

The Underestimated Male:
An Analysis of the Other in the Disney Adaptations of
The Hunchback of the Notre-Dame
and
Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus

BA Thesis English Language and Culture, Utrecht University
Baan Al-Othmani 3877132
Supervisor: Roselinde Supheert
April 2014



Table of Contents

Chapters

1. Introduction: The Other in Gothic Novels and Films p. 3
2. Defining the Other as a Literary Metaphor p. 5
3. Analyzing the Creature and Quasimodo in Their Original Form p. 8
4. Reviewing the Creature and Quasimodo in the Modern Disney Adaptations p. 15
5. Conclusion: Summarizing the Transformations of the Other p. 22

Works Cited p. 24

Chapter 1

Introduction

The Other in Gothic Novels and Films

Film adaptations are always different from the novels. The representation of literary characters in a new medium depends upon directors and screenwriters, who decide to delete or incorporate original themes in their films: “The art of filmic adaptation partially consists in choosing *which* generic conventions are transposable into the new medium, and *which* need to be discarded, supplemented, transcoded, or replaced” (Stam 6). Inevitably, the representation of characters and settings has to change significantly if the genre of the adaptation is different from the genre of the source. However, film and cinema are “multitrack” (Stam 6); they can present a novel or original source in diverse genres thereby adjusting to the unique interests of many viewers.

There have been many film adaptations of gothic novels, particularly of Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus*, published in 1818 (Jansson VII) and Victor Hugo’s *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame*, published in 1831 (Wren VII). The film adaptations of these novels, which were released by Disney, are Tim Burton’s *Frankenweenie* in 2012 and *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame* directed by Gary Trousdale and Kirk Wise in 1996. In these films, the original characters of the gothic novels are placed in a new genre, namely children’s films. Especially the original appearance of the deformed main characters or the Other, viz., the Creature and Quasimodo, is transformed in these child-oriented films.

In these gothic novels, the Other defies social norms, namely civility and good breeding. He¹ is therefore defined by the qualities he lacks according to the social norm. Hunter explains: “Yet what is human cannot be defined in itself, but only by what it is not, by its difference from others: as the figure of the monster is introduced to affirm the primacy of humanity, it succeeds only in reiterating differences in their monstrous form” (Hunter 95). The Other’s malformation stresses his abnormality compared to the average human body. Consequently, other characters view the Other in these novels and films as a monster because of his unique physiognomy. Quasimodo’s and the Creature’s deformity sets them apart from the rest of society in the novels and in the films therefore they are categorized as the Other.

¹ The Other in the novels and in the films is a male therefore the Other shall be referred to as he.

There are several critics who link the Creature and Quasimodo to the Other. Reichardt describes the Creature as a monster who possesses human emotions (139) and Jansson argues that the Creature's monstrous characteristics are formed by Frankenstein's rejection (XII). Stevens explains that Quasimodo's deformity represents the imperfect Parisian society (164) therefore the Other functions as a symbol of corruption in *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame*. Nevertheless, there are not enough studies which link *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame* to *Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus*. This study shows that these gothic novels can be connected because their Disney film adaptations center the main character, namely the Other. The internal en external transformation of the Other in these Disney films compared to the novels can thus be illustrated.

Frankenweenie is a black and white stop motion² animated film set in the fifties in the fictional town of New Holland. Victor Frankenstein is a young boy and his pet dog is Sparky, who dies in a car accident (0:14:34). His death devastates Victor and after watching a class experiment he decides to exhume and revive Sparky. Sparky comes back to life and Victor's classmates, who become aware of it, steal Victor's method to revive their own pets, resulting in the creation of horrendous monsters. Though many characters in this Disney film are inspired by the Creature in the film *Frankenstein* from 1931, they can also be linked to the original Creature in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus*.

The animated Disney film *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame* has a medieval setting, similar to the novel. However, this film contains a blend of music and lyrics; songs are incorporated in the plot and in its narration. The plot remains the same: a young deformed man, Quasimodo, is the bell-ringer of the church of Notre-Dame in Paris. He becomes infatuated with a gypsy girl named Esmeralda, who is accused of witchcraft. He attempts to save her from the painful execution (1:14:28), while his father-figure and mentor, the archdeacon Claude Frollo, also becomes obsessed with her (0:52:04).

In chapter two, the definition of the Other according to diverse literary disciplines shall illustrate the Other as a metaphor of abnormality and deformity. Afterwards, in chapter three, the Other in the novels will be analyzed. Chapter four will consist of the discussion of the film adaptations and a comparison between the Other in the novels and in the films.

² In this film, stop motion is used to photograph movements of clay characters. The photographs are then presented one after another at a fast pace; afterwards, the character's movements can be seen on the screen.

Chapter Two

Defining the Other as a Literary Metaphor

The Repressed Other

In psychoanalysis, the Other is the repressed part of the human psyche. Sigmund Freud's research is undoubtedly significant in this field; he examined the phenomenon named the Other and explains: "Inside every person [...] there was *something* transmitting scrambled messages in a cryptic language, trying to break through the conscious surface of life" (Leitch 812). It is already implied here that the Other's existence, though located in the subconscious, is not to be underestimated because it is inseparable from the psychological development of human beings. The Other has always been intertwined with its exact opposite, namely the Self. The Self and the Other can be placed in a dichotomy, where they form a hierarchy, "in which the first term functions as privileged and superior and the second term as derivative and inferior" (Abrams and Galt 79). The Other as a symbol of abnormality and inferiority functions as a contrast to the accepted social norm, thereby refining the image of the Self. The Self and Other must coexist however, though the Other is often repressed.

