as much as the last transformation. Her reaction to finding out that Mr Frost was the man Jack is confusion and she even admits to being "scared of nice Mr Frost and his scarier friends" (GB, 258). Later, however, when Bod has led the man Jack to the Sleer and the snake monster has the man in its coils, Scarlett is terrified by the dissonance of Mr Frost and the man Jack and his ultimate fate:

> What Scarlett saw was not what Bod saw. She did not see the Sleer, and that was a mercy. She saw the man Jack, though. She saw the fear in his face, which made him look like Mr Frost had once looked. In his terror he was once again the nice man who had driven her home. . . Mr Frost, the man Jack, whoever he was, was pulled away from them, forced back until he was spread-eagled, arms and legs wide and flailing, against the side of the chamber wall.
>
> (GB, 266)

This alternation and the violence of what happens to him causes fear in her, but also rage, as she considers Bod liable for what happened (GB, 267). Scarlett is forced to perceive two changes. The first is the one from Mr Frost to the man Jack that forces her re-evaluate how she saw Mr Frost. This makes her afraid of the man Jack, as the transformation imposes a threat to the centre she created by assuming that Mr Frost is an unchangeable human being. The other change is the fluctuation of changes from the man Jack back to Mr Frost that induces empathy in Scarlett with the consequence of considering Bod a monster.

From one point of view, the sequence described above is unusual compared to most of the transformations in the book. To the point of the scene in the tumulus, transformation from one form to another has been the catalyst for fear. To revoke this rule, it is the man Jack's fear that turns him into Mr Frost in Scarlett's eyes. In other words, the direction of the chain of events is reversed and the fear becomes a catalyst for the transformation. It should also be noted that the change or the flux of changes is involuntary, unlike the change from Mr Frost to the man Jack. This is stated when the man Jack tries to beckon Scarlett to him but cannot assume the role of Mr Frost anymore: "'Scarlett,' he called, trying to remember how he would have called her name when he was Mr Frost, but he could not even find that part of himself any longer: he was the man Jack now, and that was all he was" (GB, 258). Mr Frost appears to be the man Jack's reflexive reaction to being afraid, whereas to the man Jack Mr Frost is a disguise.

The man Jack and the Jacks of All Trades are the villains that pursue the protagonist throughout the plot, even though they do not appear in every chapter. As monsters, they employ the failure of categorisation most of the time; the man Jack alternates between being a human being, a predator and something supernatural, whereas the Jacks mostly alternate between being gentlemen and murderers. These dimensions concern how they are described and what they are described to be doing. Then again, naming and its contradictory nature is brought to foreground with their proper names; the references to various levels of society and children's culture imply that if the names do not offer anything in terms of recognising and classifying them, they can be anyone. Not much can be said of these characters in relation to movement, other than that the man Jack resembles the Sleer in its possession of an object and movement with it even though the character is not actually present in the sequence. The Jacks, who do not belong to any time or place, have created a heterotopia-like niche for themselves by hiding in the plain sight. Finally, it can be stated that while the Jacks as a group do not use transformation to their advantage, the man Jack uses the disguise of Mr Frost to capture the protagonist. The man Jack does not undergo a considerable physical change, but rather

has changed with age and in mien. The actual change process is observed twice, the first resembling taking off a piece of clothing and the second as a fluctuation of transformation between two forms. A notable aspect of this character's transformation is that the second time he changes, the transformation is a product of fear rather than a catalyst of fear: the man Jack changes back into Mr Frost because he himself is afraid. This makes the man Jack an unusual monster in comparison to other characters in the book.

3.4. Miss Lupescu and the Large Grey Dog

Miss Lupescu, Bod's second guardian and teacher, is introduced as a woman with a disapproving mien and grey hair and crooked set of teeth (GB, 59). She is not present in more than a couple of chapters, but the ambiguous descriptions regarding her, the mysterious connections between her and the dog and her overwhelming manifestation as something unseen but heard make her a prominent monster character. In addition to the description of her looks above, nothing else is straightforward stated of her person or origins. The character is not more inclined to introduce her backstory; on the contrary, she simply states where her temporary lodgings reside, her cover story for her daily visits in the graveyard and finally her name. She dislikes Bod's sobriquet and refuses to call him with it: "I will call you "boy". You will call me "Miss Lupescu."" (GB, 60). This announcement reveals how she prefers to be seen at least by her ward: simply by name and no other definition. Also in the context of calling Bod by his assumed gender category, "Miss Lupescu" seems more of a category than a name. This interpretation is further reasserted not much later when she teaches Bod about different kinds of people:

> 'Repeat after me, there are the living and the dead, there are day-folk and night-folk, there are ghouls and mist-walkers, there are the high hunters and the Hounds of God. Also there are solitary type.'
>
> 'What are you?' asked Bod.
>
> 'I,' she said sternly, 'am Miss Lupescu.'
>
> (GB, 63)

Considering how vague these other categories are, with ghouls being an exception, "Miss Lupescu" sounds an intentionally obscure classification.

A more precise picture of what or who this teacher is is slowly revealed in the same chapter. A large, grey dog appears in the graveyard at the same time as Miss Lupescu arrives and her behaviour is somewhat animal, as she sniffs the air like a dog upon meeting Bod for the first time (GB, 65 and 59). Despite these hints, she and the large dog are regarded as different entities by Bod. It is not until the appearance of the ghouls that the large dog is revealed to be something else than an ordinary dog, as they call it a "ware dog" by its smell (GB, 67). Other than by its smell, the dog is not described at this point to be anyhow abnormal. At this point, the protagonist is also not afraid of the dog, but rather wants to befriend it. When the dog shows no interest in the boy, Bod throws mud at it (GB, 66). Later, however, when Bod faces the creature, it clearly does not warrant the usual category of a dog and this is the point where the protagonist's reactions to the dog begins to change. It is not clearly indicated in the text that Bod mentally combines this large dog and that "something huge and grey" that seems to pursue him and the ghouls in the realm of Ghûlheim (GB, 82), but it seems that for a moment he regards them as two different canine creatures. The monstrous dog that Bod actually refers to as a monster in his thoughts seems more of a wolf with its "wolfish howls" than a dog (GB, 79–83).

In the travel sequence from the ghoul-gate to the city of the ghouls, the large dog is mostly unseen, but creates an oppressive presence that follows Bod and the ghouls like a ghost. The problem with the failure of categorisation also occurs in this sequence. At first, the dog appears in the hellish realm of ghouls just in the form of noise that causes the ghouls, who declared to be afraid of nothing, huddle closer to their fire and sniffle and curse (GB, 77–78). As the howling draws nearer, the ghouls even deny the existence of such presence that would terrify them:

> Something howled, off in the desert to their left, and the ghouls eyed each other. It was louder than the night before, and closer: a deep, wolfish howl
>
> 'Did you hear that?' asked the Lord Mayor of London.
>
> 'Nope,' said the Thirty-Third President of the United States.
>
> 'Me neither,' said the Honourable Archibald Fitzhugh.
>
> The howl came again.

'We got to get home,' said the Duke of Westminster, hefting a large stone.
(GB, 79)

Eventually, some of the ghouls disappear in the darkness. The large dog that haunts them is referred to as "just something out there in the desert" (GB, 77) and this something that moves in the darkness embodies the horror of something that cannot be categorised; if the monster is not known or it remains obscure enough, it can be endlessly everything and thus horrible.

Also notable about the haunting of the large dog is that as the ghouls cannot know who or what in reality took their companions, they rather accuse the enemy they know and that is then safer to them: "there were those… who believed that something, probably the night-gaunts, was out to get them" (GB, 79). After all, the night-gaunts, large bird-like creatures that populate the skies of the hellish realm, are not monsters as such to ghouls; they are a possible threat, but one the ghouls regard as predators and, even on occasion, a meal that can cause troubles (GB, 75). Even though it is later revealed that it truly was the night-gaunts that took some of the ghouls during the night, the monstrous thought of something unknown embellish their imagination. Bod, for his part, realises the horrifying possibility that the unseen wolf-dog is, especially in relation to the reactions of the ghouls. He considers that "anything that could terrify the ghouls-folk must itself be even more terrifying than he could imagine" (GB, 81). In other words, Bod does not have to know what the creature really is that is chasing them, because he is able to read the signals in the ghouls' reactions. For him, the monster is not in the concrete existence yet, but the creature is formed through the reactions of others and belongs in Bod's mind in the category "the monster that frightens other monster". This ambiguous parameter for categorisation is enough to make Bod afraid of the grey dog.

Later, when the large grey dog is revealed to be Miss Lupescu, it becomes evident in the text that this is not necessarily the typical werewolf from the horror stories. First of all, it is notable that the reader must at the beginning of the chapter be able to divulge from the textual evidence that this creature is what could be called a werewolf, as it is only later directly stated in the text. Before the direct quote that refers to werewolves, it is only implied through various cultural hints, such as the

changing into a larger than normal canine. The abnormally large dog is not a dog, as the protagonist assumed first, but a monster that is able to chase and terrify such beings as ghouls even in their own territory.

