ARCHIVIO ISTITUZIONALE
DELLA RICERCA

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna
Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

John Polidori’s Gothic Novel: "Ernestus Berchtold" and the Daring Narrative of Incest

This is the final peer-reviewed author’s accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:
Baiesi, S. (2020). John Polidori’s Gothic Novel: "Ernestus Berchtold" and the Daring Narrative of Incest. Cham : Palgrave Macmillan [10.1007/978-3-030-35546-3_11].

Availability:
This version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/11585/744818 since: 2020-03-07

Published:
DOI: http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-35546-3_11

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (https://cris.unibo.it/).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

30 December 2024

John Polidori’s Gothic Novel
Ernestus Berchtold and the Daring Narrative of Incest

Serena Baiesi

Polidori’s almost ‘lost romantic’ novel *Ernestus Berchtold, or the Modern Oedipus* (1819) is an intertextual narration that challenges its readers, both contemporary and of the present time, from several points of view. It is a Gothic story, whose central issue of incest and damnation is suggested in the novel’s sub-title. It implies a double sin committed by unacquainted couples of siblings, – an immoral entanglement which is constantly referred to but only disclosed at the very end of the story. Moreover, Polidori employs many of the conventional elements of the Gothic tradition: dangerous powers related to occult science, endless sense of guilt, unspeakable mysteries, demonic spirits and a deathbed confession. In particular, the author uses all the means of the Gothic romance – incorporating elements of the novel – as well as the drama. For this novel, Polidori draws quite openly from the contemporary literature of his time.

This novel is one of the many ‘lost’ materials of the Romantic period since it has suffered a long lasting oblivion from the part of critics, scholars and the general public alike. This is due to the fact that Polidori’s most successful work is the internationally recognised *Vampire* published in 1819 and the author is mainly cited as Byron’s physician during the summer at Villa Diodati. Actually, Polidori has almost disappeared from literary histories and scholarly research because he was not a successful writer at his time. His limited literary activity was flanked by a disastrous career as physician both in England and in Italy, and his addiction to gambling drove him to suicide for his debts at a young age. He is mocked by Mary Shelley as ‘poor Polidori’, and he is commonly referred to as a silent listener of Byron’s and Shelley’s conversations. As a matter of fact, Polidori’s works are quite derivative from his literary circle and life experience with Byron and the Shelleys, and we should read and interpret them today with reference to such tradition. What should be rescued from being lost is his skilful ability to rework literary modes, issues, and his cultural context taking inspiration from and referring to his contemporaries and reproduce them in his own writings. In rediscovering Polidori as a product of his age, modern readers should define his works as a dialogue with the literary tradition of his time. Although not an innovator of themes, genres, and aesthetics, Polidori did experiment with different literary modes (short story, novel and drama) and discussed issues of his time taking as source of inspiration his contemporary authors.

As a matter of fact, *Ernestus Berchtold* is the direct progeny of Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein* and Lord Byron’s *Manfred*, both in literary and contextual levels. Due to its exceptional genesis, *Ernestus Berchtold* may be read as a response to what Polidori was experiencing in his life, namely

his journey with Byron to the Continent and, in particular, those events that animated the summer spent at the Lake near Geneva with the Shelleys. The novel is precisely the result of the alleged ghost-story competition – and not the short story *The Vampyre* as is usually incorrectly claimed[1] – and is to be studied in relation to and in dialogue with the more successful literary works published by his fellow writers. Even though Polidori as a novelist did not reach the same success and critical attention of his contemporaries, his 'lost' gothic story *Ernestus Berchtold* is still a work worth reading, for its dense intertextual connotations and as an offspring of a unique literary context.

With the aim to frame Polidori's Gothic novel into a larger literary setting of Romantic literature, in this essay I would firstly contextualise Polidori as a literary figure and his role during the ghost-story competition at Villa Diodati that much influenced his writings. Next, I will discuss the performing elements of Polidori's Gothic narrative in order to see how he employed this genre borrowing features from the romance tradition and combining his narrative with the dramatic form. Finally, I turn to the issue of incest as a recurring theme in Romantic literature, to see how Polidori has used it as a cross-reference component to enter into a dialogue with and challenge other works by his contemporaries.