The Self can be represented in the body and in the mind; it can refer to the healthy human body and the desired mental state. The relationship between the Self and Other signifies their unequal standing because the Other is often used to describe inferior beings which is the case in Orientalism.

The Oriental and Exotic Other

Originally the Other was linked to foreign countries where customs and inhabitants were considered alien and exotic. Edward Said connects the Other with the Orient: "The Orient is not only adjacent to Europe; it is also the place of Europe's greatest and richest and oldest colonies, the source of its civilizations and languages, its cultural contestant, and one of its deepest and most recurring images of the Other" (1866). This image of the enchanting and fascinating foreign culture has completely reversed over time. It might be suggested that the cultural distance has grown to such an extent that the Orient, or Other, has now come to represent the savage and abnormal side of humanity (Spivak 2115). The Other as the Oriental

and savage inferior is used to verbally abuse and isolate foreign cultures which were seen as alien and beneath the norm of the West.

The Male Other

The male Other often symbolizes the sexual and aggressive nature of humankind, particularly in men. He is possessed by a “sexual instinct” (Rogers 8); his pursuit and urge for females is stronger than normal male’s or the Self’s urges. He also enhances and seems to parody male characteristics, e.g. superhuman strength, obsession with women and excessive rationality. This impressive and strong image of masculinity is inserted in literature, for example in *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame* and *Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus*. These exaggerated features exemplify that the Other could be the metaphor for men’s hidden animal instincts which are revealed after shedding the refined and inauthentic exterior, the Self.

The externality or deformity of the Other distances him from all human ties; eventually the Other transforms from an animalistic male to a monster. Though this transformation serves to shock and even offend characters, the Other as a male monster must harbor traces of humanity: “Only as human being or a humanoid can be a true monster[...]The essential condition for a monster is that the human characteristics it possesses must not be changed too far” (Reichardt 139). Some human male features must be recognizable within the monster Other to demonstrate that the Other is a metaphor for the animalistic nature of the male gender.

Additionally, aggression, according to Madeline Klein, is linked to sexuality (Rogers 10). Aggression is used to satisfy the “sexual instinct” (Rogers 8) of the Other. Since the male Other is in constant pursuit of the female, he is in need of something or someone; in other words, the Other’s aggression and sexual urges indicate that the Other’s psyche is evolved around a “wish” (Rogers 8). This term is a metaphor for a fantasy or vision which the Other is hoping to realize. The male Other’s, “wish” (Rogers 8) is finding a female mate and thus satisfying the sexual and emotional needs. Clearly, the male Other is showing signs of “attachment behavior” (Rogers 8) which “is instinctive, like sexual behavior” (Rogers 8). The Other feels no shame and propriety cannot possibly restrict him from pursuing the natural hunt and desire for females. The Other therefore strongly craves for affection and contact with human beings but particularly with females.

The meaning of the Other changes according to different literary critics. In this chapter,

the Other is illustrated as a literary metaphor for abnormality or deformity. The Other also represents the repressed desires, aggression and a strong sexual identity, which are unacceptable because the desires and traits of the Self are superior. These characteristics will clarify the personality of the Other in the Mary Shelley's and Victor Hugo's gothic novels *Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus* and *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame*.

Chapter 3

Analyzing the Creature and Quasimodo in Their Original Form

Naming the Other

The Other in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus* and in Victor Hugo's *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame* illustrates the characteristics of the male Other which were discussed in chapter two. These characteristics are presented through four themes. Firstly, the Other receives nicknames which refer to important characters from Greek and Christian theology. In *the Hunchback of Notre-Dame*, Quasimodo is linked to deities from Greek mythology, in contrast with *Frankenstein*, where the Creature is compared to figures from Christianity. These allusions function to clarify their unusual features and their status as an alien in society.

The most apparent sign of Quasimodo's deformity is his name, which means incomplete (Hugo 124); Quasimodo is an incomplete man, externally at least. His nickname also connects him to one mythological figure in particular, namely the Cyclops. Both the narrator and the characters compare Quasimodo with this powerful being: they refer to him as a "cyclops" (Hugo 40) repeatedly and more specifically, "Polyphemus" (Hugo 42). Cyclopes are strong, dominant giants who descended from the oldest gods in Greek mythology, viz., Uranus, god of the sky, and Ge, goddess of sky and earth. Cyclopes are well-known for their prominent facial feature: a single huge eye on their forehead (Morford, Lenardon and Sham 60). Polyphemus fell in love with a beautiful Nereid – a sea-nymph – who was repulsed by his appearance and already had a handsome lover. After Polyphemus unsuccessfully attempts to woo the Nereid, he murders her lover (Morford, Lenardon and Sham 164-5).

The similarities between Quasimodo and this Cyclops are unmistakable. As his infatuation for Esmeralda grows, Quasimodo realizes that his love will never be returned. Yet he does not murder Phoebus, Esmeralda's lover, despite his hostility; instead, he accepts the natural attraction between the physically attractive young couple. Additionally, Quasimodo, who is indeed, "one-eyed" (Hugo 40), muscular and sensitive undoubtedly recalls the image of a powerful yet passionate giant, whose abnormality is so extreme that he might be from another world. The narrator, who describes Quasimodo's mental development in detail, stresses the distance between this deformed man and humankind in general: "Separated forever from the world by the double fatality of his unknown birth and his deformity –

imprisoned from his infancy within that double and impassable circle – the poor wretch had been accustomed to see nothing of the world beyond the religious walls which had received him under their shadow” (Hugo 125). Sheltered by the Notre-Dame church during his youth, Quasimodo’s status as the alien creature in Paris is emphasized from the start, which is emphasized by his obscure origin. It is implied that he came from the “Phlegeton” (Hugo 119) by a disgusted court clerk who encountered Quasimodo after he was abandoned at the threshold of the church. The “Phlegeton” (Hugo 119) is one of the five rivers leading to Hades’ underworld (Morford, Lenardon and Sham 375). These allusions to Greek mythology link Quasimodo to the Oriental Other; his isolation from Parisians and his deformity make him a foreigner in the opinion of his society.