Naming the large creature that Miss Lupescu can become presents another substantial problem in categorisation: what she is called varies according different characters and thus referring to them is quite an unreliable manner with which the character is classified. For instance, the ghouls call her a "hellhound" when they decide to leave Bod behind (GB, 83). The name "hellhound" has a certain cultural content that is connected to the devil; in Milton's *Paradise Lost* they are connected to the deceitfulness of the devil and general disturbance (Edwards 2007, 87). It is notable that this name is given for the creature before Bod realises it to be his guardian. After the revelation, Miss Lupescu presents a contradictory name for herself that, too, has a meaning in folktales, as she tells Bod that she is "a Hound of God" and thus able to travel to Hell and back (GB, 86). This name introduces a rather different view to the history of werewolves that requires a look into a specific instance in the folklore. A witch trial record recounted by Carlo Ginzburg deals with a Livonian case where an 80-year-old man confesses to be a werewolf in the court but instead of admitting to working with the devil, he claims to have worked for God instead:

> How was it possible, [the judges] asked, for the souls of werewolves to ascend to God if it was not God they served but the devil? The old man emphatically rejected this notion: the werewolves were anything but servants of the devil. The devil was their enemy to the point that they, just like dogs – because werewolves were indeed the hounds of God – pursued him, tracked him down, and scourged him with whips of iron. They did all this for the sake of mankind: without their good work the devil would carry off the fruits of the earth and everyone would be deprived as a consequence.
>
> (Ginzburg 1983, 29)

This incidence is also referred to in *The Graveyard Book*, as Bod read his notes from Miss Lupescu and comes across the term "Hound of God" where it is stated that the transformation is a gift that the Hounds of God, or Werewolves and Lycanthropes, use to chase evildoers back to Hell (GB, 88). The

reader as well as Bod is left in the crossfire of two different definitions which leaves Miss Lupescu unpredictable and thus dangerous to the categorisation process needed for the centre.

What are the consequences of such conflicting naming? These two titles call the reader to examine the character from the point of view of two different cultural stances towards a werewolf. The first aspect, the aspect of a hellhound, calls upon associations about werewolves' connection to death and the character's past symbolism for brutal, violent and uninhibited behaviour. This is the werewolf of the 19th century that embodied class issues, racial prejudice in the wake of colonialism and the fear of unbridled sexuality (du Coudray 2002, 7). This is the creature the protagonist fears. Simultaneously, Miss Lupescu, by using the name Hound of God, connects herself concretely to history but also to the modern monster as a hero that ultimately saves her ward and returns him to safety. That is to say, the creature that Miss Lupescu and the grey large form is a monster that oscillates between two poles in literature history, the past and now.

Liminality can be said to be a significant part of Miss Lupescu as a character. The very reference to the Livonian werewolf mythology comprehends the movement as something otherworldly, as the werewolves according to the myth were able to move between this world and the realm of Hell. There seems to be a tension between the fact that she travels this time to the hellish realm of the ghouls in order to save the protagonist and the question of what kind of being she is, given that she can make that journey. This tension, the capability to travel between such a space and the human world as a part of heroics, refers to the monster hero; the characteristic that would typically make Miss Lupescu a monster is also her ability to save the protagonist. The ability also distinguishes her from other characters in the book, as even Silas, who is able to somewhat control Jack, cannot enter the realm. He states that during his absence he heard rumours that both the ward and the woman went "further afield" than he could have gone (GB, 89). When it comes to Ghûlheim and its realm, most characters remain stationary and cannot cross the boundary, with the exception of Miss Lupescu and the ghouls.

Existing in between is arguably a trait of a werewolves in most legends, as Donald Haase states that they "lack a proper position in the human realm" and "[t]rapped betwixt and between, werewolves sway between this world and the otherworld without fitting into either". This is caused mostly by the unlikely catalysts of their transformation and the liminality of their birth. (Haase 2008, 1025). Even so, Miss Lupescu is not "trapped" between the worlds in the text, as she is able to visit and see the people in the graveyard but stay outside its borders in the living world all the while transgressing the actual realm borders. In fact, this makes her more free than many other characters in the book, because her ability to move does not only include the two poles of the living and the dead world but the third, the rarest option. In the theory section I mentioned how the Other is able to move along a line segment between the Otherness and the self, but in this instance, the range of Miss Lupescu is much wider than that, as she moves constantly between the worlds of the living and the dead but also the human realm and the Hell realm. This liminality is unlike others in present in the book, as even Silas, who exists in the liminal spaces, is not able to move into all of these directions available to Miss Lupescu.

As will be discussed in the next subchapter, Miss Lupescu and the ghouls in the book have similar abilities. However, what separates the werewolf's movement from those other monsters in the book is the route she uses to cross the border from the human world. Where the ghouls use a specific gate, Miss Lupescu states that she as a Hound of God and because of it she uses her own way (GB, 86). Unlike going through a gate or a door, her travel through the red realm resembles more of an actual continuum of space than a distinct passage. In fact, it could be stated that when she carries the protagonist away from the Ghûlheim and back to his parents, the space blurs and the moment when she crosses to the world of humans becomes unclear. The progress of the journey is mostly narrated through the changing scenery and, most notably, the night sky. At first, three moons rise as the werewolf and the child on her back run through "the desert of bones". After the hellish landscape they arrive at a place Miss Lupescu calls the boundary. The sky above the boundary reveals that while

they only run, they range over different places in the universe, as Bod describes that he can see the Milky Way as "a glimmering shroud across the arch of the sky". Finally, they arrive at the graveyard, without much explanation how they transitioned from a landscape so close to the Milky Way to the ordinary landscape. Bod only relates that he buried his face in the grey dog's fur and "it seemed only moments later that he was being carried. . . across the graveyard". (GB, 86–87). How Miss Lupescu moves across the realms is left quite open and what is described is physically impossible and questions the very borderlines of these different worlds. Miss Lupescu is presented to the reader as a creature to whom the logical constructions of space do not apply, thus questioning the concepts of how space is constructed in the reader's reality.

As she is a werewolf, transforming from a human form into a large canine is the measure that connects Miss Lupescu into the long tradition of shapeshifting monsters. Considering that it is implied that Miss Lupescu alternates between her two forms because the large grey dog appears in the graveyard around the same time as the new guardian does, the actual sequence of change between forms is not completely narrated in the text. Du Coudray points out that "the werewolf can be classical or grotesque at different moments, but it is always at its most grotesque *as* it transforms" (2002, 8). The process of change is not present as such in the character of the werewolf, as mostly the text refers to the two outcomes of the transformation. For instance, the text implies that the change is quick and imperceptible, but the phases between the outcomes are unnarrated. After crossing the boundary between the ghoul realm and the world of humans, Bod simply wakes up in the arms of Miss Lupescu and it is as if alongside the abrupt and mysterious change of landscape her form has changed too (GB, 87). When Miss Lupescu lies dying, her form oscillates between the wolf and the human and she even gets caught between the forms: "[s]he was halfway now, halfway between grey wolf and woman, but her face was a woman's face". However, the text leaves out all the details of how such a change comes to be and simply states that it has happened: "When she raised her head again, it was a wolf's head" (GB, 230–231).

Even though Du Coudray states that the grotesqueness is at its peak when the werewolf changes, it should be discussed why the absence of the change in the text does not, in fact, diminish the terror induced by such characters. The changes of Miss Lupescu, and all transformations for that matter, usually take temporally place between the utterances in the text and the occurred transformation must be deduced by the reader. Instead of the transformation being "safe" because the change is not detailed, I argue that the text's inability to represent the transformation is made mysterious, supernatural and even more terrifying. Just as with a successful categorisation that gives the observer a sense of prediction, a visual or narrated change provides a point of view which would explain the process. Being obscure is the basis of terror, because what cannot be seen, cannot be controlled. This notion is supported by Edmund Burke who states that "[t]o make anything very terrible, obscurity seems in general to be necessary. When we know the full extent of any danger, when we can accustom our eyes to it, a great deal of the apprehension vanishes" (1756, Part II, Section III). The elusive transformation of Miss Lupescu turns her into an even more terrifying monster, as the transformation is left for the reader's imagination. As was stated earlier with Nick and his encounter with Bod, whatever the observer cannot see from the centre becomes most likely even more terrifying that it could be if it could be perceived.

Despite the absence of a grotesque process of change, Miss Lupescu's ability to change invokes terror. As a result of trying to escape the large grey dog, Bod falls down large steps by the city of Ghülheim and the dog says something to him in the voice of Miss Lupescu. Falling down, Bod realises that the large creature is in fact his guardian: "*That big dog was actually Miss Lupescu*" (GB, 84). However, knowing about his guardian's ability to transform does not make Miss Lupescu any less terrifying for Bod; the form of the large grey dog is nevertheless monstrous to him. Even after recognising the woman's voice, the text continues to describe Miss Lupescu as "a huge grey beast" who simply speaks with the voice of Miss Lupescu. When the guardian licks the child's face to show affection, Bod's first reaction is fear: "for one mad, fear-filled moment, he thought she was going to

take a bite out of him”. (GB, 85). If Czachesz’s terms are brought into the analysis, Miss Lupescu can be regarded as a polymorphic monster in its forms, as she and the large grey dog overlap in one regard: the dog form, however capable of howling and growling, uses the human voice. Thus, the form of Bod’s guardian and teacher is present in the predator. Even so, it is the wolf form that terrifies the protagonist, despite the fact that he knows who the werewolf is. This would suggest that it is the transformation and not Miss Lupescu’s revealed identity that induces fear in Bod.

It should also be added that while Miss Lupescu can be considered to be a polymorphic creature, she differs from the Sleer, the monster inside the tomb, in that she mostly is either a woman or a wolf-like dog. The Sleer is a creature that stirs fear because of the impossible combination of the living and the dead and an animal and a human being, as I will discuss later. Such controversy is not present in Miss Lupescu, other than considering her ability to talk like a human while in the wolf-form or in her brief dying moments. Thus the factor mentioned in the theory section does not apply to her; the fear is not caused by the object’s insistence to stay between forms. There is also another regard in which Miss Lupescu’s human form and her transformation does not actualise some of the traditional notions made of werewolves. The werewolf character usually employs the stark visual difference between the human and the transformed wolf, emphasising the savagery of the beast. This is the dimension that Du Coudray relates as she states that “[i]n order to obtain maximum effect from the juxtaposition of the two forms, [narratives about lycanthropy] contrasted the middle-class ideal of the cultivated, carefully groomed and costumed body with the form of the wolf” (2002, 8). Miss Lupescu is presented as a woman of no beauty and as the text points out, some parts of her appearance is irregular, like her teeth, or not groomed, as she wears “a bulky macintosh” (GB, 59). At the same time, she does wear a tie and Bod notes that Miss Lupescu is a woman “with not a silver hair out of place” (GB, 62). Considering that quite little is told of her looks and her appearance even in the wolf form being very succinctly detailed in text, it seems that the stark controversy between the human

and the wolf is quite little employed in Miss Lupescu's character. As such, the reader is not made to contemplate the most radical change possible when Miss Lupescu changes.