John William Polidori came from a distinguished literary family: his father, Gaetano Polidori, was himself an accomplished man of letters, translator, poet and essayist. Gaetano had been Vittorio Alfieri's secretary, and he had moved from Italy to France and then to London in 1790. This man had inspired in his son considerable psychological conflict for his severe method of education and driving ambition. The fact that Gaetano had had a successful career and became a respected scholar in both Italy and England, made him push his son to have similar aspirations in life, causing great anxiety to the young boy. John Polidori was the eldest son of eight children; his sister, Frances, married an Italian expatriate, Gabriele Rossetti, and they had three children: Dante Gabriel Rossetti, William Michael Rossetti, and Christina Rossetti. John Polidori was 'handsome, and possessed a gift of writing'[2], but he also showed some vanity and sensitivity in his character. At a young age he received his medical degree from the University of Edinburgh, publishing his thesis on somnambulism in 1815.

Early in 1816 he obtained the post of physician to Lord Byron and departed on a tour of the continent with him. On their arrival at Geneva on 25 May 1816, Byron rented the Villa Diodati and was soon joined by Percy Shelley, Mary Godwin and her half-sister Claire Clairmont, who took up residence nearby at the Maison Chapuis. While in Geneva, Polidori was not only part of Byron's circle of friends, but he also attended Madame De Staël's salon at Coppet, and had frequent entertainments with other aristocrats and intellectuals – men of literature and of science – of the area.

However, Polidori's oversensitivity to ridicule and Byron's growing contempt for his complex and arrogant young physician friend led to a rapid decline in their relationship. Eventually this caused Polidori's dismissal at the end of the summer. He then visited several Italian cities before going back to London, where he died in 1821 at the age of 25. After accumulating pressing debts, he committed suicide by means of prussic acid. His biographer, L. D. Macdonald, gives us the picture of a man who desperately wanted to be a Romantic literary figure, but through an inescapable clumsiness in dealing with people of his own life remained only the pale imitation or reflection of the better-known and more talented people he knew.[3]

Before leaving England with Byron, Polidori was offered £500 by John Murray, Byron's publisher, for a journal of the tour. As a consequence, during the summer 1816, Polidori was not just a participant in the famous literary competition, but more importantly he was recording Byron's spectacular life, his adventures, his literary progress, his relationship with the Shelleys; in short he was an eyewitness reporter. This journal, entitled *The Diary of Dr. John William Polidori 1816 Relating to Byron, Shelley, etc.*, was edited in 1911 by Polidori's nephew, William Michael Rossetti, from a transcription of the original manuscript in the possession of Polidori's sister, Charlotte. In 1869 she had made a copy in order to leave out the 'peccant passages', and destroyed the original.[4] As a consequence, Polidori's entries during the summer at Villa Diodati provide a censured and probably incomplete narration of the event.

At Diodati, Polidori was frequently a target for the satire of Byron and the Shelleys. From both Polidori's own entries and Mary Shelley's records we know that 'poor Polidori' was frequently the subject of disparaging comments, about his physical ineptitude, his volatile personality, but also his disputed literary gift. With Mary Shelley, though, Polidori established a more personal relationship, which provoked ambivalent reactions from both sides. She called him her 'younger brother' showing him some affectionate feelings, and when Percy Shelley and Byron undertook a boat excursion, leaving the women and Polidori behind, Mary Shelley and Polidori met every day, even twice a day. The competition had already started; both Mary Shelley and Polidori were busy searching for the right inspiration in composing their tales of wonder and mystery. However, two days after Percy Shelley and Byron returned, Polidori's diary breaks off for over two months, and he resumes it on 5 September with a description of his quarrel with both Byron and Percy Shelley (Polidori, *The Diary of Dr. John William Polidori 1816*, 135).

At the same time, Mary Shelley's later disparaging remarks about Polidori in the Introduction of the 1831 edition of her novel indicate a similar sense of ambivalence on her part.[5] Indeed, the rainy summer of 1816 is significant to Mary Shelley's biography because it raises personal issues due to the complicated nature of the relationship involving all members of the

group. Mary Shelley's sense of her own isolation from the two major poets may have led her to resent the person to whose level she had been relegated, so that, even fifteen years later, her recollection of that time suggested a sense of rivalry with Polidori that inclined her to revise some of the factual details.[6] As James Rieger suggests: 'no statement in her account of the writing party at Diodati, or even of the inception of her own idea, can be trusted'.[7] Mary Shelley's recollections as well as Polidori's on the very same summer seem to be both incomplete and disfigured. However, the dialogue that is missing between the two through their diaries is established through their two novels and how they both employed the gothic and incest in order to give voice to states of anxiety and power relations.