Despite the apparent Christian allusions throughout this novel, *Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus* also contains some references to Greek mythology. Prometheus’ famous trick was stealing fire from the gods and giving it to the mortals. Zeus was enraged; in his wrath, he created and sent Pandora with her box to punish the mortals (Morford, Lenardon and Sham 87). Remarkably, this allusion is not directed at the Creature; it is rather hints at Victor Frankenstein’s fatal error of altering nature by creating the Creature. However, the nicknames of the Creature are more important because they emphasize the Creature as the antagonistic repressed Other.

Frankenstein is horrified by his Creature and verbally abuses him by naming him “Devil,” “dæmon” and “monster” (Shelley 77). These nicknames not only allude to the Other’s antagonistic appearance but they also explain how society perceives the Creature and how he in turn perceives himself. His usage of verbal references is striking and precise, for instance when he addresses Frankenstein: “I am thy creature, and I will be even mild and docile to my natural lord and king [...] Remember, that I am thy creature; I ought to be thy Adam; but I am rather the fallen angel” (Shelley 77). The Creature clearly views himself as inferior to Frankenstein. In his opinion, Frankenstein represents the ideal human being therefore Frankenstein is the Self and the Creature becomes the inferior and repressed Other. The relationship and power struggle between the Creature and Frankenstein is clear; his infinite devotion and approval of Frankenstein is exemplified by comparing Frankenstein to God. More importantly, here begins the process from devotion to animosity. Indeed, the Creature again links himself to evil personas by lamenting: “the fallen angel becomes a malignant devil. Yet even that enemy of God and man had friends and associates in his desolation; I am alone” (Shelley 169). The Creature’s awareness of his own self-pity and loneliness is intriguing; yet, now he seems to distinguish Frankenstein from God. His former

idol has become merely a man. His deformity and isolation makes him a foreigner and inferior in the eyes of Frankenstein which is also similar to the status of the Oriental Other.

Master and Monster

The relationship between the Other and his master in *Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus* and *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame* is integral to his development. Though complex and varying in extremes, this relationship is quite similar to that of the child-parent bond thereby also displaying “attachment behavior” (Rogers 8). Even if the devotion of the Other is initially unwavering, it progresses from dependence to animosity. As discussed above, Victor Frankenstein’s immediate animosity towards the Creature signifies the parent’s rejection and desertion of his child; even when the Creature describes his torment and fear Frankenstein remains repulsed: “his [the Creature’s] countenance bespoke bitter anguish, combined with disdain and malignity, while its unearthly ugliness rendered it almost too horrible for human eyes. But I [Frankenstein] scarcely observed this; rage and hatred had at first deprived me of utterance” (Shelley 77). Frankenstein’s inhumane treatment of the Creature causes the Creature’s resentment and hatred towards his master and the rest of humankind. Jansson illustrates: “Victor manufactures his Creature, but then literally ‘creates’ him as a monster by his rejection” (XII). Therefore, the Creature’s upbringing, or its absence, results in the retaliation of the Other by using violence against the source of the rejection: Frankenstein. “You are my creator, but I am your master; – obey!” (Shelley 128) the Creature cries violently. He intends to become Frankenstein’s master since he cannot gain his affection. However, the Creature never receives it from the parent he admires; instead, he becomes more obsessed with destroying humankind. The Creature’s or the Other’s “attachment behavior” (Rogers 8) with his master therefore triggers his aggression and violent behavior.

In the *Hunchback of Notre-Dame*, the relationship between the Other and his master is clearly more complex because Claude Frollo, the archdeacon, does not reject Quasimodo initially. On the contrary, Quasimodo was raised by Frollo, who was also raising his little brother Jehan after their parents died. Quasimodo is also an orphan like Jehan therefore Frollo decided to adopt him out of pity (Hugo 123). Quasimodo is very attached to Frollo and therefore his “attachment behavior” (Rogers 8) is stronger than the Creature’s. His devotion lasted much longer; throughout his childhood and in his early adulthood he worshiped Frollo, though the relationship is somewhat crudely described by the narrator as a pet’s devotion to its owner (Hugo 131). Frollo is Quasimodo’s mentor which is in direct contrast with

Frankenstein who learns language and manners by observation alone. Quasimodo's dependence on Frollo is described as follows: "[I]t was between Claude Frollo's knees that he had been accustomed to take refuge when the dogs and the children ran yelping after him. Claude Frollo had taught him to speak, to read, to write" (Hugo 130). Yet this relationship also turns sour when Frollo and Quasimodo fall in love with Esmeralda. This affection or better yet, obsession, causes the exact switch of the master-pet roles. Eventually, Frollo's obsession becomes extreme to the point that he becomes the monster, while Quasimodo rescues Esmeralda. When Esmeralda is seeking sanctuary in Notre-Dame Frollo attacks her; he is stopped by Quasimodo, who will not let his master and father assault Esmeralda. He nobly intends to sacrifice his life to protect her: "Monseigneur, afterwards you will do what you please but kill me first" (Hugo 327). Frollo's conversion into a true monster is complete when he triumphs after Esmeralda's death: "At the most awful moment, a demonical laugh, a laugh such as can come only from one who is no longer human, burst from the livid visage of the priest" (Hugo 424). Frollo's fall from grace can only mean that Quasimodo is redeemed for his heroic protection of Esmeralda; indeed, his virtues are expanded by his selfless devotion and affection. Though he may be displeasing to the eye, his emotional involvement is far more attractive.