On the whole Miss Lupescu as a character contains much to be said in terms of categorisation. She herself introduces the ambiguity of names, as she presents the classification of creatures to the protagonist. She is also an obscure creature whose connection to the grey dog is unclear at first and who is terrifying enough that she is named only as "something". It is also notable that Bod categorises the obscure wolf monster through the fear induced in the ghouls. Miss Lupescu's range of movement is wide, as she can move to the Hell realm and back, but she is also welcome to the graveyard and the human world, but she is not left between the spaces. The route from Hell to the dimension of humans is connected to her essence as a Hound of God; the road is somewhat obscure and resembles more of a continuum between the worlds than gateways. In terms of transformation, she is polymorphic and once oscillates between the forms of wolf and woman. Nonetheless, the actual transformation process is not present in the text and the stark difference between the details of the human form and the animal form is not employed much.

3.5 The Ghouls

It appears suitable that such a monster as a hell-travelling werewolf should fight against other monsters that move between different poles of existence. The ghouls that abduct the protagonist emphasise constantly how they defy certain categories, and it is arguably in this undecidedness that their somewhat comedic effect, but also a threat, is born. In comparison with the temporal ambiguity of Miss Lupescu's character, these creatures employ the class distinctions in speech. Then again, naming and its disparity with other features is a key factor in these monsters as well; the ghouls, just as some other characters in the book, have such lengthy and distinct names that they are likely to draw reader's attention. The ghouls' names mentioned include the following: Duke of Westminster,

the Honourable Archibald Fitzhugh, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, the Thirty-Third President of the United States, Emperor of China, the famous writer Victor Hugo and Lord Mayor of London.

The incongruity of these characters lies in the non-standard forms, register and dialect that they use and the social status which their names imply. For instance, as they introduce themselves to Bod, they state: "*we* . . . is most important folk, we is" (GB, 68). In addition, as they bow for introduction and use such phrases as "Charmed, I'm sure" (GB, 68), they also use h-dropping, g-dropping and h-addition as hypercorrection in their speech. This is evident in phrases such as "…and I 'ave the honour to be ther 'onourable Harchibald Fitzhugh" and "And don't tell any porkies, remember as how you're talkin' to a bishop'" (GB, 68). Some of these characteristics appear in Cockney dialect, for example (Drobot 2013, 90). Thus, there seems to be a discrepancy between the status implied by the name and the dialect that stereotypically is seldom used in the context of such a status. This is probably a reference towards the exact fear that was also present in the werewolf: distinctions brought by the class society leading to an assumed threat of a lower class overthrowing or restraining the hegemony of the middleclass (du Coudray 2002, 2). After all, the manner with which they receive these names is connected to the people they devoured first when they became ghouls (GB, 76).

The expectations such names produce are also revoked by the ghouls' appearance. They are small and "lean and leathery, all sinews and cartilage" (GB, 67) and when introduced to them, Bod considers that they do not resemble anything he would have affiliate with such names (GB, 68). They wear suits and historical clothing, but their clothing have been reduces to tatters, as if very little of their previous category is left anymore and all they bear are the remains of their victims. Considering that these are creatures that mainly talk about food and eating, as is proven by for example their songs of body parts to be consumed (GB, 77), the ghouls are described to be very lithe and almost as if starving. These monsters that are thin enough to show cartilage and sinews are yet the monsters connected to eating and devouring, which raises the question whether these kinds of creatures are

every satisfied. Their appetite resembles the sublime fear and the fear produced by the possible endlessness. This is one of the effects of the ambiguity inherent to their appearance, as their appearance undermines any centre that uses the appearance as a basis for categorisation, because these parameters are completely contradictory.

Closely connected to the ghouls and the conflict between their bodies and their ravenous disposition is their home, Ghûlheim. Even though it is a place or building of a certain kind, I treat it as a monster in its own right; the city's inanimate nature and immobility are secondary to its description mirroring the ghouls' nature. As such, it is a personification of the ghouls. Here is the description of the city in its entirety:

> Ghouls do not build. They are parasites and scavengers, eaters of carrion. The city they call Ghûlheim is something they found, long ago, but did not make. No one knows (if anyone human ever knew) what kind of creatures it was that made those buildings, who honeycombed the rock with tunnels and towers, but it is certain that no one but the ghoul-folk could have wanted to stay there, or even approach that place.
>
> Even from the path below Ghûlheim, even from miles away, Bod could see that all of the angles were wrong – that the walls sloped crazily, that it was every nightmare he had ever endured made into a place, like a huge mouth of jutting teeth. It was a city that had been built just to be abandoned, in which all the fears and madnesses and revulsions of the creatures who built it were made into stone. The ghoul-folk had found it and delighted in it and called it home.
>
> (GB, 74)

The city seems to mirror the ghouls' monstrosity, as it is, after all, a place they chose and the one they seem to regard as their home. In addition, however, Ghûlheim contains two other monsters created in the rift of not knowing or in the paradox of two different categories. The first is the aspect mentioned above: the dead city that seems to have monstrous face and a mouth. Thus the city seems to be alive and the nightmares and fears it reflects are almost as if contained by a conscious will that repulses everything else than the ghouls.

Secondly, the contrast between everything the ghouls tell the protagonist about their city and what the city is in the description is the kind that destroys the predictive power of categorisation for Bod. He is lured to accompany these monsters in their realm under the pretence that something better

awaits him. It is “a city of delights, of fun and magic, where you would be appreciated, not ignored” (GB, 69) as Bod’s new acquaintances claim. Hence it is a paradise to the protagonist, considering how alone and abandoned he feels without Silas and with Miss Lupescu. Against this background, the sight of Ghûlheim rouses a more fearful reaction in Bod than any other described in the book before this event: “Bod looked up at the city, and was horrified: an emotion engulfed him that mingled repulsion and fear, disgust and loathing, all tinged with shock” (GB, 74) He faces the city as a monster, because not only did his expectations fail, but they were polar to the description. The emotion is born out of the inconsistency between his assumptions of the city and how it turned out to be, as the promises of an adventure and attention are incorporated in the centre that he inhabits. That safe position crumbles, when he learns a lesson not to construct his assumptions based on what unknown people tell him.

In addition to being a terrifying entity on the grounds of being the opposite of its description, the city of Ghûlheim is a monster of unknown origins. It is not made by the ghouls but rather waited to be found and no one can tell what kind of creatures created it. It presents a possibly unrevealed threat and broadens the protagonist’s world of creatures. After all, he was taught the kinds of people by Miss Lupescu just before disappearing into the ghoul realm, but as the text states, nobody knows the architects of the city. Building a city just to abandon it raises a question of how logical these creatures behaviour is from a human’s point of view and thus how predicable they are. In the face of incomprehension, Bod projects his own nightmares into the city, as nightmares of someone else have been the foundation of the city. The city is a place that Bod describes and makes sense of its layout by referring to his own fears and nightmares than could further relate to “the fears, madnesses and revulsions of the creatures”. To the reader, the monstrous city is a city that lacks a further category than a city or a nightmare, almost as if it no description could extend to cover all of its horrors.

The ghouls do not appear again in the book, but the Other space where they have made their home is so horrifying that it contains the demise of such monsters as the Jacks. Bod awaits them

deliberately by the ghoul-gate, opens the gate and lets the men fall into another dimension (GB, 254). This time the realm of the ghouls does not manifest itself in the horrible walls of Ghûlheim, but as swallowing darkness that only stars elaborate. The realm with its pitch darkness appeared briefly at the beginning of the book, as Bod notes that the utter darkness around him makes him frightened. (GB, 254 and 70–71). It could be stated that the arrangement has changed along with the threat the world imposes; to Bod, the darkness and the red realm is now a known territory and he is the one who unleashes its dangers, while to the Jacks the darkness is something that cannot be anticipated and thus controlled. Mr Dandy, one of the Jacks, who is yet to fall through the ghoul-gate, confesses not to be familiar with the gate: "' I don't know what you just did,' said Mr Dandy. 'But it didn't work.'" When he falls but manages to hold onto the tombstone's edge, it becomes evident that he finds the obscure darkness frightening, because "[h]e did not know what was beneath him, only that he had no wish to find out". (GB, 254–255).

Miss Lupescu is a travelling monster, able to cross many boundaries in order to perform her duty. To antagonise such a monstrous hero and to validate her ability to transgress borders, the ghouls move beyond their realm as well and visit the world of the living in search for food. The Ghülheim can be seen as the culmination of their own space, from which they move and finally return to. As has been stated before, they use tombstones called ghoul-gates to cross the border. This might suggest that their movement is somewhat limited: there is a point that allows the crossing and thus the line segment of moving from the red realm into the human world pierces the gate. However, it is revealed in the text that while a certain escape point between the realms is necessary for them, there are in fact several gates to be used. Bod calls the limit between the worlds "the wall of graves" and wonders whether each of the headstones is a portal for ghouls (GB, 86, 71). Unlike Miss Lupescu, who is confirmed only to move between Hell and the human world, the ghouls have almost an endless number of possible spaces to visit. This is also confirmed at the beginning of the ghoul chapter:

> One grave in every graveyard belongs to the ghouls. Wander any graveyard long enough and you will find it – water-stained and bulging, with cracked or broken stone, scraggly grass or

> rank weeds about it, and a feeling, when you reach it, of abandonment. It may be colder than the other gravestones, too, and the name on the stone is all too often impossible to read. If there is a statue on the grave, it will be headless or so scabbed with fungus and lichens as to look like a fungus itself. If one grave in the graveyard looks like a target for petty vandals, that is the ghoul-gate. If the grave makes you want to be somewhere else, that is the ghoul-gate.
>
> There was one in Bod's graveyard.
>
> There is one in every graveyard.
>
> (GB, 57)

Not only are the ghouls able to move into any graveyard in the text, the beginning does imply that their scope is even further; by addressing the reader, the text suggests that the ghouls transgress the border between reality and fiction. This threatens the reader's centre, the position that is created by the separation of fiction and reality; the beginning of the chapter alludes to that such borderlines can be transgressed, as it gives instructions how to find a portal in every graveyard.