This is also true of the famous conversation between Byron and Percy Shelley about 'the nature of the principle of life' that Mary Shelley reports in her introduction and to which she was a 'devout but nearly silent listener' (Shelley, *Frankenstein*, 8). This more probably occurred between Polidori and Percy Shelley, since the former was an expert on the new science and the latter an accomplished amateur. As a consequence, it was actually Polidori's medical knowledge that fed into Mary Shelley's scientific gothic and not Byron. And it was the ambiguous relationship between Byron and Claire, Mary and Percy Shelley, Mary and Byron, Percy and Claire that gave inspiration to the double incest between siblings in Polidori's novel.

As a matter of fact, Mary Shelley and John Polidori both shared a subordinate position in the relationship to Byron and Shelley. Both were allies and rivals in vying for the attention and approval of the poets. Shelley and Polidori struggled to find their own place and their own literary voices alongside the more famous and established members of their circle. Such a relationship would only invigorate their participation in the ghost story writing contest and probably the content of their novels. Consequently, as Jeffrey Cass has proposed, 'Polidori and Mary Shelley have a great deal invested in establishing their writing careers. They compete – both with each other and with Byron and Percy Shelley – in order to assert their own private and public legitimacy'.[8] Moreover, as noted by Adam Mekler: 'in the end, therefore, it is understandable that the works produced by Mary Shelley and Polidori would incorporate complex considerations of legitimacy and rivalry in narratives centring on the threat to the domestic affections of the hubristic engagement with alchemy. In this way, the topic of incest becomes an important symbol of their concern' and 'in this regard, the placement of these texts and their treatment of the theme of incest within a literary context, while not completely independent from biographical considerations, become especially relevant'.[9]

Recalling Victor Frankenstein as well as Manfred, the protagonist of Polidori's story is a solitary young man who wanders around the Alps in search of a sublime relation with nature.

Ernestus is a version of the Byronic hero. He is also an orphan, then a voluntary patriot who fights against the foreign invaders of Switzerland (the French). During his eventful life, Ernestus experiences the sins and joys of youth, meaning that he is tempted by gambling and prostitution but then he is redeemed by true love and religion. Ernestus's happiness does not last long though, because Louisa, his lover, is dying of consumption. However, all the misery which destroys Ernestus's loved ones (including his sister Julia and his friend Olivieri) is unveiled by a shocking admission: Count Doni, Ernestus's (second) adopted father from Milan, has been for a long time acquainted with occult powers. He has been invoking devil spirits from an early age in order to acquire perpetual wealth. Doni's Faustian pact, however, implies a corresponding curse on his family affections. The consequences of Doni's evil powers are affecting everybody, and only on his deathbed, does the old man disclose the truth about Ernestus and Luisa, a newly wed couple, who are in fact brother and sister. Similarly, Ernestus's twin sister Julia, who dies after being seduced and abandoned by Louisa's libertine brother Olivieri (who dies soon after in a fight), has been fated by this curse. And the offspring of their incestuous relation is probably the ultimate silent listener of Ernestus's oral confession.

Ernestus Berchtold was published in 1819 and received a mixed reception from the reviews of the time. The *Edinburgh Monthly Review* (1820) for instance found Polidori's publication a 'vile abortion'. The fact that the novel is termed an 'abortion' immediately connects it with several metaphorical meanings of *Frankenstein*. The review continues, labelling *Ernestus Berchtold* a 'very stupid work', a 'silly tale', thus making it appropriate for 'any circulating library in the kingdom', but clearly not for a higher educated public. In the reviewer's opinion, the author appears too full of himself and is far from being a genius. The article closes with an intertextual reference between the novel's subtitle (the Modern Oedipus), and the one assigned by Mary Shelley to *Frankenstein*, namely the Modern Prometheus:

> And for what reason is all this folly acted by a plain dull man, vainly endeavouring to escape from his own native sphere? Why, for the laudable purpose of raking together the sweepings of the Minerva Press, and circulating libraries – of delighting and improving the world, by the delicate exhibition of a *partie quarrée* ['four-handed game'] of incest – and of nicknaming a stupid story, the modern Oedipus, only we suppose because Mr. Shelley has chosen to designate one of his reveries the modern Prometheus.[10]

Like many contemporaries, the reviewer assumed that Percy Shelley had written the anonymous *Frankenstein*. As for the relation between Modern Prometheus and Modern Oedipus, this was the consequence of the influence Mary Shelley had on Polidori's narrative and the challenge to rewrite a mythological story in a modern-Gothic key. As remarked by D.L. Macdonald and Kathleen Scherf,

> the myth of Prometheus is a myth of origins: Prometheus created humanity before giving it fire. The Modern Prometheus discovers the origin of life, with disastrous consequences. The modern Oedipus, like the Oedipus myth, discovers only the origin of his own life, but with almost equally disastrous consequences.[11]

Despite this negative assessment in *The Edinburgh Review*, as well as the inaccuracy of authorial identification at the end of the article, we could nonetheless find some interesting comments in relation to Polidori's use of the romance as gothic genre in other articles. Polidori was clearly inspired by a well-established tradition of gothic fiction. Indeed he is experimenting with new treatments of this genre. For instance, in the 'Introduction' of *Ernestus*, Polidori needs to contextualise his story: 'the tale here presented to the public is the one I began at Coligy, when Frankenstein was planned.' In this way Polidori established a close reference with Mary Shelley's own fiction from the very beginning. Polidori describes the same events as Shelley does in her 1831 preface of her novel, but from a different perspective. The author wants to validate his aim and procedure in dealing with the gothic, especially in relation to his use of 'supernatural agency.' He states that despite the disputable degree of originality in depicting 'the colouring' of Ernestus Berchtold's mind comparing the tradition of 'erudite in novel and romances', his work is indeed original – even though 'not always pleasing.' Polidori's romance 'rests upon improbabilities' that 'generally disgust a rational mind', but the author has 'thrown the superior agency into the back ground as much as was in my power.' Even though the characters act 'under the ordinary agencies of life', the author 'had agreed to write a supernatural tale […] that does not allow of a completely every-day narrative.'[12]

This is significant because Polidori's introduction recalls very closely Horace Walpole's second preface to *The Castle of Otranto*. Here Walpole states that the fusion of romance and novel generated a new form of gothic romance in which characters possessed psychosocial, believable traits, while nevertheless investigating the realm of the marvellous. This attempt to depict deep emotional insight is apparent across genres in the Romantic period, and is clearly shared by Polidori. His narrative distinctively recalls this tradition and, following the Byronic hero and the torment of Victor Frankenstein, Polidori casts Ernestus among the Alps in solitude, incapable of sharing his feelings with anybody: 'I did not feel pleasure in the society of men. […] I found they could not sympathise with one whom they looked upon as a wild romantic mountaineer' (Polidori, *Vampyre*, 70).[13]

Placing mystery at the centre of his thematic, rhetorical, and moral projection, Polidori follows in the footsteps of gothic romance, but, at the same time, he tests elements of the subsequent Gothic practice – notably Gothic horror. Writers such as Matthew Lewis and Charlotte Dacre had transformed the terror Gothic into the horror, intensifying the idea of mystery with the

deliberate obfuscation of religion and the dark machination of satanic forces. The components of terror and horror, however, were infused by political and social significance and protest, and Polidori includes those elements in his tale too. Spirits, visions, mysterious sounds and sublime locations are all present in this novel together with gambling, corruption and redemption: 'I went to bed, but not to sleep, the thoughts of having seen an unembodied being, the tales of my foster-mother, of power, of wealth, arising from the communication with beings of another world, arose before me.' (Polidori, *The Vampyre*, 123). This scene recalls both Victor's nightmare after the creation, and Manfred's involvement with the spirits and black magic.

In this novel, Polidori employs Gothic elements to question the nature of power, the source of its authority in the oppressive past, and also to investigate the ways in which contemporary society and gender roles reinforced it. Other Gothic motifs that are absorbed and elaborated in Polidori's tale include: the scientific Gothic exemplified by Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, and the colonial Gothic developed by William Beckford. These elements are also found in Polidori's gothic story and are part of a long list of subgenres deriving from the anxieties during this period. Among them, we can distinguish several social concerns including evolutionary theories: medical experimentation, scientific and geographical discoveries, as well the influence of Orientalism, the fear of the Other, and the threat of colonial insurrections. Indeed, Polidori enters into a critical discussion on the aesthetic forms, values and issues of a familiar Gothic convention, adding the dramatic element. As a consequence, in *Ernestus Berchtold* the author contaminates forms and contents: romance with novel, prose and drama, terror with horror, supernatural with reality, colonialism with revolution.

A more favourable review published in the *European Magazine* (1819) characterises Polidori as a very good writer praising his 'highest faculties to combine the natural with the marvellous, and to develop the human character with the consistency of truth, in a sphere of action beyond the range of possibility.' The review continues that 'this extraordinary tale may claim no obscure place in the department of literature to which it belongs.'[14] Interestingly, *Ernestus Berchtold* is here immediately compared to the classic tragedy by Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannus*, but also to the modern Gothic play by Horace Walpole, *The Mysterious Mother* (1768). The reviewer then claims: 'subjects of this kind are more fitted for narrative than for dramatic representation', and of this as a truth, 'every reader will […] be convinced.'[15] The reason lies in the impressions left on the reader's mind by these works – all three dealing with the issue of incestuous love, but in different narrative forms. In particular, the reviewer exalts Polidori's 'no moderate degree of skill' to 'detail such a story in a manner consistent with the purest delicacy, and at the same time to render it capable of exciting strong sympathetic emotions, and of conveying an

important moral lesson.'[16] Defined as such, Polidori's narration is not so different from a drama in terms of the representation of human passions, which were so frequently at the centre of the Romantic dramatic investigation.[17]

It was Joanna Baillie, who in her 'Introductory Discourse' to her *A Series of Plays* (1798), attempted 'to delineate the stronger passions of the mind' observing men engaged in the 'ordinary occurrences of life',[18] but especially 'when placed in extraordinary situations of difficult and distress'[19] . It is in fact 'when some great explosion of passion bursts forth, and some consequent catastrophe happens'[20] that we are prone to sympathise with the other. And it is not by chance that the reviewer is recalling Walpole's Gothic drama – and not his novel – in comparison with Polidori's tale. Walpole experimented with different forms in his Gothic tragedy, and despite being quite provocative[21] *The Mysterious Mother* (1768) was one of the most popular dramas of the time. In the postscript of the play, the author admits that 'the subject is more truly horrid than even that of Oedipus.'[22] *The Mysterious Mother* certainly contained unusual and controversial material, as it dealt with a double incest plot. It could be read as another source of Polidori's novel and testify the link between *Ernestus Bertchtold* and the dramatic genre.

A third and final review embodies a suitable example to frame the issue of Romantic incest in Polidori's fiction. In 1819, the *Literary Gazette* defines Polidori's novel as 'semi-sentimental' and 'semi-supernatural', following a kind of production very much in vogue at the time, the so-called prose 'Byroniads', which are said to 'infect the times'. The Reviewer goes on to assert that 'the style is good, and the story as horrible as the greatest lovers of raw-head and bloody-bones can desire.'[23] It is important to note that this reviewer is the only one of the three to contextualise *Ernestus Berchtold* as the output of the literary competition organised by 'country-folks, who agreed to write each a story founded on some superstition.'[24] Polidori is here inserted into a particular and unique literary 'school', specifically the so-called 'Satanic school', that attracted much attention in the English public. Being an acquaintance of Byron and Shelley, Polidori was labelled as one of their circle, also because he was much influenced by these authors in his literary productions.