The Battle between the Other and the Self

The existence of the Other inevitably marks the existence of the Self, the antithesis of the Other; in *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame* the Self is Captain Phoebus de Chateaupers and in *Frankenstein* it is Victor Frankenstein, who is also the Creature's master. Nonetheless, in these novels, the Self uses its deceptive exterior to conceal its malicious intentions.

In *Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus* Frankenstein, initially represents the ideal male. Even in his childhood, Frankenstein symbolizes the norm, though it is implied that Frankenstein's upbringing was rather too indulgent: "I [Frankenstein] was their plaything and their idol, and something better – their child, the innocent and helpless creature bestowed on them by Heaven, whom to bring up to good" (Shelley 28). Nevertheless, as an adult he is intelligent, kind and well-liked in many social circles, e.g. among academics, hard-working fishermen and his neighbors in the countryside. Robert Walton reports in his letters his esteem for Frankenstein though he is not yet fully acquainted with him: "He is so gentle, yet so wise; his mind is so cultivated" (Shelley 23). Before Frankenstein begins his narration, he embodies the intellectual and the rational scientific male.

Yet, his normalized outer shell breaks after the creation of the Creature which is shown in his disheveled appearance: “his eyes have generally an expression of wildness, and even madness” (Shelley 21). His curiosity for science diminishes entirely and the repulsion he feels for the Creature lays bare the cruelty in humankind. Reichardt concludes: “To us, Victor’s inability to tolerate extreme ugliness may seem an insignificant human inadequacy[...]It is not so surprising that he made a hideous creature he could not control, as it is that he should immediately disown it because it was loathsome to look at” (137). The creation of the Other reveals the imperfections hidden in the Self and the naivety of the characters who overlooked Frankenstein’s faults.

Phoebus de Chateaupers, on the other hand, is the antithesis of Quasimodo, externally and internally. His name, similarly to Quasimodo, represents society’s view of him. Phoebus is an alias of the sun god Apollo, who was renowned for his skills in medicine and music (Morford, Lenardon and Sham 65). Phoebus in this novel is therefore a young man who presents an example to Parisian citizens and the norm of perfect masculinity. This stresses Quasimodo’s deformity; compared to the norm, he is incomplete and unacceptable. While Phoebus may possess an appealing countenance, his intentions are far from admirable. He seduces Esmeralda as he seduced many girls. His countenance reveals his nature after Esmeralda’s request for marriage: “The captain’s face assumed a mingled expression of surprise, disdain, carelessness and licentious passion” (Hugo 252). Quasimodo is well-aware of Phoebus’s shallowness as he tries to warn Esmeralda, “Oh, look not on the face / Young maid, look on the heart / The heart of a fine young man is oft deformed/ (Hugo 321).³ The pleasing exterior of the Self is the most effective weapon to please others and to blend in with society. Quasimodo and Phoebus personify the Other and Self in the human psyche: the Self is the superior norm and the Other must be repressed and isolated.

The Better Man

The Others are obsessed with the female gender more than the average male because their “sexual instinct” (Rogers 8) is stronger. The relationship between the Others in these novels and the females is essential because it also reveals their true nature behind their horrific externality. Quasimodo demonstrates that his affection is stronger than his hatred and distrust of humankind when he saves Esmeralda from the gallows:

³ Stevens takes it even further by suggesting that the society in *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame* represents the Self, which could explain the natural exclusion of Quasimodo, the Other (157).

His gnome-like eye, resting upon her, flooded her with tenderness, grief and pity [...] he, that orphan, that foundling that outcast; he felt himself august and strong; he looked full in the face that society from which he was banished, and into which he had so powerfully intervened; that human justice from which he had snatched its prey; all those tigers whose jaws perforce remained empty; those myrmidons, those judges, those executioners, all that royal power which he, poor, insignificant being, had foiled with the power of God (Hugo 297).

Saving the young girl empowers Quasimodo as well and he gains appreciation for humanity. He does not believe that all Parisians are unkind because he befriends one citizen: Esmeralda. Wren accurately notes: “Yet a similarly unrequited passion, that of Quasimodo, actually has a redemptive and transforming force, leading, as the concluding chapter suggests, to a union in the grave and beyond with Esmeralda” (XIV). Quasimodo’s strong affection for Esmeralda enforces his duty to restore society’s virtue by acting against the repressive powers of the church, which claimed Esmeralda’s execution.

Yet he seems to be more aware than ever of his deformity when he is in Esmeralda’s presence:

Never did I see my ugliness as now. When I compare myself with you, I do indeed pity myself, poor unhappy monster that I am. I must look to you like a beast, eh? You – you are a sunbeam, a dewdrop, a bird’s song. As for me – I am something frightful, neither man nor beast – something harder, and more trodden underfoot, and more unshapely than a [sic] flintstone” (Hugo 313).

Despite his noble retaliation against the harsh laws of his society, Quasimodo realizes that he, the male Other, cannot possibly gain the love of an angelic young woman. Yet Quasimodo’s gratitude to Esmeralda is unaltered and her kindness reveals his noble intentions behind his monstrous visage.

Women by no means redeem the Creature in *Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus*; in fact, the Creature’s desire for women makes him malicious. After observing women’s horror at the sight of him, the Creature bemoans his fate: “I remembered that I was for ever deprived of the delights that such beautiful creatures [women] could bestow” (Shelley 110). The Creature has a “wish” (Rogers 8) for a female companion who will not reject his

deformed externality. As a solution, he demands that a woman should be custom made for him by Frankenstein: “You must create a female for me, with whom I can live in the interchange of those sympathies necessary for my being. This you alone can do; and I demand it of you as a right which you must not refuse to concede” (Shelley 111). The Creature is attached to females and he believes that his “wish” (Rogers 8) must be granted by his creator. His relationship with women is far more superficial than Quasimodo: he believes women are the cure for his loneliness and abnormality. He craves for them like one craves for pills or other antidotes, thus also objectifying them instead of seeing them as a redemptive force.