Not only is the ghoul's wide scope of movement analysed as constructing their monstrosity, but the manner with which they cross the boundaries requires observation. Close portrayal of their movement is connected to their form in the introduction of the ghouls. They move by "slipping and bounding from shadow to shadow" and lope, skulk and leapfrog over objects (GB, 67). The task of the description is to distance these creature from the human beings and to push them further away to the mental area reserved for these liminal creatures. They move fast and can traverse the desert "more swiftly than a vulture flies", which implies that the creatures in question are nothing like humans but neither like animals. Impossibility of their movement is further highlighted by the fact that the ghouls seem to be endless travellers: they do not tire in the way the humans do. This is proven by the fact that "[n]one of them seemed to get tired or out of breath". (GB, 74, 72). This brings out the issue that if they do not tire, how far can they travel? As such their reach is endless.

While the ghouls are not able to change their forms per se and thus arguably there is quite little to be observed in their monstrosity through transformations, there is one aspect that is interwoven with altering forms. It is not directly stated what the origin of the outer appearance of the ghouls is, but they seem to be forms left between transformations and play with the distinction of

living and the dead. Their faces resemble "mummified humans . . . but their features were mobile and interested" (GB, 68). What is more prominent is their plan to change Bod into a ghoul. This is the only instance in the book where a character is a target of transformation rather than an agent that transforms themselves. Here Bod's unchanged and stable form that constructs the centre is being pressured not because something is able to change but because they are able to change him. The process itself is left quite unsolved; the Bishop of Bath and Wells points out to the child that denying them will not matter and that the child will be turned into a ghoul "one way or another". The process is only hinted and even for them seems to be a taboo, as the same ghoul continues that "[t]he other way is messier, involves being digested, and you're not really around very long to enjoy it" and another states that "that's not a good thing to talk about". (GB, 77). How to become such a monster remain unrevealed, but the implications of violence and death mark the transformation.

All in all, it could be stated of the ghouls that they are most clearly defined as monsters in their resistance to names and categories as well as their ability to travel from their own realm into many other spaces. The names or titles and the clash between the social strata represented act as the main starting points when observing how these characters defy classification; named dukes, bishops and presidents after their first meals, the ghouls employ dialect that generalised marks the speech style of stereotyped "lower social classes". This contradictory factor is also present in their appearance, but from another perspective: though they stop consuming, they are never satisfied. The incapacity to be described precisely is mirrored into the Other space, the Ghûlheim, as it is a city built by unknown creatures to reflect unknown nightmares and madness. Later in the book, the realm appears as a dark void that terrifies the Jacks; the unknown depth of darkness can hold many terrors. When it comes to moving, the ghouls are able to cross borders through their ghoul-gates that reside in every graveyard. Not only does this widen their territory in the text, it also addresses the possibility that such creatures might exist in the reader's reality. Lastly, it can be stated that transformations are a relatively smaller component of the ghouls' monstrosity, as they themselves do not change their

form. However, they endeavour to transform the protagonist into a ghoul through a process that is left obscure and almost a taboo-like in the text but is implied to be violent.

3.6 The Indigo Man and the Sleer

From a living child, Scarlett, Bod hears that the graveyard might hold even older residents than Caius Pompeius, a Roman citizen, and the piece of information sends them on a search for an ancient burial mound. Who precisely is buried in the tomb is never revealed in the book, as Caius Pompeius states hesitatingly that "[b]efore the Celts there were other people on this island" but he knows there is something inside the tumulus as he has seen a person going in and re-emerging with white hair and another person who never resurfaced. The inhabitant of the tumulus is addressed, but the older man cannot describe it much further than by using the word 'something':

> 'Um. Oh. So, who is buried down there?'
> Caius shook his head. 'I do not know, young Owens. But I felt him, back when this place was empty. I could feel something waiting even then, deep in the hill.'
> 'What was he waiting for?'
> 'All I could feel,' said Caius Pompeius, 'was the waiting.'
> (GB, 42)

Whatever awaits inside the tomb escapes categories completely at this point of the text and it can only be described through perceived experiences of other people. The protagonist hears about whitening hair, a suggestive sign of terror, and a mysterious disappearance as evidence of a creature prowling beneath the ground of the graveyard. Even though Caius does not admit that he is afraid of the creature, feeling is all the same a rudimentary indication that whatever resides in the tumulus is something threatening and rather unusual. After all, the older man is able to feel the presence and the waiting all the way from the tomb: the creature is not only stirring emotions but projecting them.

Despite Caius' tale, Bod and Scarlett decide to descend into the tomb through a hidden passage. Because of darkness, the descent and finding the room inside the tumulus are instructed by Bod who is able to see without a light source; Scarlett is left completely at the mercy of her friend's narration of what lies in the tomb. After hearing the stories of other people visiting the tomb, Bod

obviously anticipates something threatening, as he cannot with good conscience tell Scarlett that whatever the creature is, it does not want any harm. (GB, 44–45). However, in the light of the expectations, the creature is a surprising one. When the children reach the room, a glowing man appears from the wall whom both Bod and Scarlett can see: “Scarlett made a noise that was half gasp and half wail, and Bod saw something, and he knew without asking that she could see it too” (GB, 46). The man is described in detail and as such the Indigo Man does not terrify Bod. The protagonist, on the contrary, is left confused as the man does not recognise his citizenship of the graveyard.

The fact that the man can be seen by Scarlett is in the end the feature that dispels all fear and invalidates the monstrosity of the Indigo Man. Scarlett, who has not been able to see any of the ghost children they play with in the graveyard, apologises to Bod for thinking all their playmates are imaginary:

> ‘No,’ said Bod. ‘I think you’re right. I think this one is.’
> ‘Is what?’
> ‘Imaginary.’
> ‘Don’t be stupid,’ said Scarlett. ‘I can see it.’
> ‘Yes,’ said Bod. ‘And *you* can’t see dead people.’ He looked around the chamber. ‘You can stop now,’ he said. ‘We know it’s not real.’
> ‘I will feast on your liver!’ screamed the Indigo Man.
> ‘No, you won’t,’ said Scarlett, with a huge sigh. ‘Bod’s right.’ Then she said, ‘I think maybe it’s a scarecrow.’
>
> (GB, 48)

Bod does not need to establish anything else about the Indigo Man but that he cannot be anything like the creatures in the graveyard, if his friend is able to see it. This is the only parameter available for Bod when he categorises the man before him to be harmless. Yet it is also the parameter that renders the Indigo Man not terrifying and the mood shifts from horror to an anti-climax. Calling it a scarecrow highlights the dimension of erroneous categories: a classic scarecrow usually represents a human being in order to frighten away pest birds. In the same manner, the Indigo Man is not a monster, only resembles one, but with the children, it fails in its task.

It turns out, however, that the Indigo Man is not the "something" whose eager waiting emanates through the walls of the tumulus. When the man disappears, the only light source goes out and the children are once again left in the darkness. This is where the real monster enters. It cannot be seen or heard talking by Scarlett, yet she senses its presence and that presence is oppressive: "I didn't hear anything, just a slithery noise. It made me feel strange. All prickly in my tummy. Like something horrible is going to happen."(GB, 48–49). In contrast with the Indigo Man, who turned out to be a hoax, the Sleer is real. Bod, who was not afraid of the Indigo Man but perplexed by its illogical behaviour, becomes wary as "[t]he hairs on the back of Bod's neck began to prickle" and the strange voice of the creature fills his head. As a defence against the Sleer, Bod tries to manage it by trying to categorise it as something he knows. He asks question such as "what are you", "what do you protect" and "how many of you are there", but the creature answers vaguely. (GB, 49). The Sleer, whose speech is foregrounded in the text with a capitalised font, refuses Bod's attempts to categorise and make it safe, and the children in the end escape the tomb.

The Indigo Man intimidates the children by yelling violent threats, but the Sleer does not at first establish why the children should stay away from the treasure. As a small child, when Bod first encounters it, he states that the creature cannot really harm them, as it is only able to scare. The Sleer answers that "FEAR IS A WEAPON OF THE SLEER". (GB, 49). The full extent of what the creature is able to do becomes concrete when the teenager protagonist lures the man Jack into the tumulus to save himself and Scarlett. So far, the reason why Bod has not been afraid of the Sleer has based upon the knowledge that the being cannot do anything physical to him. This assumption is proved false as the monster takes hold of the man Jack and absorbs the villain into the wall. In addition to proving to the protagonist that he was wrong to assume that the Sleer cannot hurt anyone, the fate of the man Jack underlines the ambiguity of the threat the monster contains. The Sleer does not kill its victim in plain sight but leaves the deed for imagination. The man Jack is pulled *through* the wall, but where he is taken remains unrevealed. In addition to hurting its victim, the Sleer is able to take people into

unthinkable places that cause even the book's main villain to beg for his life. In the end, the threat that the Sleer embodies is the fear that there is something and somewhere outside the position of centre that cannot be defined.