As Peter Thorslev asserts in his landmark essay, 'Incest as Romantic Symbol' (1965), it was during the Romantic period that the theme of incest 'was first developed into a literary symbol, a symbol of the Romantic psyche's love affair with self and of its tragic isolation in an increasingly alien world.'[25] Following this study, Alan Richardson's more recent article confirms that 'the development of the incest theme takes place at the heart of the Romantic movement.' And more specifically, 'the portrayal of incest in the Gothic period, which is characteristically between parents and children, has little to do with Romantic incest, which is characteristically between siblings.'[26]

However, in Polidori's novel the issue of incest between siblings is not overly discussed until the end of the story and in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* is briefly acknowledged only in the first edition.[27] The brother figure is not represented as a tyrannical and usurping villain of the Gothic tradition. Instead, Polidori's male protagonist Ernestus is a Byronic hero very close to Manfred experiencing the same sense of guilt and exclusion from society especially when the incest issues are only elusively implied. Ernestus shares with his sister/lover an equal condition of sufferer under patriarchal power. As underlined by Jenny DiPlacidi, it is this 'potential for equality', this mutual condition, that 'underpins the relationships between brothers and sisters and makes the bonds between siblings so dangerous and potentially destructive to patriarchal society'. This sort of sibling desire is considered the most dangerous and complicated of all the incestuous relationships represented in the Gothic.[28]

In conclusion we can affirm that Polidori has ingeniously fused autobiographical details of his experience at the Villa Diodati with his novel's central gothic theme. He has given his story the form of a spoken narrative in order to dramatise the unspeakability of incest. The silent listener's main function is to foreground Ernestus's difficulties in telling his story, and most of these difficulties have less to do with the attitude of the listener than with the content of the story. After marrying Louisa, Ernestus discovers that she is his sister, and that his family has been cursed forever. This is why he invites his interlocutor to leave him but with hopeful farewell: 'Drop not a tear over my grave, I shall be with Louisa. Farewell, but depart knowing that there exists a consolation, which man cannot take from you, which misfortune cannot destroy, the belief in a future state, in the mercy of a redeeming God. It is there I find refuge' (Polidori, 152). Byron and Shelley had scorned Polidori's religious beliefs, however in his story the physician is nonetheless combining the metaphorical device of confessional mood with the religious faith. As a matter of fact, the religious component was also present in Polidori's only surviving play *Ximenes* (1819), whose original subtitle was 'The Modern Abraham', anticipating the subtitles of *Frankestein* and *Ernestus Berchtold* and establishing Polidori's and Mary Shelley's mutual intertextuality.

Works Cited

Baillie Joanna. 2001. Introductory Discourse. In *Plays on the Passions*, ed. Peter Duthie, 67-113. Peterborough: Broadview Press.

Burwick Frederick. 2016. Incest on the Romantic Stage: Baillie, Byron, and the Shelleys. In *Decadent Romanticism: 1780-1914*. Eds. Kostas Boyiopoulos and Mark Sandy, 27-41. London: Routledge.

Byron, George Gordon Noel. 1980-92. *The Complete Poetical Works*. Ed. Jerome J. McGann, 7 vols. Oxford: Clarendon.

Cass, Jeffrey. 1996. The Contestatory Gothic in Mary Shelley's Frankenstein and J.W. Polidori's Ernestus Berchtold: The Spectre of a Colonial Paradigm. *The Journal of the Association of the Interdisciplinary Study of the Art* 1,2: 33-41.
Cronin, Richard. 1996. Shellyan Incest and the Romantic Legacy. *Keats-Shelley Journal* 45: 61-76.
DiPlacidi, Jenny. 2018. *Gothic Incest. Gender, Sexuality and Transgression*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Leask, Nigel. 2004. Polidori, John William (1795-1821). *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Macdonald, D. L. and Kathleen Scherf. 2008. Introduction. In *The Vampyre and Ernestus Berchtold; or, The Modern Oedipus*, 9-31. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
_____. 1991. *Poor Polidori: A Critical Biography of the Author of 'The Vampyre'*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Mekler, L. Adam. 2010. Hideous Progenies: Mary Shelley, John Polidori, and Incest in the Godwinian Novel. In *Mary Shelley: Her Circle and Her Contemporaries*, eds. by L. Adam Mekler and Lucy Morrison, 45-62. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
Polidori, John William. 1911. *The Diary of Dr. John William Polidori 1816. Relating to Byron, Shelley, etc.* ed. William Michael Rossetti. London: Elkin Mathews.
_____. 2008. *The Vampyre and Ernestus Berchtold; or, The Modern Oedipus*. Eds. D.L. Macdonald and Kathleen Scherf. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
_____. 2008. *The Vampyre and Other Tales of the Macabre*. Eds. Robert Morrison and Chris Baldick. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Richardson, Alan. 1985. The Dangers of Sympathy: Sibling Incest in the English Romantic Poetry. *Studies in English Literature, 1550-1900* 25, 4: 737-754.
Rieger, James. 1963. Dr. Polidori and the Genesis of Frankenstein. *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 3, 4: 461-472.
Shelley, Mary. 1980. *Frankenstein; or, The Modern Prometheus.* Ed. M. K. Joseph. London: Oxford: Oxford University Press.
_____. 2018. *Frankenstein: the 1818 Text*. Ed. Nick Groom. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
_____. 1987. *The Journals of Mary Shelley*. Eds. Paula R. Feldman and Diana Scott-Kilvert. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Anon. 1820. *The Edinburgh Monthly Review* 4: 727-35.
Anon. 1819. *The European Magazine, and London Review* 76: 534-536.
Anon. 1819. *The London Literary Gazette and Journal of Belles Lettres, Arts, Sciences, etc.* 136: 546-48.
Thorslev, Peter L. Jr. 1965. Incest as Romantic Symbol. *Comparative Literature Studies* 2, 1: 41-58.
Walpole, Horace. 2003. *The Castle of Otranto and The Mysterious Mother*. ed. Frederick S. Frank. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
_____. 2001. *The Castle of Otranto*. ed. Michael Gamer. London: Penguins Books.

Notes

[1] It was Henry Colburn who initially credited *The Vampyre* to be written by Lord Byron, when it was firstly published in the *New Monthly Magazine* issue of April 1, 1819. However, both Byron and Polidori, immediately corrected the misleading attribution.
[2] Rieger, 'Dr. Polidori and the Genesis of Frankenstein', 464.
[3] Macdonald, *Poor Polidori*.
[4] Polidori, *The Diary*, 11.

[5] When Mary Shelley wrote the introduction to the revised edition of *Frankenstein* for the Bentley's *Standard Novels* collection in 1831, Polidori was already dead, having committed suicide, it appears, in 1821. Byron too was dead and, of course, Percy Shelley had drowned nine years early in Italy.
[6] Mekler, 'Hideous Progenies', 48.
[7] Rieger, 'Dr. Polidori and the Genesis of Frankenstein', 465.
[8] Cass, 'The Contestatory Gothic in Mary Shelley's Frankenstein and J.W. Polidori's Ernestus Berchtold', 36.
[9] Mekler, 'Hideous Progenies', 48-49.
[10] Anon., *Edinburgh Monthly Review*, 735.
[11] Macdonald and Kathleen, 'Introduction', 30.
[12] Polidori, *Vampyre*, 63. Quotations follow the Peterborough edition, unless otherwise indicated.
[13] See *Manfred*: 'From my youth upwards / My spirit walk'd not with the souls of men, / Nor look'd upon the earth with human eyes' [Byron 1817, Act II, scene 2, ll. 50-52]
[14] Anon., *European Magazine*, 534.
[15] Ibid.
[16] Ibid.
[17] See Burwick, 'Incest on the Romantic Stage: Baillie, Byron, and the Shelleys'.
[18] Joanna Baillie's first volume of *A Series of Plays: in which it is attempted to delineate the stronger passions of the mind. Each passion being the subject of a Tragedy and a Comedy* (known and referred to as *Plays on the Passions*) was published in London in 1798 by T. Cadell Jr. and W. Davis.
[19] Baillie, 'Introductory Discourse', 69.
[20] Ibid., 73.
[21] 'From the time that I first undertook the foregoing scenes, I never flattered myself that they would be proper to appear on the stage. The subject is so horrid that I thought it would shock, rather than give satisfaction to an audience'. From 'Postscript' of *The Mysterious Mother*. [Walpole (1768) 2003, 251]
[22] Walpole, *The Castle of Otranto and The Mysterious Mother*, 251.
[23] Anon., *Literary Gazette*, 546.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Thorslev, 'Incest as Romantic Symbol', 56.
[26] Richardson, 'The Dangers of Sympathy', 738.
[27] Mary Shelley changed the status of Victor's and Elizabeth's relationship from the first to the third edition of the novel: from Victor's first cousin of the 1819 edition, Elizabeth is turned into an orphan from a Milanese nobleman, and raised by peasants later adopted by the Frankenstein family in the 1831 edition.
[28] DiPlacidi, *Gothic Incest*, 86.