The Other’s portrayal in the novels clarifies his original features, which will be compared to his characteristics in the Disney films to demonstrate his transformation. The themes also illustrate the Other’s repressed aggression and sexuality along with his status as the foreign Oriental Other. In these novels, the Other has intense and mixed desires for his master’s appreciation, social acceptance and female companionship.

Chapter 4

Reviewing the Creature and Quasimodo in the Modern Disney Adaptations

The Disney adaptations of *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame* by Victor Hugo and *Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus* by Mary Shelley place the Other in another medium, viz., film and in a different genre compared to the original gothic novels. This drastic alteration inevitably changes the portrayal of the characters, as Stam argues, “Filmic adaptations of novels invariably superimpose a double set of generic conventions, one drawn from the generic intertext of the source itself, and the other consisting of those genres engaged by the translating medium of film” (6). The genres of novel and film naturally differ therefore the genre of the adapted film might well be different from its source.

The two adaptations discussed here are quite diverse; yet each adaptation changes the portrayal of the original characters. Tim Burton’s *Frankenweenie* and Gary Trousdale’s and Kirk Wise’s *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame*, portray the Other quite differently from the above-mentioned novels, resulting in its external and internal transformation. The Others are adjusted in similar fashion in these films because they have the same target audience viz., children. Ross reveals that there is no room for ambiguity in characters in children’s films; it can enhance a child’s imagination or cause unnecessary harm (Ross 54). Consequently, the characters in these films are clearly categorized as evil or kind-hearted. It is thus imperative to point out the significant changes in the Other’s personality compared to its original and illustrate the incentive for these alterations.

First Impressions and Nicknames of the Other in Disney’s *Frankenweenie* and *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame*

The most surprising change of the Other’s appearance is in Tim Burton’s *Frankenweenie*. The Other is not a chimera of human bodies; in fact, it is Victor Frankenstein’s exhumed dog, Sparky (0:29:13) who displays typical canine features e.g. chasing after cats, following his owner around and constantly barking. This playful presentation of the Other compared to the dark, villainous Other in *Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus* might be a parody of the horror genre. By displaying the Other as an entirely different species, especially as the most innocent companion of man, children become more receptive of him. The horrendous externality of the Other is forgotten, as is Frankenstein’s error in reviving the dead.

Nevertheless, the original externality and character of the Other can be found within this film, though not in the form of Sparky. Edgar, a deformed classmate of Frankenstein, clearly recalls the maliciousness of the Creature (0:10:27); for instance, he blackmails Victor, who excels in scientific experiments, to obtain his method for reviving the dead (0:33:42) and he deceives Victor by sharing the method with his classmates (0:35:49). One of these classmates, Nassor, resembles Frankenstein's Creature as well, though only physically. Long, bony and with an angular frame⁴, he lisps: "Tonight... We shall bring the dead to life!" (0:51:55). These portrayals of the Other serve a didactic purpose: the most malicious children are deformed. Their abnormality permits the breach from proper social discourse; in short, their deformity enables their unaccepted cruelty. Yet Sparky is clearly intended to be the Other in this children's film; despite the complete external transformation, Sparky is revived and exhumed. His name also refers to Frankenstein's method because Victor used electricity to revive Sparky. The complete external transformation of the Other is quite striking; however, the original features of the Creature are depicted, though subtly, in Victor's classmates therefore the film contains some original characteristics of the Other in the novel.

The Hunchback of Notre-Dame, directed by Gary Trousdale and Kirk Wise, does not contain such a vivid transformation of the Other, externally at least. Though in color, its playfulness is evoked by the occasional songs which convey the story to children and also enhance its accessibility. The plot within the film itself is told by the gypsy Clopin, who appears in the novel as well, to surrounding children (0:1:44). The story is therefore intended for children inside and outside of the film. Clopin insightfully warns the children when he says the story is "A tale of a man and a monster" (0:2:07) and in the end, children will be able to identify and separate the man and the monster. Quasimodo's appearance is relatively faithful to the original description in the novel; he still has a prominent hunchback and deformed facial features. However, he is a little less disheveled, more civilized and talkative; his appearance seems softened compared to the overly aggressive and hostile demeanor of Quasimodo in the novel.

Quasimodo is, similar to the novel, crowned as the King of Fools (0:25:15). He is afterwards unjustly tormented by the crowd; this scene replaces the painful whipping he receives in the novel. Despite the unkindness Quasimodo receives, he possesses the same inward kindness as in the novel. It seems that all his benevolent traits are magnified and he shows an earnest desire to be accepted by society, in contrast with Quasimodo in the novel,

⁴ Nassor also resembles the famed portrayal of the Creature by Boris Karloff, who also had a lisp ("Frankenweenie").

who distances himself from the Parisians. When Quasimodo sings his dialogue, children become once more drawn towards this kinder version of the Other.

The internal transformation of Quasimodo in *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame* is in contrast with *Frankenweenie*; in this film, deformity is not linked to animosity and cruelty. Instead, music is blended with dialogue thus making the connection between appearance and personality arbitrary. Consequently, children are encouraged not to pay too much attention to the malformation of Quasimodo's body.