Defining someone as the master of the Sleer initiates the monster in its full form and it finally shows itself to Bod:

> He could sense the Sleer writhing and expanding, hear a noise like the scratching of a thousand dead twigs, as if something huge and muscular were snaking its way around the inside of the chamber. And then, for the first time, Bod saw the Sleer. Afterwards, he was never able to describe what he had seen: something huge, yes; something with the body of an enormous snake, but with the head of a what…? There were three of them: three heads, three necks. The faces were dead, as if someone had constructed three dolls from parts of the corpses of humans and of animals. The faces were covered in purple patterns, tattooed in swirls of indigo, turning the dead faces into strange, expressive monstrous things.
>
> (GB, 264)

The body of the Sleer defies definition, even in the end for the protagonist, as he cannot after the incident describe what he saw in the chamber. To Bod, the object lacks any substantial borders that would allow him make sense of the creature before him. In that moment, the Sleer defies definition, because some parts of him are alive and dead; some human and some animal; one creature but many voices. This dimension approaches some of the dictionary definitions of a monster and the eradication of distinctions. It is a form that borrows from other forms and thus is arrested between forms, as was stated in section 2.3.1 (Cohen 1996, 6).

While the Sleer is a multifaceted monster character in terms of categorisation, it is mostly physically bound to the tumulus. Admittedly, it is implied that it transgresses from somewhere into the chamber, as it first appears as the Indigo Man walking through the wall and finally withdrawing into the wall with the man Jack in its coils. In addition, its reach from the vault seems to be longer, as a ghost has been able to sense its projection of emotions through the ground, but all in all, its movement from the tumulus is restricted. Nonetheless, the text implies that the Sleer is able to travel, but the description of such movement is somewhat more ambiguous. The brooch in the chamber is like a possessed object that carries the presence of the Sleer with it as it is taken from its resting place,

as is revealed when Bod takes it to the Bolger's pawnshop. Bolger recognises the brooch as being "a snakestone" which can only be found in the museums and the brooch is encircled by snake-figure whose expression causes Bolger to shiver. (GB, 111–112).

Upon inspecting the piece of jewellery, the brooch begins to reach out to Bolger. The shopkeeper is described as a greedy and dishonest man, who most often participates in fraudulent schemes for money; the shop is just "an iceberg", as most of his transactions involve selling stolen goods (GB, 110). From this point of view it would seem that the character would do almost anything for profit, yet he finds himself drawn to the brooch: "[h]e was also beginning to regret that he was going to have to sell the brooch when he was done. It was special. The more it glittered, under the tiny light on his counter, the more he wanted it to be his, and only his" (GB, 116). The greed and passiveness over the snakestone culminates when Bolger and his accomplice Tom Hustings struggle for it and fight until both men are unconscious. Bolger is even desperate enough to try to drug Hustings. (GB, 123–124). As Bod picks up the brooch from the unconscious men, he notes that "the expression on the snake-heads was one of triumph and avarice and satisfaction" (GB, 126). The piece of jewellery is described to be conscience of its surroundings and it is implied that it thrives of discord and greed. As the Sleer cannot move itself, as most characters do in the book, it haunts the object and thus is almost unbound from its location. The Sleer's control over the object is confirmed as Bod returns it to the grave later: "IT COMES BACK, said the Sleer, with satisfaction in its smoke-tendril voice. IT ALWAYS COMES BACK" (GB, 129). The only reason the Sleer seems to move is to visit, involuntary, the outside world and cause chaos only to be returned back to its resting place; to cross over to the centre only in order to shake its foundations and challenge its borders.

The body of the creature emphasises its other dimension that would make it undoubtedly a monster: the Sleer changes and has changed to become the thing that Bod faces at the end of the book. It is implied that the Indigo Man, the scarecrow of the tumulus, is connected to the Sleer and is almost just one form of it that only withdraws once Scarlett and Bod establish it is not real. The first phase

of its form is mostly unable to harm anyone in reality and uses only the weapon the creature admits possessing, the fear. However, instead of being a creature that changes from one stage into another, as was suggested in the theory section, it should be noted that the Sleer in its snake-like form is present at the same time as the Indigo Man appears; it is "the rustling slither that" that precedes the scarecrow apparition (GB, 45). Thus the first form that appears to the protagonist and his friend foreshadows the next form but also coexists in the Indigo Man as a sound cue. Thus the Sleer's change from the Indigo Man to the insubstantial source of voice and an oppressing presence could be described as being polymorphic.

There is a small temporal gap between the scarecrow form and the actual emergence of the voice that is manifested by the change of lighting in the room. Whereas the first stage of the Sleer emanates light and is made to be visually observed, even by the living, the second stage thrives in the darkness. The second stage of the Sleer is only a presence in the form of a voice that continuously insists that it waits for the master. As such this form that the Sleer transforms into differs from all the other transforming monsters in the book, as it does not necessitate to be seen, but is observed with hearing. As well as being just a voice, the monster manifests itself in the form of emotions it projects. Caius feels it and later, when Bod takes the brooch guarded by the Sleer to exchange it for the witch's headstone, he considers it as a mass of feelings: "[i]t was as he remembered, an invisible thing, all smoky tendrils and hate and greed" (GB, 105).

Just as the first form anticipates the second form, the voices of the Sleer seem to hint towards the perceivable monster that appears at the end of the book. When the Sleer's voice fills the tomb chamber, the protagonist experiences the voice as containing more than one creature: "it seemed to Bod that there were more than one voice there, that they were talking in unison" (GB, 49). The source of the multi-layered speech is introduced and the final form of the Sleer is presented, as Bod implies that the master the monster has been waiting for has finally returned, in the shape of the man Jack (GB, 264). The giant snake with three dead heads is last form that the Sleer takes in the book, and it

is also the form that questions who was able to make such a creature. It is noted in the text that the synthesis of the dead faces and a large animal is like a doll made of corpses (GB, 264), connecting it with such transformative monsters as Frankenstein's monster. However, the master that existed before the Romans and constructed such a monster is unknown. This would mean that the origin point of such transformations remain concealed for the observer, thus transfixing the terror of the transformations into the being itself.

The snake-like monster residing inside the ancient tumulus is a monster that mostly employs the ambiguity and the impossibility of categorisation as well as transformation to repel anyone who trespasses into the tomb. The form of the Indigo Man becomes safe when it is clearly categorised as being not real, but same cannot be done to the Sleer itself, who refuses to answer any questions with a clear answer and who most often is described as "something". When it reveals its final form, it becomes clear that the Sleer is a form trapped between forms. It uses the guise of Indigo Man to reach out to the living, but has also two other forms into which it transforms as the story progresses. Quite little is said about the process of transformations, even though they happen in front of the observers. However, notable about these transformations is that they are somewhat imbricated and thus the transformation could be described as being polymorphic. Movement and liminality is a minor part of how this character works, but when it does, it seems to just visit the realm of the ordinary and without any further agenda cause disorder and violence. It should be also added that it does not move voluntarily but requires another character for its movement.

3.7 Liza Hempstock

Naming is the driving force behind the witch character in the book. She, unlike Miss Lupescu and Silas, is an unwelcome inhabitant of the graveyard and an inconvenience in the hierarchy of the dead society living in the graveyard. Despite the fact that Liza Hempstock, the witch, does not herself take the protagonist away from his family and the sphere of security, the chapter in which she is introduced

resembles notably the previous chapter of the ghouls, especially in the manner with which the subject is introduced. Where the ghoul chapter begins with the description of the ghoul-gate and thus a confirmation that these creatures do exist and that they exist everywhere, the beginning of Liza's chapter states a fact that Bod's graveyard does have a witch and that Bod has been told to stay away from that specific area. In comparison to the previous chapter, it might be reasonable to expect that the witch is a threat to the protagonist or a similar kind of monster that the ghouls were. This is only reasserted by the inhabitants of the graveyard at the beginning of the chapter. Bod's adoptive parents, a long ago deceased couple, tell him to avoid the witch's grave site, his mother under the pretence that the damp place might give him flu and his father by simply stating that "[i]t's not a good place" (GB, 93).

The place that is forbidden for Bod and that yet still fascinates him is the unconsecrated lands on the west side of the graveyard, also known as the potter's field. Just as the terrifying Ghûlheim seemed to have reflected the threat, chaos and horror the ghouls' impose, the potter's field distinguishes itself from the graveyard proper in that it has fallen into disarray and has been taken over by nature: it is "a wasteland beyond [the fence of the graveyard], a mass of nettles and weeds, of brambles and autumnal rubbish" (GB, 93). Even though the graveyard itself has become quite dilapidated, as it has an abandoned funeral chapel and broken-down tombstones (GB, 7), the potter's field is clearly separated from it by its wilderness.

It is Silas who explains to Bod that the area was reserved in the past for socially rejected and isolated individuals, such as criminals, non-Christians and people who committed a suicide. Yet he cannot remember "anyone particularly evil" in the potter's field. (GB, 94). It could be stated that the wild potter's field holds no monsters but people who did not live according the society's rules of that time, as Bod's teacher states: "They aren't our sort of people" (GB, 97). However, when Bod asks Silas again about the witch, his guardian confirms that the witch is real (GB, 95). The offence that leaves the witch as something not to be talked about and thus outside the centre that the graveyard

society forms is her nonconformity to society's standards. She does not, as Bod's teacher points out, live up to the perimeters of the society and thus she is a threat.

Disregarding such a cultural phenomenon as *Harry Potter*, the word "witch" often has negative connotations and the meaning of someone who foils the protagonists or the hero's endeavours or at worst, abducts and devours little children: this is the case in such fairy tales as Hansel and Gretel, Baba Yaga or Snow White. Not using the name "witch" seems to be significant when considering the character as monster or not; Haase states that usually when a woman of magic is the donor or helper in the narrative, they are not specifically called "a witch" (2008, 1033). As a counterpoint to this, a character who is called a witch must most often then be a villain or at least an uncontrollable, neutral force. Then the most eminent content of the word "witch" is not that she is a female or that she can do magic, but what she is most likely to produce with the magic. Against this frame, having a witch in the potter's field adds an ominous mood to the beginning of the chapter.

