In Gothic literature, the nature of the surface is anything but superficial. Both Matthew Lewis’ *The Monk* and Daphne du Maurier’s *Rebecca* employ elements of artifice which contribute to the induction of the terror and horror dichotomy. The impact that these surfaces have on appearances and representation in these novels reveals the vast forms which gothic space utilises in order to successfully educe hauntings.

There is some contestation over the distinction between terror and horror, along with their corresponding effects. This is a direct cause of the nebulous nature of the word terror and its capacity to avoid any clear definition. Dani Cavallaro avers that ‘… if horror makes people shiver, terror undermines the foundations of their worlds.’¹ In other words, not only is terror ineffable but it also subsumes questions of morality and some incredulity over the representation of reality; for Cavallaro, this implies the notion that terror is subjective as opposed to a universal fear that is derived from moments of horror. Notwithstanding the reasonable psychological validity of this claim, it does not highlight the immense interdependence of these two states of fear: it places an unnecessary demarcation between them. To analyse them in the absence of this demarcation is to recognise the tensions between such terms without creating some form of hierarchy with terror as paramount. It would be judicious, then, to acknowledge the fleeting critical definitions of a term such as terror without privileging one definition over the other; these terms and their manifold definitions should work in flux.

The elusive quality of terror corresponds with art and representation in these two texts. In relation to surfaces, terror is evoked almost ironically through subjectivity and interiority. In *The Monk*, this pertains to the painting of Madonna on Ambrosio’s wall. The connection between this surface and Ambrosio is evident:

… “I must accustom my eyes to Objects of temptation, and expose myself to the seduction of luxury and desire. Should I meet in that world which I am constrained to enter some lovely Female, lovely ... as yon Madona....!”²

Here, Ambrosio declares his private fantasies towards this image of a representation of the Virgin Mary. He explains that as a result of his being intrigued by artifice he is able to preserve the distance between representation and reality; while Ambrosio does not yet know that Matilda was the model for this portrait, the terror which is evoked from this moment is one of a bifurcated unity between subjectivity and obscurity. Robert Miles, on the other hand, believes that there is no such interiority in *The Monk* and that the novel is far too concerned with the demonic and transitory instances of horror.³ Miles treats terror and horror as distinctive entities that are separate at the point of the character. He believes Ambrosio to be a character completely devoid of interiority: one for whom the signified of Ambrosio’s character merely functions as demonic. There is indeed an ambiguity between terror and horror at play here which Patricia Cove complicates even further: ‘… obscurity entails not only the heightening of sensation and disruption of rational observation, but also the individual’s loss of autonomy.’⁴ For Cove, terror
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consequently leads to the symptoms of horror such as the shivering of the senses. But obscurity is a term that is subsumed in the Burkean notion of the sublime which Radcliffe argues is related to terror – it evokes both pain and pleasure simultaneously.\(^5\) Terror and horror, then, are not necessarily confused terms, but they operate in succession rather than independently of each other. When thinking of the portrait in *The Monk* these two elements of fear intertwine after Matilda’s identity to Ambrosio has caused him to pursue other chaste women: “… his eye fell upon the picture of his once-admired Madona. He tore it with indignation from the wall: He threw it on the ground, and spurned it from him with his foot.”\(^6\) The portrait alone is able to engender feelings of both pleasure and pain, which derive from obscurity and his subjective attachment to this image. Terror itself occurs not only at the prospect of his not gaining access to heaven, but also in regard to one of Fred Botting’s explanations of terror in regard to evasion. He writes: ‘terror enables escape; it allows one to delimit its effects, to distinguish and overcome the threat it manifests.’\(^7\) The capacity to escape applies to Ambrosio when he engages in sexual congress with Matilda for a second time, even after having connected her to the painting. Initially he is stunned at this discovery and his instinct is to escape the company of Matilda; however, while he is able to escape her, he cannot reverse the removal of his chastity, which is the true horror. In the eschatological sense, Ambrosio’s fate is ambiguous and his soul consequently contracts. It causes Ambrosio to become submissive to the power of his newfound sexuality which the image of Matilda has inspired. Thus, this image indicates the dangers of art and shows that the meaning that Ambrosio writes into this artificial representation of Matilda becomes an instance of performativity.