Masters and Commanders

In the Disney version of *Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus*, the master of the Other remains Victor Frankenstein. Yet the name is the only feature the original Frankenstein shares with his modern counterpart. The contemporary Frankenstein treats the Other with much more kindness; he is also mentally superior to the original Frankenstein because he is kinder and more responsible. Victor, devastated after Sparky's death, conducts an experiment; its success cumulates in the rebirth of Sparky (0:2:22). Then occurs the most essential break from the novel: instead of fleeing cowardly from his responsibility, as the original Frankenstein had done, Victor is relieved, not repulsed. Cooper accurately reveals the great error Frankenstein committed in the novel: "Here, Frankenstein stands accused not so much of impious meddling in the work of creation [...] but, rather, of failing to live up to the moral responsibilities that such an act should entail" (95). This is remedied by Victor in *Frankenweenie*, who revives Sparky and fully acknowledges the consequence of his success. He is made into an enlightened and reliable scientist.

Furthermore, the transformation of the Creature from a man into a dog increases his dependence and submission on his master drastically. It is much more apparent now that the Other fulfills the servant role in this film. For instance, Victor locks Sparky away in his house: "We can't let anybody know about you. They may not understand" (0:28:02). Here, Frankenstein symbolizes the responsible model child who acts like an adult, while its adult version acted childlike in his fear. This change of character removes all ambiguity in the Other and in his master. Their relationship clearly demonstrates the Other's submission and the Self's dominance thereby exemplifying the "attachment behavior" (Rogers 8) clearly.

The master in Trousdale's and Wise's *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame*, Claude Frollo, emphasizes the Other's benevolence instead of his inferiority. There are many not so subtle changes in Frollo's character and occupation. Instead of an archdeacon, Frollo is a judge

(0:2:35) and he reluctantly raises Quasimodo. In the film, Frollo takes Quasimodo in out of guilt. Yet he also sees Quasimodo as a tool which might be of service (0:5:35). Clopin gives the children in the film and those who are watching the film a riddle: “Who is the monster and who is the man?”(0:5:55). After viewing the film, the children should be able to answer the question without referring to Quasimodo’s obvious deformity. To that end, Frollo’s personality is much more severe and cruel than in the novel; for example, he refuses to let Quasimodo attend the Festival of Fools and to let him participate in the merriment of the occasion. Thus, Frollo becomes the antagonist from the start and children are more prone to qualify him as such. He also manipulates Quasimodo often: “The world is cruel. The world is wicked. It’s I alone who you can trust in this whole city. I am your only friend” (0:12:15). He encourages Quasimodo to fear and repel others. Nonetheless, Quasimodo also shows “attachment behavior” (Rogers 8) by defending Frollo from Esmeralda’s reprimands (0:41:36) as a pet will defend its harsh owner.

As in the novel, Quasimodo fights Frollo to defend Esmeralda when Frollo attempts to murder her (1:19:25). The Other overpowers its master (1:19:37), mentally and physically, thus claiming its deserved equality. This restoration of balance, not unlike the novel, is meant to instruct children that kindness always has its reward. Frollo’s transformation from a man with dual characteristics, namely generosity and lustful obsession, into the antagonistic opponent of Quasimodo is striking. Just as in Quasimodo, all ambiguity has been erased from his personality.

Unexpected Transformations

The Other as a canine limits the relationship between Victor Frankenstein and the Other in *Frankenweenie* to master and servant roles. Sparky, who is defined by his species, cannot mentally evolve into a human being. Therefore, there cannot be an equal relationship between Frankenstein and the Sparky, in contrast with the novel. This intentional change of species also presents a switch in the Other/Self position. Sparky no longer represents the antagonistic Other in contrast with the Creature in *Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus*.

As discussed above, the young Victor Frankenstein exemplifies the ideal scientist who claims responsibility for his errors. Yet in this film, the antithesis of Victor is personified in his treacherous classmates and not in Sparky. Their malicious actions resulted in the creation of horrendous monsters (0:59:40); the birth of the Creature in the novel was also motivated by the wrong intentions. Frankenstein’s ambition motivated the birth of the Creature, causing his

resentment against humankind. Victor, on the other hand, revived Sparky because he had lost his best friend and companion. Therefore, there is no animosity and no battle between them. However, Victor's classmates are hunted by their own creations (1:06:32) like the Creature pursues Frankenstein in the novel. The younger Victor and Sparky kill the monsters (1:06:59). The presupposed Other – Sparky – therefore becomes the Self. Victor no longer participates in the Self/Other struggle because his role as the Self has been replaced. Sparky fights the Others, which are now the horrendous creatures of the classmates. These creatures display the original Creature's violence, caused by lack of affection. Additionally, these Creatures have more terrifying and monstrous features, such as claws and sharp teeth. Sparky, who has scars here and there, is quite harmless. The battle between the Other and the Self remains present in this adaptation; nonetheless, the significant transformation of the Other into a benevolent character transforms him into the Self.

In Trousdale's and Wise's animated version of *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame*, the battle between the Other and the Self is almost non-existent. Phoebus de Chateaupers, who is also the Self in the novel, is instantly attracted to the gypsy Esmeralda (0:17:14). Again Phoebus' flaws from the novel are diminished; he is nobler and less aristocratic altogether. In fact, he even helps Esmeralda escape from corrupt lieutenants. Clearly there is an open hostility between Phoebus and Quasimodo, who as the Other naturally rejects the Self. Interestingly, they are both ignorant of each other's kindness (0:44:48) and they continue to argue, though they are both trying to rescue Esmeralda (1:06:20). Phoebus is the original Self in the novel and in this Disney adaptation, though he does not necessarily represent Quasimodo's antithesis. Physically, he is of course Quasimodo's opposite. Though Quasimodo remains distant, Phoebus first pierces through Quasimodo's rough exterior: "Tell Esmeralda she's very lucky [...] to have a friend like you" (0:45:26). As the film progresses, they do not battle nor repel each other; instead, they treat each other with civility. This is illustrated when Quasimodo shows his gratitude to Phoebus for saving his life (1:21:59), finally abandoning his hostility. The equality between the Other and the Self in this film diminishes the original battle in the novel.

The drastic change of character in both the Other and the Self breaks from their original hostility in *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame*; nonetheless, the battle between the Other and the Self in *Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus* is preserved in this adaptation. All the ambiguous features of the Other and the Self have been removed. Phoebus's personality is admirable; however, his pleasing features emphasize his kindness. Similar to the deformed classmates in *Frankenweenie*, the antagonistic characters are deformed or unattractive while

the handsomeness of characters such as Phoebus signifies their generosity. Quasimodo in the Disney adaptation is the only exception: as the protagonist in a children's film, he has to be attractive to the target audience; his benevolence diminishes his deformity.

Graphic Lust and the Other

Since these adaptations target children, violence and lust are kept to a minimum. Clearly, there are many alterations in that regard in these adaptations, as the original sources are gothic novels. Interestingly, Burton's *Frankenweenie* and Trousdale's and Wise's *Hunchback of Notre-Dame* seem to differ in their display of graphic scenes.

In the animated version of Victor Hugo's *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame* there are still elements of violence and lust. Esmeralda, the lust object of both Quasimodo and his guardian Claude Frollo, has grown into a mature and attractive young woman who is no longer the original sentimental and romantic girl. She is not repulsed by Quasimodo; on the contrary, she is impressed by his skills and humility (0:40:18). Quasimodo's gratitude becomes boundless and he decides to help Esmeralda to escape her imprisonment: "You helped me. Now I will help you" (0:42:39). Esmeralda's personality has been altered significantly; she has become a helping force and a powerful woman. A modern woman from the twentieth century is inserted in this children's film. Her personality has thus been adjusted to the women and girls who are viewing the film while completely abandoning Esmeralda's original naïve self. However, the independent woman, no doubt an example for young girls, has a significant impact on the Other. Quasimodo's gratitude enables him, as in the novel, to fight against injustice. In a striking scene, Quasimodo saves Esmeralda by carrying her off the gallows and onto Notre-Dame, shouting "Sanctuary!" (1:14:28). After literally breaking the iron chains which bound him (1:12:31) Quasimodo, as in the novel, shows his strength as an individual and as the Other.

Nevertheless, some graphic scenes from the novel remain intact in the film. Claude Frollo's lustful obsession with Esmeralda is preserved and explicit in the film. Some might say it is too explicit for children's comprehension. He bemoans, "This burning desire is turning into sin⁵" (0:49:22) and "But she will be mine or she will burn!" (0:52:04). Frollo's "wish" (Rogers 8) for Esmeralda emphasizes his role as an antagonist in the film and in the novel as well.

⁵ Frollo sings this line in a song.

Frankenweenie on the other hand, seems completely void of any signs of violence or lust. Sparky's total internal and external transformation in this film enables him to become the rescuer of females. For example, Sparky is humorously coupled with a female poodle (0:31:32) who he saves from the monsters Victor's classmates created (1:09:10) and they are reunited in the end (1:16:45). Despite this playful display of heroism, it becomes clear that this film has a masculine focus, similar to the novel. The females are not the rescuers nor are they intellectually superior; they do not redeem nor present the benevolence of the Other. There is no "wish" (Rogers 8) for them.

An analysis of children's films based on gothic novels illustrates that the Other is completely transformed to adjust to the target audience, namely children. The internal and external changes eliminate any ambiguity in characters. It becomes quite easy to identify and separate the antagonists from the heroes. The Other in both films only has hero and savior roles and his flaws are swept away under the guise of playfulness. Consequently, the Other is not a symbol of the complicated human psyche. In its loss of complexity, the representation of the Other has become unrealistic and thus flawed.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

Summarizing the Transformations of the Other

This study of film adaptations of gothic novels aimed to explain the alterations of the original characters in Disney films. The Other's internal and external transformation is demonstrated by comparing the Other and the Self in the famous gothic novels *Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus* by Mary Shelley and *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame* by Victor Hugo, to the Other and Self in the Disney films, namely *Frankenweenie* and *the Hunchback of the Notre-Dame*. These themes were analyzed in the novels and in the films: the Other's nicknames, his relationship to his master, his battle with the Self and his obsession with females. They clarified the characteristics of the Other and how his society viewed him.

The meaning of the Other as a literary metaphor can also be illustrated in relation to literary disciplines. In psychoanalysis, the Other and the Self are placed in a hierarchy where the Other is inferior. The Other is also used to describe social groups which are seen as inferior or abnormal compared to the norm. For instance, Orientals were seen as abnormal from the Western norm therefore they were named the Others (Said 1866). The Other is also a metaphor for the uninhibited and sexual male who wants to fulfill his desire for females.

This metaphor of the Other is vividly illustrated in the Creature in *Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus* and in Quasimodo in *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame*, who personify the isolated and deformed male Other. Their nicknames exemplify their abnormality and despite their immense physical strength, the Others are subservient to their masters. The anti-thesis of the Other, the Self, is in these novels deceptive because it is represented by males who use their pleasant externality to hide their immorality. The struggle between the Self and the Other is quite evident in these novels. The Self in *The Hunchback of the Notre-Dame* is the handsome and unkind captain Phoebus de Chateaupers and in *Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus* Frankenstein's error is shown when he washes his hands of the Creature. The Others desire the acceptance of females which would end their sexual frustration. Quasimodo's infatuation with Esmeralda causes his disillusionment and reprisal against the cruel Parisian society. The Creature, on the other hand, is past redemption because he objectifies women to satisfy his sexual needs. The Others in these novels are both hostile

towards other humans yet they crave for the acceptance of their society. It is also clear that the Others will never blend in with society, despite their desire to do so.

The Other is also analyzed in the Disney adaptations to demonstrate the extent of his transformation. The modifications of the Other have the same purpose in both Disney films, namely to eliminate any unwanted ambiguity in characters. The Other is the main character therefore children have to sympathize with the him; as a result, all his benevolent features are exaggerated.

In Tim Burton's *Frankenweenie*, the Other's appearance is changed significantly: the Creature has become a canine named Sparky. He is literally Frankenstein's pet. The purpose of this transformation is to make children more responsive towards the Other which is also achieved by Sparky's playfulness and innocence. Nevertheless, some characteristics of the Creature are retained in *Frankenweenie* in Victor's classmates, especially in Nassor en Edgar's malevolent actions. Quasimodo's traits also become benign and they are adjusted to the target audience. He is kinder, talkative and more civilized compared to his original portrayal. The cruelty of the medieval society is diminished in the film by the insertion of lyrics sung by the characters. Music therefore softens the portrayal of the Other and the film becomes more suitable for children. It is striking to note that the role of the Other changes in the Disney adaptations and in the novels. For instance, Frollo becomes the monster in the novel and in the film because his lust for Esmeralda stress Quasimodo's role as her protector. In *Frankenweenie*, the Others are the horrific creatures of Victor's classmates and Sparky, as the innocent protagonist, becomes the heroic Self. The internal and external transformation of the Other in these films causes a complete turnaround in the Self/Other roles.

Ross argues that Disney films, especially contemporary ones, have won over the child's imagination by constantly presenting unrealistic characters in social discourse: "How much more complete the Disney conquest will become for our children and grandchildren, with the constant replay made possible by video and DVD, is definitely cause for concern" (63). Disney's "conquest" (Ross 63) is successful because unrealistic characters, such as Victor and even Quasimodo, can be dispensed to children everywhere. Consequently, children are encouraged to believe the unreliable representations of human beings because the separation of antagonists and heroes, as demonstrated in *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame* and *Frankenweenie*, disregards the realistic duality of benevolent and malevolent features in human beings. Explaining the transformation of the Other in this study aimed to contribute to the study of film adaptations and the contemporary analysis of the Other in literary theory.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H., and Geoffrey Galt Harpham. "Binary Oppositions". *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 10th ed. USA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2012. Print.
- Bann, Stephen, ed. *Frankenstein, Creation and Monstrosity*. Ed. Stephen Bann. London: Reaktion Books, 1994. Print.
- Cooper, Melinda. "Monstrous Progeny: The Teratological Tradition in Science and Literature." *Frankenstein's Science: Experimentation and Discovery in Romantic Culture 1780-1830*. Eds. Christa Knellwolf and Jane Goodall. Surrey: Ashgate, 2008. 87-99. Print.
- Frankenweenie*. Dir. Tim Burton. Perf. Charlie Tahan, Catherine O'Hara, Martin Short, Martin Landau. Walt Disney Pictures, 2012. DVD.
- "Frankenweenie." *Internet Movie Database*. n.p., n.d. Web. 17 Apr. 2014.
- Hugo, Victor. *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1993. Print.
- Hunter, Allan K. "Evolution, Revolution and Frankenstein's Creature." *Frankenstein's Science: Experimentation and Discovery in Romantic Culture 1780-1830*. Eds. Christa Knellwolf and Jane Goodall. Surrey: Ashgate, 2008. 133-51. Print.
- Jansson, Siv. Introduction. *Frankenstein or The Modern Prometheus*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1999. VII-XX. Print.
- Jordanova, Ludmilla. "Melancholy Reflection: Constructing an Identity for Unveilers of Nature." Ed. Stephen Bann 60.
- Leitch, Vincent B, ed. *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. 2nd ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2010. Print.
- Morford, Mark P.O., Robert J. Lenardon and Michael Sham. *Classical Mythology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011. Print.
- Ross, Deborah. "Escape from Wonderland: Disney and the Female Imagination". *Marvels and Tales* 18.1 (2004): 53-66. *Project Muse*. Web.14 Feb.2014.
- Reichardt, Jasia. "Artificial Life and the Myth of Frankenstein". *Frankenstein, Creation and Monstrosity*. Ed. Stephen Bann. London: Reaktion Books, 1994. Print.
- Ross, Deborah. "Escape from Wonderland: Disney and the Female Imagination". *Marvels and Tales* 18.1 (2004): 53-66. *Project Muse*. Web.14 Feb.2014.
- Said, Edward W. "Orientalism." Leitch 1866.
- Shelley, Mary. *Frankenstein or The Modern Prometheus*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1999. Print.

- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "A Critique of Postcolonial Reason." Leitch 2114.
- Stam, Robert. *Literature through Film: Realism, Magic, and the Art of Adaptation*. Oxford. Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2005. Print.
- Stevens, Bradley. "Reading Walter Benjamin's Concept of the Ruin in Victor Hugo's Notre-Dame de Paris". *French Studies: a Quarterly Review* 61.2 (2007): 155-66. *Project Muse*. Web. 14 Feb.2014.
- The Hunchback of Notre Dame*. Dir. Gary Trousdale and Kirk Wise. Perf. Tom Hulce, Demi Moore, Tony Gay, Kevin Kline. Walt Disney Pictures, 1996. DVD.
- Vincent B. Leitch, ed. *Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. 2nd ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2010. Print.
- Wren, Keith. Introduction. *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1993. V-XIX. Print.