When Bod falls down from a tree and sprains his ankle, the witch is finally introduced. Just as the grey large dog could not be seen at first, the witch appears behind Bod and is only manifested as a pair of fingers that examines the boy's injury (GB, 99). When he turns around, he sees a person "older than him, but not grown-up, and she looked neither friendly nor unfriendly. Wary, mostly" (GB, 99). The girl does not seem to oppose Bod any threat, but on the contrary she shows interest in his well-being. It would seem that she, like some other inhabitants of the potter's field, were accused of pettier crimes then that would lead to such grave sentences in the past, just as Silas explained to Bod at the beginning of the chapter about the people in the potter's field (GB, 94). However, when Bod expresses his doubts whether she is witch aloud, as she after all drowned during dunking in a witch trial, she is quick to dispel such suspicions:

> 'What nonsense. Of course I was a witch. They learned that when they untied me from the cucking-stool and stretched me on the green, nine-parts dead and all covered with duckweed and stinking pond-muck. I rolled my eyes back in my head, and I cursed each and every one of them there on the village green that morning, that none of them would ever rest easily in a grave. I was surprised at how easily it came, the cursing. Like dancing it was, when your feet pick up the steps of a new measure your ears have never heard and your head don't know, and

> they dance it till dawn.' She stood, and twirled, and kicked, and her bare feet flashed in the moonlight.
>
> (GB, 101)

Compared to Miss Lupescu, who rather calls herself with a title that refers to the heroic legend of werewolves, the witch claims the name that bears such negative connotations quite happily and even tells the protagonist how all the villagers present in her trials died soon after in the first plague wave and were buried in a plague pit. She seems to be less terrifying for Bod than the ghouls or even his guardian, Miss Lupescu and her dog form, even though they have just met; the witch holds no threat, but honestly confesses to being what she is and revealing what she can do. Such transparency seems to render her less of a monster than the other characters analysed.

Nonetheless, what she is called is a major component of the character and a factor that eventually sends Bod away from the graveyard and almost reveals his location to the man Jack who is still looking for him. When Bod asks about her name, the witch addresses the issue at the core of the categorisation: "'Got no headstone,' she said, turning down the corners of her mouth. 'Might be anybody. Mightn't I?'" (GB, 103). As a contradiction, she is one of the few characters who does not conceal what she is or whose character is not solely based on hints and cues about past literature tropes, like Silas, Miss Lupescu or even the man Jack. With most of the inhabitants of the graveyard, the tombstone serves as a point of information for the reader as well, most of which carry a title or some name. This is evident for example in "Doctor Trefusis (1870-1936, *May He Wake To Glory*)" (GB, 87) or "Joji G. Shoji, d. 1921, *I was a stranger and you took me in*)" (GB, 42). Interestingly, Liza Hempstock, the witch, on the other hand, wants no title or any other explanation, but her name and dates on the tombstone (GB, 107). She is driven by her need to be named, but not explained or categorised.

In addition to resisting categories, Liza as a character is the only ghost described able to move outside the graveyard. In relation to the description of the potter's field dealt before with the issue of categorising Liza, it should be noted that the potter's field is the heterotopia inside a heterotopia.

These layers are revealed when the point of observation is changed. Foucault considers graveyards as the Other spaces of the everyday world, existing at the brims of society because of the reserved reactions to death (1984, 5–6). This reaction is also present in the chapter of Danse Macabre, as the living citizens of the town are astonished and terrified by the visiting dead. However, the society of the dead have their own heterotopia: the unhallowed ground of the graveyard. It is almost a taboo of the society, as was mentioned before; the inhabitants of the graveyard do not talk about it and their answers regarding the space are vague. Reading the potter's field as the unspeakable Other space is relevant to analysing Liza and her movement in the book.

The reason why Silas was chosen to be Bod's guardian and caretaker at the beginning of the book stems from the ghosts' inability to cross the boundaries of the graveyard; Silas, unlike the ghosts, can leave and bring food and clothes for the child. In addition, Mr Owens notes that Bod will not be seeing his biological mother again: "'She'll not come here again,' said Mr Owens. 'Next time she wakes it'll be in her own graveyard, or wherever it is she's going'" (GB, 12). This implies that the ghosts have rigorous physical boundaries and are tightly bound to the graveyard they are buried in. When Bod is caught by Bolger and locked into the backroom, Liza appears to help him:

> It was hard to see her properly, but Bod had spent his life talking to dead people. 'Anyway, what are you doing here? What are you doing out from the graveyard? It's daytime. And you're not like Silas. You're meant to stay in the graveyard.'
>
> She said, 'There's rules for those in graveyards, but not for those as was buried in unhallowed ground. Nobody tells *me* what to do, or where to go.'
>
> (GB, 115–116)

For the dead buried in the potter's field, being cast outside the society seems to have led to detachment from some metaphysical rules of the graveyards. Second time Liza moves beyond the graveyard is when Bod is arrested by the police after a feud with a school peer. She appears beside him again, warns him of the police and finally leaves when the police put Bod in the police car. After Silas saves the protagonist, the guardian tells him that it was Liza who found Silas: "You should thank your little witch-friend. She came and found me, told me you were in trouble, and what kind of trouble you were

in.' (GB, 190). Liza undermines the laws of the dead society and corrodes with her free movement the rules that make up the centre of the graveyard.

Liza is not bound to the same locations as most of the dead people are, but instead of moving to cause chaos or haunt, she uses her ability to transgress borders to take care of the child who found her a headstone. That is to say, she does not use her status as a liminal monster to visit the spheres of utopia to disrupt the balance between these poles, but to function as one of the heroes of the chapter. In addition to being able to step outside the potter's field, she is also able to visit another space of I, in other words the majority of the graveyard area. It is the space where she is not welcome, as the protagonist is told not to visit her space. Nonetheless, she joins the fight against the Jacks on the graveyard side, stating that even though she is angry at Bod, she will not let them kill him (GB, 250). Her actions as a liminal creature challenges the meaning of such social boundaries, since as a social reject and outcast, Liza uses her transcendence of boundaries to protect the protagonist and fight against the villains.

Although Liza does not as such change from one form to another and it is not a fundamental part of her character, she can be analysed to transform. As most ghosts are, Liza is invisible to the living. This, for instance, is shown when she haunts Bolger and Hustings to break Bod free from the locked room. As an invisible presence she begins to giggle to unnerve Hustings and finally "put her lips together, making a noise that began as a whistling, and then sounded like a distant wind" (GB, 122). This is the occasion where she uses her invisible form to haunt people. Later in the book, her formlessness becomes a means to avoid teenager Bod. He notices that after six years of friendship she is "less likely to be there for him when Bod went down to the nettle patch to see her" (GB, 214). Onwards from the chapter where Liza saved Bod from the police, she appears only as a voice. Her transformation from a perceptible form to an invisible girl is not used to evoke terror but to express the changing feelings between the protagonist and the witch. Thus this monstrous ability is employed to deal with a theme sometimes significant in youth literature.

The witch that is introduced in a very similar manner as the ghouls were warrants a reading that she could somehow be the threatening monster in the chapter. Liza, who inhabits an Other space called the potter's field and who is regarded as someone avoidable by the rest of the graveyard, admits to being a witch contrary to the usual convention in fairy tales and fantasy. However, she presents the problem of not having a name on her headstone and thus the dilemma of failure of categorisation: as her resting place is left unmarked, she could be anyone or anything without a name. Liza does have a space of her own where she returns to; the potter's field is the heterotopia inside the graveyard and its inhabitants seem to have different rules concerning the boundaries. The witch character is free to move beyond the boundaries between the world of the dead and the living, which makes her a moving monster. Instead of intentionally bringing chaos with the liminal transgressions, Liza's ability makes her a hero character, as it allows her to come to rescue when the protagonist is in danger. In the manner of modern monster literature, she also uses her transformation into an invisible character to solve the emotional tension between her and the protagonist more than to haunt the living.

In this chapter I have analysed seven characters in *the Graveyard Book*: the major characters Nobody Owens, Silas and the man Jack and Jacks of All Trades and then four minor characters, Miss Lupescu and the grey large dog, the ghouls, the Indigo Man and the Sleer, and Liza Hempstock. In the light of the analysis, it can be stated that all of the characters display all three dimensions of the instability to a certain degree. The manners with which they manifest these dimensions vary throughout the book. This means that while many of the characters have some similarities that can be compared, they also present a wide range of features that could be analysed as realising the instability. The main stress of the analysis shifts onto the categorisation, as the characters provide most to be analysed in terms of naming and categorising.

4. Conclusion

The Graveyard Book is a study of different aspects of monsters and the dimensions of what a monster is in relation to humanity; it is a story of a host of canonical horror creatures bringing up and protecting a human child where the human world cannot. While the book undoubtedly offers room for multiple approaches and many characters to study, I have narrowed down the subjects of the analysis into three dimensions, and into a number of monsters that frequent the text or warrant their own chapters. Some of the characters are familiar from the significant horror stories of literature history, such as a vampire, a werewolf and the demon-like ghouls. Some are found in the fairy tales or the thrillers of the 21st century: this is the case of the witch and the human murderer. Others are figments of the author's imagination; the child protagonist and the snake monster inside the tomb are not per se connected to the canon, but can be considered as monsters. The three dimensions through which I have analysed the characters in *The Graveyard Book* are the categorisation, liminality as movement, and transformation.