Similarly, *Rebecca* is suffused with implications of the dangers of art and how these surfaces affect appearances. The most striking example is that of the toppling art books in Rebecca’s study: ‘they swayed dangerously, leaning one against the other … at any rate the foremost one fell, and the others slid after him.’\(^8\) Art books contain appearances and representations of certain moments in time which are suspended in the surface. Not only do these books show that appearances rely upon each other for stability, but they also show that the superfluity of appearances has an impact when the ideas of terror and horror are introduced. It is likely that such a large collection of art works across history may include several representations of the same subject; this is echoed in the ball scene at Manderley when Mrs de Winter arrives emulating the appearance of one of the house portraits: “it’s the picture,” I said, terrified at his eyes, at his voice. “It’s the picture, the one in the gallery.”\(^9\) While Ambrosio in *The Monk* sleeps with the image of Madonna rather than Matilda herself, Maxim is repulsed at the representation of Rebecca through Mrs de Winter’s dress. His seeing her at the top of the stairs is an instance of horror which transforms into psychological terror. As Steven Bruhm opines:

> in the psychoanalytic Gothic, we intensely desire the object that has been lost, or another object, person, or practice that might take its place, but we are aware at some level that this object carries with it the threat of punishment…\(^10\)

Mrs de Winter, then, becomes an unconscious supplement for Maxim, a Gothic space of terror. In marrying Mrs de Winter, he leaves himself vulnerable to a haunting of his late wife because
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of a persistent threat of his having replaced her. Although she is remarkably distinct from Rebecca, this desire to supplant herself with an opposite image backfires and goes awry.

A duality between Gothic space and terror is redolent of the case of Scottie and Madeleine in Alfred Hitchcock’s Vertigo. When Madeleine is purportedly possessed by Carlotta Valdes, the past haunts the present. But this Madeleine is in fact an artificial representation performed by Judy Barton who emulates Madeleine’s appearance, which corresponds with a trope of terror: the supernatural not at all being supernatural. After Madeleine falls to her death he later encounters Judy as herself and intends to replicate Madeleine at the level of the surface; he dresses her in identical clothing and meticulously fashions her hair in the same complex style. Notwithstanding his unawareness of the duplicity to which he had been subjected, Scottie creates an appearance of an appearance which means that his desire to recreate Madeleine is futile – she never existed. Lacan acknowledges this futility:

… a signifier is what represents the subject to another signifier. This latter signifier is therefore the signifier to which all the other signifiers represent the subject – which means that if this signifier is missing, all the other signifiers represent nothing.

The subject here is Judy; the latter signifier is the initial Madeleine constructed through artifice, with the first being Scottie’s recreation of the whole system. In this sense, the initial Madeleine is unattainable and her fictitious identity renders all of the others void. Scottie can no longer project the original Madeleine onto this new surface because the supernatural elements of Vertigo are proven to be a fallacy; as Terry Castle explains: ‘the “ghost” may be of someone living or dead. Mourners, not surprisingly, are particularly prone to such mental visions.’ It is not the ghost of Madeleine which haunts Scottie; it is, rather, the surface which invigorates his optical fantasy. His precise remodelling of Judy – particularly in regard to the selection of clothes that Scottie foists on her, as well as the symbolic coiled bun in her hair – restores this surface. The horror that he faces during the discovery that this Madeleine never existed then produces symptoms of terror; his fantasy amounts to sheer disappointment in the final result, for it has truly inculcated in him a sense of false desire.

When both surface and artifice work in conjunction, they produce difficulties concerning desire and fantasy. A created appearance is a fantasy which is eventually disrupted and descends into chaos. According to Slavoj Žižek, ‘the appearance implies that there is something behind it which appears through it; it conceals a truth and by the same gesture gives a foreboding thereof, it simultaneously hides and reveals the essence behind its curtain.’ Mrs de Winter’s dress acts as a surface and therefore exhibits Rebecca in an absent form. Thus, Žižek’s argument marries up with Radcliffe’s notional terror because, not only does this entrance shake Maxim to his foundations, but it creates an apprehension in him that obfuscates the future. With Vertigo in mind: when Mrs de Winter appears at top of the stairs as a representation of Caroline, there is another link in the signifying chain which is that of Rebecca performing the same role. Notwithstanding Mrs de Winter’s resentment of Rebecca’s popularity, the performative utterances to which she is subjected encourages her to be more like Rebecca in order to please her husband – whether or not such an action is one of unconscious desire. Lacan explains that such a drive operates with the other in mind: ‘it is only with its appearance at the level of the

other that what there is of the function of the drive may be realized.\(^{15}\) In this instance, Maxim is the other who fulfils the Lacanian sense of desire in her; it is her belief – from the inordinate praise of his former wife uttered by mere acquaintances – that he desires the appearance of Rebecca in her. Yet the strict recoil from Maxim at this sight delineates what Žižek considers to be an instance of fantasy realised. This is an entirely negative term and the effect of which removes Maxim’s distance from the deceased Rebecca. For Žižek, the notion of fantasy realised is sustained through humiliation.\(^{16}\) Mrs de Winter has humiliated herself in dressing up as Rebecca, and, in essence, she loses the gratification over which she had control when it was a mere fantasy. She remarks during her preparation: ‘I felt different already, no longer hampered by my appearance. My own dull personality was submerged at last.’\(^{17}\) Prior to the ball she mentions that her dull character is in contrast to that of Rebecca’s, which seems to strengthen the proposition that she can display this artifice at the level of the surface. The reification of an incorporeal Rebecca indicates this link between fantasy, terror, and a removal of control.

The control which Ambrosio had over his sexual temptations is also lost as his Madonna is represented to him in the human form of Matilda. He is no longer able to relish the distance he had between himself and the woman in the painting. This is his fantasy realised: the continued sense of the fantasy that bleeds into reality. Žižek elucidates this idea: ‘… what precedes fantasy is not reality but a hole in reality, its point of impossibility filled in with fantasy.’\(^{18}\) The painting as a living woman is the impossibility; and it is into this surface that Ambrosio installs meaning. Matilda is a simulation of the figure in the painting – she is now the artificial being. The irony, here, is a reversal of depth and surface because Matilda becomes the mere surface, whereas it is the depth of the painting which supplants her. This process of confused representation is comparable to Vertigo in the sense that the figure in the painting is thus the missing signifier. The depth which originates from Ambrosio’s connection with the image in the painting is absent in the surface of Matilda. As a consequence Matilda is now the empty space of impossibility onto whom Ambrosio inserts his fantasy. Although Matilda is never quite sufficient, for she does not equal the lofty signifier that is the surface of the painting. Kriss Ravetto-Biagioli expands upon this idea concerning the feminine in Vertigo: ‘… the idealized representation of the feminine figure supplements the lack of the real thing as well as the impossibility of sexual fulfillment.’\(^{19}\) While this corresponds to Vertigo in the form of never being able to revive a dead woman, in The Monk the element of chastity is the desired impossibility. It is chastity which now separates Matilda from the image of her in the painting; the anger with which he throws down the painting indicates a realisation from Ambrosio of his lust for chaste women. As he grows fond of Antonia, he harbours resentment for Matilda that is partially unexplained. Yet Matilda is no longer a virgin like the character in the painting; the latter of whom is essentially the distant past haunting his present, which subsequently becomes the near past which haunts the present. In other words, the painting is a suspended surface which is contingent upon its social conditions. When he realises the damage that the painting has caused – and as he recognises its influence on his actions – he scorns the surface, for he is now unable to make the distinction between Matilda and Madonna: his fantasy is realised.

The additional surface of Antonia further complicates matters. Once again the plethora of representations portends danger, as was the illustration in Rebecca with the toppling art books; while Antonia does not resemble the figure in the painting, it is the surface of divine
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innocence with which Ambrosio is mesmerised. The amalgamation of several elements constructs this image, particularly her close study of a Bible with all the ribald parts removed. This attention to innocence was imperative in his attitude towards Matilda: “... I am secured from danger by the innocence of Matilda.”  


ascertaining her familial connection, her role as phallus is fulfilled – she is the Gothic space where jouissance occurs. This last term is one that is closely linked to terror through the sublime; as Dylan Evans points out: ‘the term jouissance thus nicely expresses the paradoxical satisfaction that the subject derives from his symptom, or, to put it another way, the suffering that he derives from his own satisfaction…’

26 The elision of pleasure and pain, of which the latter is eventually realised, is a corollary of Antonia as phallus who embodies the textuality of Madonna while simultaneously being an initiator of symbolic castration, which Lacan defines as a punishment for incestual activity.27 Surfaces rely on this textual component in order to signify moments of terror.

Textuality, then, in relation to terror is demonstrated in Rebecca when haunting is examined. Cavallaro kindles this argument with his statement: ‘haunting is a discourse.’

28 Primarily this works in relation to a tension of hierarchy between presence and absence. Although, it is not one of a sexual nature; it is merely one of competition. That selfsame space of which Mrs de Winter is now in occupation was once the territory of the deceased Rebecca. Thus, it is the incompatibility of the space to contain the two identities – one of memory in the case of Rebecca, for her belongings furnish the room. Arguably this demonstrates the diversity of the surface and the various forms it assumes. Rebecca’s very name which comes from the Hebrew “to bind” is significant because her influence binds the two temporalities of past and present together. The recurring motif of her name amplifies this binding; the embroidered form also characterises this binding, such as in the instance of wearing Rebecca’s dress which is, not only a binding of thread, but it binds also the haunting of a past scene for Maxim when he sees it again. Of the salient letter, Mrs de Winter remarks: ‘a tall sloping R, with the letters de W interlaced. The R dwarfed the other letters, the tail of it ran down into the cambric, away from the laced edge.’

29 This curled letter towers over the other initials in the sense that Rebecca dominates Mrs de Winter, the latter of whom is not in possession of that first initial; in the novel she is absent of any first initial which diminishes her value over her predecessor. The curled shape of this letter also resembles Rebecca’s discursive effect over events, for she pervades almost every element of the life at Manderley in fragmented intervals. Its tail which reaches the bottom of the fabric further intensifies the textual link between the past and the present: its descending tail mirrors the submerged body of Rebecca herself. This textual residue turbulently sustains her memory in the living world; textuality is embodied in the surface. Consequently, Maxim’s issue is that he sees her as the deceased Rebecca because her appearance in the ball gown is textual: it enables the signification of Rebecca. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick argues that it is these visual signifiers which generate a form of writing system in Gothic literature: ‘to the degree that such writing is writing at all, it is like an illustrated lexicon of nouns.’

30 Even though she argues that writing in the form of a visual signifier is inchoate, it establishes an element of terror which relies upon caution. The competing presence of wife and former wife inculcate in him a feeling that he will never be free of Rebecca; the dress, similar to the effects that Rebecca’s possessions have on Manderley, has contaminated Mrs de Winter and has transformed her into a permanent signifier of Rebecca.

The primary difference between The Monk and Rebecca is that the former subjugates itself to surfaces while the latter is cautious of them. Nevertheless these reactions to surfaces are not strict attributions of instances of terror or horror. For instance, Mrs de Winter is cautious of
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29 Du Maurier, Rebecca, 132.
the sea and represents it as a harmful surface: ‘I could not hear the restless sea, and because I could not hear it my thoughts would be peaceful too.’\textsuperscript{31} The sea is a surface from which she can escape but only temporarily owing to where Manderley is situated. In that sense she cannot truly escape this surface; however, the allusion to her thoughts suggests that terror is something that transcends the corporeal. Meanwhile \textit{The Monk} confuses such a supposition, for Ambrosio experiences terror in relation to his physical contact with Matilda. Considering this qualm, then, it is feasible to declare that terror is any instance which elicits a haunting. Horror does, however, disrupt a prolonged case of haunting especially in the ball gown scenario in \textit{Rebecca} – he is hitherto haunted by dint of Rebecca’s lingering textuality in Manderley. Therefore the instability of these signifiers, aided both by their ability to reverse the appearances of other signifiers and to transgress boundaries such as Rebecca’s body being removed from the sea, creates the caution towards these surfaces. It is equally plausible that the removal of surfaces contributes to these cautious attitudes. Alison Criddle magnifies this point pertaining to surfaces in \textit{Vertigo}: ‘hair is active, durable, powerful and subject to manipulation, a site for the exercising of control over matter.’\textsuperscript{32} In addition to its bolstering of the textuality point, it implies that surfaces are able to sustain their power and that this power lies in whoever has constructed this surface. With Madeleine, it is the knot in her hair which is significant: the absence of this knot signals vulnerability. Judy is aware that the forming of this knot grants its manufacturer such hegemony, which is why she is so reluctant for Scottie to gain the same power which Gavin Elster had in the first half of the picture. Terror is instilled in her when this surface is removed because not only will Scottie procure this power when he reconstructs it, but there is, for Judy, the looming threat that he will discover her role as the first Madeleine. With this in mind, it is only when Mrs de Winter removes the ball gown that terror occurs, followed by an intensified haunting for Maxim because his new wife was the only surface that was free of Rebecca’s contamination. The much more intense haunting is hastened by one of the guests: ‘“that’s right, isn’t it, de Winter? Tell your wife she must call herself a ‘forget-me-not’.”’\textsuperscript{33} Mrs de Winter, for Maxim, is now a perpetual reminder of Rebecca. Incidentally, it is no coincidence that the colour of her current dress in this scene corresponds with that of the sea. These two surfaces are now interlinked which precipitates the inevitable terror of what is to come. If in \textit{The Monk} it is the removal of the veil which engenders terror and the same is true of the ball gown in \textit{Rebecca}, then, by the same token, it is equally conceivable to deduce that the decomposition of Rebecca’s body is what prompts terror and the pervasive wariness of surfaces in the first place. However, while Maxim turns out not to be implicated in Rebecca’s death and is able to escape a prison cell, both he and Mrs de Winter are left with the conundrum over whether or not they will truly be able to escape Rebecca; this is evinced in the ominous final line: ‘It was shot with crimson, like a splash of blood. And the ashes blew towards us with the salt wind from the sea.’\textsuperscript{34} The removal of Manderley as an active surface, along with the separation of Rebecca’s body from the sea, shows this to be the case: the effect is horrifying.

Despite being problematic terms with ever-augmenting definitions, both terror and horror are complementary terms when a surface in whatever form is involved. These two texts demonstrate how the surface can be manipulated through artifice which consequently generates moments of terror and horror, along with psychological implications for the characters. As a result, it is the surface which enables hauntings and simultaneously establishes the representation of a suspended past that invariably threatens the present.
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