In the introduction, I presented my opinion that what should be regarded as a monster is not entirely based on recognising what the protagonist in the text fears. In other words, the monster is not so much a matter of identification, but viewpoints of observation, the power of categorisation, management of movement and transformation and the tension brought by the revocation of such a power. The main positions included in these dimensions is the centre surrounded by the observer and the monster as an object. When I analysed the monsters in the book, I analysed their definitions and depictions available to the reader, as well as the emotions displayed by the observing characters. As such, it is not always the observing character in the book that is aware of encountering a monster, but the reader who is aware of the contradictions, instability and tensions presented in the text. This is emphasised by the arrangement of characters in *The Graveyard Book*: the monsters are not always something in the background or in the borderline of the story but they are sometimes found at the hub, as heroes, parental figures, friends and teachers. Thus the very lesson of the book is to find an

alternative perspective to monster, disregard the monster as only a dangerous creature and to begin examine them through their traits, features and connections to other characters that display emotions and reactions.

First of the three dimensions, categorisation and its failure is revealed to be the main aspect to the monstrosity in the book. It is dealt through all of the characters from various viewpoints and in different manners. Therefore it is justifiable to state that the book in question aims to challenge the human categorisation and naming processes and remind that the outcome of failing definitions is the loss of control and predictability. However, the ways in which the book discusses the issue varies from character to character. At times the text uses the connections to historical texts and pieces of literature to establish characters as monsters: the vampire is recognisable as a vampire because of the minor textual cues, whereas the werewolf is connected to two different cultural references of werewolves by name. These references are then reflected upon their actions and their role as protectors and teachers of the protagonist. In the same manner, the ghouls are an eerie mixture of social distinctions and contradictory appearance, whereas the names and the image they invoke are discordant with what they are in reality.

Naming a character with a title or a name is a significant element in the failure of categorisation. Such characters as Bod, the man Jack and the Jacks and Liza thrive on the contradictions created by how they are categorised and how they turn out to be. The name can either elicit a sense of being nobody or endless, as some of the names are empty camouflages for everything possible the characters hold. Being Nobody Owens, essentially not anyone, or a fairy tale character, and thus completely fictional person such as the man Jack, mocks the naming process that endeavours to make distinctions between individuals. The titles, as is the case with "witch", can be confirmed, but despite the negative connotations, the naming falls deficient; the witch of the story is a loyal friend and a hero. At times the observed creature is such in its nature that it cannot be described or mentally managed. In these cases, the monster becomes an obscure or unfocused entity that cannot be given a

categorisation or a definition but becomes “something”, a void in the text. This is evident for example in the Sleer whose true form is so horrible that the protagonist cannot later describe it. Then again, it is the protagonist as well who uses something so horrible that it cannot be portrayed to his advantage, when he fills the dreams of his bully with nightmares.

While liminality is somewhat less employed than the failure of categorisation, some characters are strongly distinguished by their ability to transgress the borders of the worlds or spaces. The described physical spaces or worlds in the book are the graveyard, or the space of the dead, the human world, and the red realm where the ghouls live. However, the graveyard as a space is also divided into two: a utopia of most of its inhabitants and a potter’s field, a heterotopia that contains the unwanted of the society. Most notably the characters that are able to move to and from all three are the ghouls, Miss Lupescu, and Bod to some extent, while the manner with which they transgress the border varies. The protagonist is taken over the border to the other dimension, but in the end the extinction of his right to move freely takes away his monstrosity. The ghouls are able to access an unrestricted number of graveyards through their ghoul-gates while Miss Lupescu has her own singular way in and out. Some characters, while not moving themselves, employ other manners of movement; the Sleer and the man Jack possess objects that serve as vessels to who they are. As such, it is not the border they cross that makes them an Other but manner which they move that separate them from the centre. Some movements are connected to the sphere of the social rules and the idea of social rejection. With Silas, the lack of movement in the Danse Macabre chapter is what pushes him into a temporary state of heterotopia, rather than his movement, while Liza resists the metaphysical laws of the graveyard by leaving whenever she wants.

Transformation seems to be the least employed form of rendering the monster unstable, as it is most often described briefly or vaguely. The forms which the characters turn into vary in the text, but one aspect seems to be a constant that permeates all transformations: the detailed process of change that is connected to the grotesque in transformations is often left unrevealed. On the one hand,

mostly the characters seem to change between the sentences in the text; in other words, how the characters are called or described is different in two adjacent sentences. The lack of description, on the other hand, does not necessarily signal that the transformation is harmless; the text's inability to capture such a change only communicates that the change might too horrible to be contained by words. In one instance, the transformation has more than two stages: the Sleer is able to change from the Indigo Man into a formless voice and from that into a giant snake-like creature. Miss Lupescu, though having only two forms, is at times polymorphic in the sense that her human form is present in the wolf form. She also fluctuates between the two forms, combining a human head with her body of a wolf. The rapid changing between two forms is manifested by the man Jack who as a result of his own fear cannot retain his own appearance but begins to resemble the harmless Mr Frost.

Who is called to observe the monster and whose reaction it is that is born in contact with the imposed instability varies in the book. Sometimes it is the protagonist who is afraid and who is in the centre position that is defended against the object. However, most of the times, it is someone else to whom the instable features of the monstrous characters are revealed. For instance, the protagonist is at times the object that causes the defensive reactions and the other characters must deal with the consequences of the assumed verities that make up the centre. At times, the only position to whom the real features of the object are revealed is that of the reader's.

As I approached the book at first from the point of view chosen for this thesis, the hypothesis was that the monsters have one, two or all three qualities of instability in them and that all three qualities manifest equally in the book. In the light of the findings, it can be stated that the first part of my hypothesis was correct, as the all of the analysed monsters display these qualities. It should be noted though that while they all can be analysed to display all three at some point of the narrative, the second part of my hypothesis was not fulfilled in the book. It seems that *The Graveyard Book* is a book mainly depicting the problematics of categorising and naming and the horror that arises from the observer's predictive control that is invalidated. The other two dimensions of instability, even

though appearing constantly throughout the book, are not as prominent factors in the paradigm that enables the identification of the monster. Some future aspects that may change this imbalance could include a wider selection of characters to be studied or analysing *The Graveyard Book* specifically as an illustrated book with the text and the illustrations complementing each other.

To conclude the thesis, I argue that the monster in Neil Gaiman's *The Graveyard Book* is not necessarily a terrifying character because it would seek to do either physical damage or annihilate life itself. On the contrary, the monsters analysed here present a variety of actions that cannot be described as being intentionally harmful. In addition to the dangerous ones like the ghouls and the secret society of the Jacks, the book contains a protagonist who wishes to avenge his biological family's murder, protect those he cares about but also defend himself against the bullies. It has a werewolf and a vampire as parental figures who risk their own safety for the safety of a child and a witch as a loyal friend. In other words, the threat the monster in this book imposes is not a corporeal, violent one, but rather an attack against the presumed power position of the observer and its norms. *The Graveyard Book* constantly negotiates the monster through its instability compared to the assumed stability of the centre position of the observer. The monsters in it, whether actively or inactively, reveal the weaknesses in the ideas that uphold the centre and thus bring chaos closer to the observer. The centre is part of the mental makeup that protects the observer from the inconsistencies of the world and that the monster in its instability threatens; it can barely hold.

Works Cited

Asma, Stephen. 2009a. *On Monsters: An Unnatural History of Our Worst Fears*. Cary, NC: Oxford University Press.

Asma, Stephen. 2009b. "Monsters and the Moral Imagination". *Chronicle of Higher Education* 56, 10: B11–B12.

Baumgartner, Holly Lynn and Roger Davis. 2008. "Hosting the Monster: Introduction". In *At the Interface/Probing the Boundaries, Volume 52 : Hosting the Monster,* Holly Lynn Baumgartner and Roger Davis, eds. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Benbow, T.J., ed. 1989. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bettelheim, Bruno. 1976. *The Uses of Enchantment: the Meaning and Importance of Fairy Tales*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Beresford, Matthew. 2013. *White Devil: The Werewolf in European Culture*. London: Reaktion

Beville, Maria. 2012. "In Pursuit of Alterity: The Labyrinth Literature as *Other Space"*. In *Otherness: A Multilateral Perspective*, Sencindiver, Susan Yi et al., eds. Frankfurt, DEU: Peter Lang AG, 121–136.

Breslin, Gerry et al, eds. 2011. *Collins Dictionary*. 11th ed. Glasgow: HarperCollins.

Brothers, Peter H. 2011. "Japan's Nuclear Nightmare: How the Bomb Became a Beast Called Godzilla". In *Cineaste,* summer 2011, Vol. 36 Issue 3, 36–40.

Browning, John Edgar. 2013. "Towards a Monster Pedagogy: Reclaiming the Classroom for the Other". In *Fear and Learning: Essays on the Pedagogy of Horror*, Aalya Ahmad and Sean Moreland, eds. Jefferson: McFarland and Company, 40–55.

Burke, Edmund. 1756. *A Philosophical Inquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*. (https://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/b/burke/edmund/sublime/index.html) [accessed 25th March 2015]

Buxton, Richard. 2009. *Forms of Astonishment: Greek Myths of Metamorphosis.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carpenter, Humphrey and Mari Prichard. 1984. *The Oxford Companion to Children's Literature*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Carroll, Noël. 1990. *The Philosophy of Horror: or The Paradoxes of the Heart.* Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Cavallaro, Dani. 2002. *Gothic Vision: Three Centuries of Horror, Terror and Fear.* London: Continuum.

Clarke, Beverly Lyon. 2001. *Regendering the School Story: Sassy Sissies and Tattling Tomboys.* London: Routledge.

Coats, Karen. 2008. “Between Horror, Humour, and Hope: Neil Gaiman and the Psychic Work of the Gothic”. In *The Gothic in Children’s Literature: Haunting the Borders,* Jackson, Anna et al. eds. Abingdon: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

Coats, Karen. 2010. “Fantasy”. In *The Routledge Companion to Children’s Literature,* David Rudd ed. Abingdon: Routledge, 75–86.

Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome. 1996. “Monster Culture (Seven Theses)”. In *Monster Theory: Reading Culture,* Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, ed. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis, 3–25.

Corbett, Sue. 2011. “The Case of ‘The Graveyard Book’”. In *Publishers Weekly*, Oct 27 2011 (http://www.publishersweekly.com/pw/by-topic/childrens/childrens-book-news/article/49277-the-case-of-the-graveyard-book.html) [accessed 27th May 2014]

Czachesz, Istvan. 2012. *Grotesque Body in the Early Christian Discourse: Hell, Scatalogy, and Metamorphosis.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Drobot, Irina-Ana. 2013. “Phonological Features of Cockney English in the Film "Last Orders"”. In *Scientific Journal of Humanistic Studies*, 2013, Vol. 5 Issue 9, 87–92.

Du Coudray, Chantal Bourgault. 2002. “Upright Citizens on All Fours: Nineteenth-Century Identity and the Image of the Werewolf”. In *Nineteenth-Century Contexts,* Mar 2002, Vol. 24 Issue 1, 1–16.

Edwards, Karen. 2007. “Milton’s Reformed Animals: An Early Modern Beastiary: Hellhound”. In *Milton Quarterly.* May 2007, Vol. 41 Issue 2, 88–91.

Fahy, Thomas. 2003. “Killer Culture: Classical Music and the Art of Killing in Silence of the Lambs and Se7en”. In *Journal of Popular Culture,* 2003, Vol. 37 Issue 1, 28–42.

Foucault, Michel, trans. J. Miskoviec. 1984. “Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias”. In *Architecture /Mouvement/ Continuité*, October. (web.mit.edu/allanmc/www/foucault1.pdf) [accessed 25th March 2015]

Gaiman, Neil. 2008. *The Graveyard Book.* London: Bloomsbury.

Gaiman, Neil. 2009. “Newbery Acceptance Speech: Telling Lies for a Living… and Why We Do It”. In *Children & Libraries: The Journal of the Association for Library Service to Children*, Summer2009, Vol. 7 Issue 2, 7–10.

Gilmore, David D. 2003. *Monsters: Evil Beings, Mythical Beasts and All Manner of Imaginary Terrors.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Ginzburg, Carlo, trans. John and Anne Tedeschi. 1983. *The Night Battles: Witchcraft and Agrarian Cults in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.* London: Routledge & Kegan.

Gregory, Bettina. 2002. “Hannibal Lecter: The Honey in the Lion’s Mouth”. In *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, Vol. 56 Issue 1, 100–114.

Grixti, Joseph. 1989. *Terrors of Uncertainty: The Cultural Contexts of Horror Fiction*. London: Routledge.

Grossman, Lev. 2013. “The Illusionist”. In *Time*. 6/24/2013, Vol. 181 Issue 24, p. 50.

Haase, Donald (ed.). 2008. *The Greenwood Encyclopedia of Folktales and Fairy Tales*. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press. 2008.

Hahn, Ulrike and Michael Ramscar. 2001. “Introduction: Similarity and Categorization”. In *Similarity and Categorization*, Ulrike Hahn and Michael Ramscar, eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hall, Jordana. 2011. “Embracing the Abject Other: The Carnival Imagery of Harry Potter”. In *Children's Literature in Education*. Mar 2011, Vol. 42 Issue 1, 70–89.

Hogle, Jerrold E. 2002. “Introduction: The Gothic in Western Culture”. In *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction*, Jerrold E. Hogle, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Irigaray, Luce. 2012. “How Can We Meet the Other”. In *Otherness: A Multilateral Perspective,* Susan Yi Sencindiver et al., eds. Frankfurt, DEU: Peter Lang AG, 107–121

Jackson, Anna et al. 2008. ”Introduction”. In *The Gothic in Children’s Literature: Haunting the Borders*, Anna Jackson et al. eds. Abingdon: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

Kafka, Franz, trans. J. Crick. 2009. *The Metamorphosis and Other Stories.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kaplan, Matt. 2012. *The Science of Monsters*: *Why Monsters Came to Be and Why Are They So Terrifying*. London: Constable & Robinson Ltd.

Kendrick, Charmette. 2009. “The Goblins Will Get You!: Horror in Children's Literature from the Nineteenth Century.” In *Children & Libraries: The Journal of the Association for Library Service to Children*. Vol. 7 Issue 1, 19–23.

Kilgour, Maggie. 1995. *The Rise of the Gothic Novel.* Oxon, Abingdon: Routledge.

Klapscik, Sandor. 2012. *Liminality in Fantastic Fiction: A Poststructuralist Approach.* North Carolina: McFarland & Company.

Leon, Carol E. 2009. *Movement and Belonging: Lines, Places, and Spaces of Travel.* New York: Peter Lang.

Levinas, Emmanuel, trans. A. Lingis. 1978. *Existence and Existents*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Liveley, Genevieve. 2010. *Ovid’s Metamorphoses: A Reader’s Guide.* New York: Continuum.

Maggi, Armando. 2010. *In the Company of Demons: Unnatural Beings, Love and Identity in the Italian Renaissance.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Marr, Vivian, ed. 2011. *The Chamber Dictionary.* 12th ed. London: Chambers Harrap Publishers Ltd.

McCormick, P. 1996. "Why Modern Monsters Have Become So Alien to Us". In *U.S. Catholic*, Nov 11, 37–41.

McGinn, Colin. 2012. "*The Fly* and the Human: Ironies of Disgust". in *Philosophy of Popular Culture: Philosophy of David Cronenberg,* Simon Riches, ed. Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 9–23.

National Audiovisual Institute. "Ikärajat". (https://kavi.fi/fi/meku/ikarajat) [accessed 23rd October 2014]

Pan European Game Information. "About PEGI? What Are Ratings?" (http://www.pegi.info/en/index/id/23) [accessed 23rd October 2014]

Pepetone, Gregory. 2012. *Hogwarts and All: Gothic Perspectives on Children's Literature.* New York: Peter Lang.

Publisher's Weekly. 2009. "Children's Bestsellers Jan.27 – Feb.2, 2014". In *Publisher's Weekly,* 2/10/2014, Vol. 261 Issue 6, 16–16.

Punter, David. 1980. *The Literature of Terror: a History of Gothic Fictions from 1765 to the present day*. London: Longman.

Pärli, Ülle. 2011. "Proper Name as an Object of Semiotic Research". In *Sign Systems Studies.* Vol. 39, Issue 2-4, 197–223.

Rana, Marion. 2009. *Creating Magical World: Otherness and Othering in Harry Potter*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Richardson, Michael. 2010. *Otherness in Hollywood Cinema*. New York: Continuum.

Rickels, Laurence A. 1999. *Vampire Lectures.* Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Roman, Hanna. 2013. "Naming as Natural Process and Historical Narrative in Buffon's Histoire Naturelle, 1749–55". In *Romance Studies*, November 2013, Vol. 31 Issue 3/4, 238–250.

Rooney, Kathy et al., eds. 2004. *Bloomsbury English Dictionary.* 2nd ed. London: Bloomsbury.

Rudd, David. 2008. "An Eye for an I: Neil Gaiman's Coraline and Questions of Identity. In *Children's Literature in Education: An International Quarterly* 2008 Sept; 39 (3), 159–168.

Rudd, David, ed. 2010. *The Routledge Companion to Children's Literature*. Oxon, Abingdon: Routledge.

Russell, David L. 2012, 7th ed. *Literature for Children: a Short Introduction*. Boston: Pearson.

Sangster, Charles. 1875. "Little Jack Frost: A Rhyme for Flossie". In *Aldine,* April 1875 Vol. 7 No 17. (http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/20636992.pdf?acceptTC=true) [accessed 18th April 2015]

Schneider, David J. 2004. *The Psychology of Stereotyping*. New York: The Guildford Press.

Schneider, Kirk J. 1993. *Horror and the Holy: Wisdom-Teachings of the Monster Tale*. Chicago, IL: Open Court.

Sconduto, Leslie A. *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf: a Literary Study from Antiquity through the Renaissance.* North Carolina: McFarland and Company, Inc. Publishers.

Shildrick, Margrit. 2002. *Embodying the Monster: Encounters with the Vulnerable Self.* London: Sage.

Smith, Anna. 2008. "The Scary Tale Looks for a Family: Gary Crew's *Gothic Hospital* and Sonya Hartnett's *The Devil Latch*". In *The Gothic in Children's Literature: Haunting the Borders,* Anna Jackson et al. (eds.), Abingdon: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, 131–143.

Tallon, Philip. 2010. "Through a Mirror, Darkly: Art-Horror as a Medium for Moral Reflection". In *Philosophy of Horror,* Thomas Fahy (ed.), Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 33–41.

Thomassen, Bjørn. 2014. *Liminality and the Modern: Living Through the In-Between.* Farnham: Ashgate.

Treanor, Brian. 2007. *Aspects of Alterity: Levinas, Marcel, and the Contemporary Debate.* Bronx: Fordham University Press.

Walter, Elizabeth, ed. 2008. *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary.* 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Warner, Marina. 2000. *No Go the Bogeyman: Scaring, Lulling and Making Mock*. London: Vintage

Woodlief, Tony. 2011. "Monster Mashup: How Our Culture's Heroes and Villains Have Traded Places". In *Acculturated: 23 Savvy Writers Find Hidden Virtue in Reality TV, Chic Lit, Video Games, and Other Pillars of Pop Culture*, Naomi Schaefer Riley and Christine Rosen, eds. Radnor, PA: Templeton Press, 15–22.

Zipes, Jack. 1997. *Happily Ever After: Fairy Tales, Children and the Culture Industry.* London: Routledge.

Zipes, Jack. 2002. *Breaking the Magic Spell: Radical Theories of Folk and Fairy Tales.* 2. Ed. Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky.