

FINAL GIRL VS. SERIAL KILLER

**A PSYCHOANALYTICAL ANALYSIS OF
FEMALE VICTIM-HEROES IN SERIAL KILLER FILMS**

Submitted by:
NUR ÖZGENALP
103617002

**İSTANBUL BİLGİ UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
FILM TV MASTER DEGREE**

Approved by:
TUNA ERDEM
2006

Final Girl vs. Serial Killer:
A Psychoanalytical Analysis of
Female Victim-Heroes in Serial Killer Films

Final Girl Seri Katile Karşı:
Seri Katil Filmlerindeki Kadın Kurban-Kahramanlar
Üzerine Psikanalitik Bir İnceleme

Nur Özgenalp
103617002

Tez Danışmanının Adı Soyadı (İMZASI) : .Tuna Erdem.....
Jüri Üyelerinin Adı Soyadı (İMZASI) : ..Nabi Avcı.....
Jüri Üyelerinin Adı Soyadı (İMZASI) : ..Kaya Özkaracalar.....

Tezin Onaylandığı Tarih :

Toplam Sayfa Sayısı:

Anahtar Kelimeler (Türkçe)

- 1) Seri Katil Filmleri
- 2) Erkek Katiller
- 3) Kadın Kurban-Kahramanlar
- 4) Slasher Filmler
- 5) Korku Janrı

Keywords (English)

- 1) Serial Killer Films
- 2) Male Killers
- 3) Female Victim- Heroes
- 4) Slasher Films
- 5) Horror Genre

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to understand the role of female protagonists in serial killer movies. This dissertation analyzes *In the Cut* (Campion, 2003), *Taking Lives* (Caruso, 2004) and *Mary Reilly* (Frears, 1996) as an example of films which have a specific common quality. Starting with *The Silence of the Lambs* (Demme, 1991), there has been a substantial increase in the number of films that tell the story of male serial killers who are investigated by females. Films with same identical properties; such as *Twisted* (Kaufman, 2004), *Copycat* (Amiel, 1999), 1996), *Kiss the Girls* (Fleder, 1997), *Murder by Numbers* (Schroeder, 2002), *Tesis* (Amenábar, 1996) and *The Bone Collector* (Noyce, 1999); followed *The Silence of the Lambs*. All These films hold the essential properties of serial killer films that have female protagonists who have a sexual relationship with the killer and, at the end, overcome the killer. This female is similar to Final Girls whom Clover has theorized while examining slasher films. Therefore this dissertation first analyzes the basic elements of horror films, and then it examines a new type of serial killer films with psychoanalytic theories and compares it to Clover's slasher films. Starting with general aspects of horror films, it focuses on slasher films - a subgenre of horror films. Afterwards, it goes on to compare *In the Cut* (Campion, 2003), *Taking Lives* (Caruso, 2004) and *Mary Reilly* (Frears, 1996) with slasher films. Although these films differ in many aspects, they still share common qualities. This study attempts to analyze these common qualities that can be traced back to slasher films. In the end, having discussed how slasher films have evolved into serial killer films with female victim-heroes, this thesis continues discussing the role of the female victim-hero psychoanalytically by studying Clover's theories of identification and Final Girls.

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı seri katil filmlerindeki kadın kahramanların rolünü anlamaktır. Bu tez belli ortak özellikler taşıyan *In the Cut* (Campion, 2003), *Taking Lives* (Caruso, 2004) ve *Mary Reilly* (Frears, 1996) adlı filmleri analiz ediyor. *The Silence of the Lambs* (Demme, 1991) filmiyle birlikte seri katilleri araştıran kadın kahramanların olduğu filmlerin sayısında bir yükselme oldu. Aynı temel özellikleri taşıyan *Twisted* (Kaufman, 2004), *Copycat* (Amiel, 1999), *Kiss the Girls* (Fleder, 1997), *Murder by Numbers* (Schroeder, 2002), *Tesis* (Amenábar, 1996) ve *The Bone Collector* (Noyce, 1999) *The Silence of the Lambs*'ı takip etti. Bütün bu filmler, seri katille cinsel ilişkiye giren ve filmin sonunda onları alt eden kadın kahramanların olduğu seri katil filmlerinin temel özelliklerini taşıyorlar. Bu kadın tipi, Clover'ın slasher filmleri incelerken öne sürdüğü Final Girl tipine benzemektedir. Bu sebeple, bu tez, öncelikle, korku filmlerinin temel özelliklerini inceliyor, ardından da yeni bir seri katil filmleri türünü psikanalitik teorilerle analiz ediyor ve bu filmleri Clover'ın slasher filmleriyle karşılaştırıyor. Korku filmlerinin genel özelliklerini tanımlamakla başladıktan sonra korku janrının bir alt janrı olan slasher filmlere odaklanıyor. Ardından da *In the Cut* (Campion, 2003), *Taking Lives* (Caruso, 2004) ve *Mary Reilly* (Frears, 1996) filmlerini slasher filmlerle karşılaştırıyor. Bu filmler bazı karakteristikleri açısından farklı olsalar da ortak özellikleri ağır basıyor. Bu çalışma bu ortak özellikleri analiz ediyor ve onların kökenini slasher filmlere dayandırıyor. Bu tez kadın kurban-kahramanların yer aldığı seri katil filmlerinin slasher filmlerinin yeniden biçimlenmiş halleri olduğunu kanıtlamaya çalıştıktan sonra, bu filmlerdeki kadın kurban-kahramanların rollerini psikanalitik açıdan tartışıyor. Bunun için de Clover'ın "identification" ve Final Girl teorilerini inceliyor.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	i
1. Introduction	1
1.1. Horror Genre and Serial Killer Films	2
1.1.1. Gothic and Serial Killer Films	2
1.1.2. Slasher and Serial Killer Films	4
1.1.3. Slasher as a Subgenre of Horror	6
1.2. What is Horrifying: “I” am Scared by my “Other” Self	7
1.2.1. The Uncanny	7
1.2.2. The True Subject of the Horror Genre	8
1.2.3. Collective Unconscious	10
1.2.4. Archetypes	11
1.2.5. The Other	12
1.3. Are Serial Killer Films with Female Heroes, Slasher Films?	19
1.3.1. Clover’s Identification Theory	19
1.3.2. A Movies vs. B. Movies	22
1.4. Serial Killers in Serial Killer Films with Female Heroes	26
1.4.1. Monsters	26
1.4.2. Serial Killers in Real Life	29
1.4.3. The Difference between Real Life and Fiction	32
1.4.4. Serial Killers in Fiction	33
1.4.5. Serial Killers vs. Supernatural Monsters of Slasher Films	34
1.5. Are Serial Killer Films with Female Heroes A Movies with Slasher Qualities?	36

2. From Clover's Slashers to Serial Killer Films with Female Victim-Heroes	37
2.1. Clover's Killer to Serial Killers	37
2.2. Clover's Terrible Places to Wicked Cities	44
2.3. Clover's Weapons to Penetration and Decapitation Objects	54
2.4. Clover's Victims to Disarticulated Bodies	57
2.5. Clover's Final Girl to Final Woman	64
2.6. Clover's Shock to Imaginative Terror	74
2.7. What is Different?	78
3. Lover vs. Killer as Opposites Become Identical	81
3.1. Identification	81
3.2. Identifying with the Final Girl	83
3.3. The Double	85
3.4. Who is Whose Double?	89
4. Conclusion	94
4.1. The Final Girl's Journey into Adulthood	94
4.2. How does the Final Girl Survive?	96
4.3. Accepting Castration	98
4.4. Final Women's Conclusion	100
Films Cited	i
Bibliography	iii

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1991, a horror film called *The Silence of the Lambs* (Demme, 1991) opened a new era. Philip L. Simpson asserts that “*The Silence of the Lambs*, directed by Jonathan Demme, [...] ensconced the cannibalistic psychiatrist, Hannibal Lecter, into pop demonology.” (Simpson, 2000: 70) *The Silence of the Lambs* was welcomed by mainstream audience as its ancestors were accepted by a specific kind of spectator.

The film was telling the story of Clarice Starling who is a young FBI trainee. She is ordered to meet with the imprisoned Dr. Hannibal Lecter to find out information about one of Lecter’s old patients, Buffalo Bill. Clarice tries to find Buffalo Bill, who skins women to sew himself a dress to become a woman when he wears. As Clarice continues her investigation, she starts sharing a strange kind of relationship, which involves sexual attraction and desire, with Lecter. *The Silence of the Lambs* led the movies which tell serial killer narratives, especially the ones with female protagonist searching the crime and relating to the killer became conspicuous like *Copycat* (Amiel, 1999), *The Cell* (Singh, 2002) and *The Bone Collector* (Noyce, 1999). There were films like *Shadow of a Doubt* (Hitchcock, 1943), *Eyes of Laura Mars* (Kershner, 1978) with female protagonists before but, mostly the leading role was male, in every instance, either he is the killer or the searcher.

This dissertation is concerned with analyzing the films with female protagonist searching the crime and relating to the killer. It tries to determine which genre or subgenre we should put *In the Cut* (Campion, 2003), *Twisted* (Kaufman, 2004), *Taking Lives* (Caruso, 2004), *Copycat* (Amiel, 1999), *The Silence of the Lambs* (Demme, 1991), *Mary Reilly* (Frears, 1996), *Kiss the Girls* (Fleeder, 1997), *Murder By Numbers* (Schroeder, 2002), *Tesis* (Amenábar, 1996) and *The*

Bone Collector (Noyce, 1999) which have female protagonists who have a relationship with the killer and at the end they overcome the killer.

1. 1. Horror Genre and Serial Killer Films

Serial killer films, in general, are narratives which find their roots in the combination of different genres and subgenres. They have built their own conventions and narratives, but basically, it seems like, they utilize the tools of the horror genre. According to Peter Hutchings, “serial killer films are a subgenre to horror films.” (Hutchings, 1996: 91) Films which narrate the stories of serial killers can be classified as horror films, but, according to their different elements in narrative and narration, the classification shifts between the subgenres of horror.

1.1.1. Gothic and Serial Killer Films

The gothic genre, which is a subgenre of horror, seems similar to serial killer movies; although there seem to be a lot of difference between them because of, both, spatial and temporal use. Gothic films narrate stories of 18th and 19th century, and they mostly pass in Victorian houses. On the other hand, most of the serial killer films pass in contemporary era, in big metropolitans. John Frick, theorizes the “wicked city motif” which, according to him, finds its roots “in the urbanization of eighteenth-century gothic novel.” (Frick, 2004) In addition, the stories of “The first cinematic multiple murderers- Cesare in the *Cabinet of Dr. Caligari* (1919), Jack the Ripper in *Waxworks* (1924)” (Simpson, 2000: 31) are based on gothic narratives and Jack the Ripper story which passes in London city. As Amy Taubin writes in her review, “...*The Silence of the Lambs* shifts back and forth from Gothic fantasy to police procedural drama.”(Taubin, *The Silence of the Lambs* Review) It seems like Hannibal

Lecter who lurk around the dark, misty city alleys does not have much difference from the blood-thirsty Jack the Ripper who wanders around in the foggy, gloomy atmosphere of gothic London.

In addition, Philip L. Simpson finds similarities between serial killers and vampire narratives which is a subgenre of gothic fiction. When he studied the list Richard Gottlieb and Margaret L. Carter made on vampires (Simpson, 2000: 4), he discovered the resemblances of vampire stories and serial killers in contemporary fictional narratives. Gottlieb and Carter made a list containing six basic characterizations of vampire narratives. (Carter, 1975) These six major features are:

First the vampire is undead and intend on continuing an inherently parasitic relationship with the living. Second his body is not decayed or decomposed. Third, he is a tormented outcasts. Fourth, he experiences conflict over their compulsions to cannibalize the living. Fifth, he destroys with his mouth, creating more vampires even as he nourishes himself. Lastly, he longs for death. (Simpson, 2000: 4)

Simpson analyzes the similarities between Gothic vampires and serial killers in the first chapter of his book, "*Gothic Legacy and Serial Murder*". (Simpson, 2000: 26-69) He describes *Kiss the Girls'* Ruskin as vampiric because he has "hypnotic command over women." (Simpson, 2000: 54) In some ways, vampires and serial killers are identical and, at the same time, some of their qualities differ. Still, the ways they are narrated in filmic world have similar properties. Simpson argues that "In the figure of serial killer, whether presented in fictional or tabloid "true crime" fashion, we see a similar human monster, textually coded as generically supernatural but, in part, vampiric." (Simpson, 2000: 4) Simpson's description

of serial killer films holds what I would like to argue about the serial killers in films. Are serial killers in these films supernatural or not? I agree with the similarities such as the fourth topic which suggests that the vampires and serial killers are common in experiencing conflict over their compulsions to cannibalize the living. This, rapidly, reminds me of Hannibal Lecter of *The Silence of the Lambs*. But, what interests me more is the relation between the serial killers and female protagonists of these films. In gothic, this kind of relation can be found between the victims and the vampires. Relationship of Count Dracula and Mina of *Bram Stoker's Dracula* (Coppola, 1992) is similar to the connection of male serial killer and the female protagonist.

1.1.2. Slasher and Serial Killer Films

Returning to contemporary serial killer films, I would like to ask again: which genre or subgenre should we put the serial killer films which have female protagonists who have an odd relationship with the killer and at the end overcome the killer? Being the leader of these films, *The Silence of the Lambs* was considered as a slasher film by some reviewers. Amy Taubin suggests that “As exhilarating as it is harrowing, *The Silence of the Lambs* is a slasher film in which the woman is hero rather than victim, pursuer rather than pursued.” (Taubin, 2006) Chiranjit Goswami, another reviewer agrees by stating “Demme’s film attempts to blur the boundaries imposed upon it by genre conventions, eagerly combining elements of women’s pictures, serial killer horrors, and slasher films in order to fashion an absorbing combination of character study and procedural thriller.” (Goswami, 2006) Do these films have some slasher elements in their narrative and narration? Can they be classified as slashers?

I would like to propose that these films, which have female protagonists relating to the serial killer and having an affair with them, are closer to slasher films than the other subgenres of horror by their properties. In summary these properties which help me relate these specific films to slasher are:

1. The films narrate a serial killer's crimes.
2. The serial crimes are investigated by a female.
3. No matter how important the serial killer is, the story is the female protagonist's story.
4. These females relate to the serial killer in an odd way and they share an affectionate and sexual relationship.

These elements have directed me to a subgenre of horror: slasher films. At first sight, these particular films and slasher films do not seem like they have much in common, because slasher's graphic violence makes them B movies whereas these films are not. Clover tries to understand how horror works in slasher films which she states as being at the "bottom of the horror heap." (Clover, 1992: 21) *The Silence of the Lambs* is exactly an A class movie, suitable for mainstream audience. It even won five Oscars, including the awards for Best Adapted Screenplay and Best Picture. "Jonathan Demme won an Academy Award for Best Director. Jodie Foster and Anthony Hopkins both won Oscars (for their roles as Clarice Starling and Dr. Hannibal Lecter, respectively)" and "it is the last of the only three films to win the five most prestigious Academy Awards (after *It Happened One Night*, 1934 and *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*, 1975)." (Wikipedia) So how can we put slasher movies and these films that are almost prestigious in the same category? However, when I analyzed the films, I started finding out that they have many shared qualities. So what is slasher and how does it relate to these films?

Carol J. Clover is a film theorist who has drawn the borderlines of slasher. She has studied this subgenre of horror in her book *Men, Women and Chainsaws: Gender in the Modern Horror Film*. (1992) She defines slasher films, basing it on Dickenstein's theory: "the slasher (or splatter or shocker or stalker) film: the immensely generative story of a psycho killer who slashes to death a string of mostly female victims, one by one, until he subdued or killed, usually by the one girl who has survived." (Clover, 1992: 21) Her psychokiller definition is similar to my definition of serial killers in the films I chose. So does the definition of "one girl who has survived" (Clover, 1992: 21) who overcomes the killer relate to the female protagonist who shares an odd relation and overcomes the killer at the end in the films I chose. She gives example from *Texas Chainsaw Massacre* (Hooper, 1974), *Hell Night* (DeSimone, 1981) or *Halloween* (Carpenter, 1978) but, basically, she finds *Psycho* (Hitchcock, 1960) having all the essential elements of slasher film. In addition, she links to *The Silence of the Lambs* as one of the latest examples of slasher. Clover regards the serial killer character called Buffalo Bill in *The Silence of the Lambs* as "the most recent incarnation of Norman Bates" who is the killer in *Psycho*; at the time she wrote her article. (Clover, 1992: 28) This linkage is very useful for me because *The Silence of the Lambs* is one of the leader films of the serial killer with female protagonists that I would like to examine.

1.1.3. Slasher as a Subgenre of Horror

Carol J. Clover bases her theories on other film theoreticians, like Laura Mulvey and Barbara Creed who analyze film narratives and narrations psychoanalytically. She starts her book with a chapter on *Carrie* (De Palma, 1976) and uses this chapter as an introduction, asking her questions. She searches the roots of "slasher films, occult or possession films, and rape-

revenge films” (Clover, 1992: 5) because they are the films of 1970-1980 era which “female figures and/or gender issues loom especially large.” (Clover, 1992: 5)

Many academicians and theoreticians (Robin Wood, Andrew Tudor, Noel Carroll...) tried to understand the nature of horror films by defining the term, “horror”. Bruce Kawin asserted that horror is especially interested in the encounter between the known and the unknown. (Kawin, 1984: 3-20) Broadening Kawin’s statement, Carroll tells that “To experience the uncanny [horror]...is to experience something that is known, but something the knowledge of which has been hidden or repressed.” (Carroll, 1990: 80-81) These remind us of Freud’s theory of the “uncanny.”

1.2. What is horrifying: “I” am scared by my “other” self

1.2.1. The Uncanny

Freud tried to explain the roots of the things that scare us. He developed a theory on what is horrifying: The uncanny. Freud describes the word, “uncanny”, as what "arouses dread and horror...certain things which lie within the class of what is frightening." (Freud, 1990: 339) According to German psychologist Ernst Jentsch, uncanny feelings are born from doubts, and confusions that arise when we come across something unfamiliar, “alien” to us. (Jentsch, 1906: 8) Freud also agrees, stating “... what is uncanny is frightening precisely because it is not known and familiar." (Freud, 1990: 341) This reminds us of Kawin’s and Carroll’s statement on horror.

Freud continues to construct his theory on the word “heimlich”. Heimlich means familiar. When it takes the prefix “un-”, it becomes “unfamiliar”. So the things we are aware of are

familiar and they do not scare us, and the things we are not familiar with scare us. But what if the unfamiliar things are the other sides of our familiar things; a part, a different face of familiar things? Freud states that "the uncanny is in reality nothing new or alien, but something which is familiar and old-established in the mind and which has become alienated from it only through the process of repression." (Freud, 1990: 363) So familiar (heimlich) is the conscious and unfamiliar (unheimlich) is the unconscious in psychoanalytic terms.

The uncanny feeling is a result of our reaction to the side of us which we do not want to make peace with. Denying something which is part of us and repressing it brings out the uncanny feeling. So what we call unfamiliar is the things that we repress in our unconscious. They are not unfamiliar but they are the things that we would not like to know about ourselves. Facing them, even through the filter of consciousness, produces the uncanny feeling. Freud affirms that the uncanny feeling comes from the return of the repressed.

1.2.2. The True Subject of the Horror Genre

Clover agrees with Freud about the uncanny feeling coming from the return of the repressed. She states that horror films find their roots in Freud's theories, "...some horror scenarios seem written directly out of Freud..." (Clover, 1992: 16) Robin Wood takes this hypothesis one step further and says that "...the true subject of the horror genre is all that our civilization represses or oppresses." (Wood, 1986: 75) This gives birth to the theory that horror narratives are produced from the society's collective unconscious. A human's unconscious records everything a human goes through, so does the collective unconscious as every individual in the society goes through similar circumstances. Freud states that

the prehistory into which the dream-work leads us back is of two kinds— on the one hand, into the individual's prehistory, his childhood, and on the other, in so far as each individual somehow recapitulates in an abbreviated form the entire development of the human race, into phylogenetic prehistory too" (Freud, 1991: 234)

So both histories should be examined to understand what is oppressed and repressed to discover how these oppressions and repressions work creating the individual's behavior in the social construction.

Freud's aim was enable his patients to become aware of how the unconscious works. By the process of therapy, the patient would start confronting her/his unconscious. As a result, the patient will gain insight of his/her problems which s/he has repressed in the unconscious and make peace with them. In order to reach the unconscious, dreams should be analyzed. For Freud, dreams are the royal road to the unconscious. They are like leaks on the valves. They help the unconscious feelings and thoughts to surface. The conscious acts like a valve to filter and control them but they find their new formations in the dream world to express themselves.

All the narratives, like dreams, are representation of our repressed and oppressed sides which come back to haunt us. As Freud states "we believe that civilization is to a large extent being constantly created anew, since each individual who makes a fresh entry into human society repeats this sacrifice of instinctual satisfaction for the benefit of the whole community", (Freud, 1991: 23). The society is constructed over the sacrifices of the individuals. There should be a leak in the valve to help the society to relax like the dreams.

1.2.3. Collective Unconscious

Psychoanalyst Gustav Jung also worked on dreams, like Freud. Jung preferred to understand the human psyche by investigating the origins of dreams, and narratives of mythology, art and religions. He found out that what Freud was telling about dreams is mirroring the whole society's structure. He studied various narratives to understand the symbolic world that surrounds us, created by our collective unconscious. Collective unconscious is like a psychic inheritance. Dr. C. George Boeree calls it as:

It is the reservoir of our experiences as a species, a kind of knowledge we are all born with. And yet we can never be directly conscious of it. It influences all of our experiences and behaviors, most especially the emotional ones... (Boeree, 2006)

Collective unconscious is like a language which is spoken all over the world. Jung understood that his dreams have universal codes in it. They were intersecting with the narratives that were repeated all through history. The forms were changing but the basic structure was staying the same. He realized that an individual's dreams have direct relation with the collective unconscious. Robin Wood connects this theory to horror films suggesting that "at once the personal dreams of their makers and the collective dreams of their audiences- the fusion made possible by the shared structures of a common ideology." (Wood, 1978: 26) The dreams and filmic world are both using the same symbols and codes. Jung tried to explain this symbolic collective language with archetypes.

1.2.4. Archetypes

There are many archetypes; such as the shadow, the mother, the persona, the hero... However, the one that seems like being used by horror narratives the most is “the shadow”. The shadow is our instincts in general according to Jung. It is can be defined as our animal sides but that is not an adequate definition. It is the dark side of the ego which we try to repress in our unconscious because of its potential of evildoing. It is called evildoing because they are the parts of us which cannot suit in the norms of society.

As a word which brings to mind visualization when it is uttered, the shadow is a useful metaphor in the filmic world. It is functional both as a visual element and a connection device to psychoanalytical world. In many horror movies the monsters’ image is reflected on the wall as a shadow when they kill or destroy. Their disgusting and heartless manner is too much for the eye to see, as for “I” (the self) to bear. Clover carries on relating this to her theories on identification of the audience. She assumes that:

[in horror films] attacker and attacked are expressions of the same self in nightmares, so they are expressions of the same viewer in horror film. We are both Red Riding Hood and the Wolf [...] knowing both sides of the story. (Clover, 1992: 12)

She claims that because of the identification process, the audience finds its reflection on the movie screen. It can be either the victim or the monster according to the narrational structure. She tries to explain identification process: It can either happen by character-identification or by camera-identification. (Clover, 1992: 6) But, what Clover discovered was, in slasher films and the films alike, these process works both ways. The audience was sometimes directed to

identify with the monster and sometimes with the victim. When we see the victim from a far, with an oblique angle, we start thinking that we are watching the victim from the killer's eyes because of the camera use. And, at the end, when the poor victim of the story becomes a heroine killing the monster, we identify with her. As a result we find ourselves at the both ends of the same rope. We experience both, being the monster and the victim who becomes the heroine. The films' narrative and narrational structure expresses them both. The killer seems to be the shadow of the victim and consequently they both become the shadow of the audience.

These expressions of both sides remind us of the theory of the "uncanny" which Freud stated. Freud constructed his theory on two sides which also unite like Red Riding Hood and Wolf, heimlich and unheimlich. Red Riding Hood finds her position by the existence of the Wolf, so does the Wolf by the existence of Red Riding Hood. They are each others' "other"s. And these narratives bring out the "other"s in us.

1.2.5. The Other

The "other" has been theorized by various sciences with different point of views. The other is defined as "another; different; the remaining pair" in many dictionaries. So "the other", which is the shadow, is both the opposite of "the same, similar, familiar", and the definer of it. One should define the other first to create its own identity. Lawrence Cahoon describes it; "What appear to be cultural units - human beings, words, meanings, ideas, philosophical systems, social organizations - are maintained in their apparent unity only through an active process of exclusion, opposition, and hierarchization." (Cahoon, 1996: 16) The paradox starts with the definition of the self and the other. In order to define the "self", the "other" should be pointed

out, furthermore it should be excluded. But if the definition comes with it, is not it a part of the “self”? This reminds us Freud’s theory on “heimlich” and “unheimlich.” Freud, in psychoanalytic paradigm, stated that “the uncanny is in reality nothing new or alien, but something which is familiar and old-established in the mind and which has become alienated from it only through the process of repression.” (Freud, 1990: 363) “Self’s relation with the “other” is exactly the same relation “heimlich” and “unheimlich” have. So as familiar (heimlich) is the conscious and unfamiliar (unheimlich) is the unconscious in psychoanalytic terms; the self is the conscious and the other is the unconscious. So what we try to leave out is a part of us. By limiting the borders between the self and the other, we create alienation between them. So what we alienate are our own selves.

There are many theories produced by this dilemma on different areas. For example philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche, stated in his book, *The Gay Science*: “You are always a different person.” (Nietzsche, 1974: 246) Also poet Arthur Rimbaud wrote: “Je est un autre” which means “I is another.” (Rimbaud, 1972: 249) In his literal work¹, he simply reconciles with his other side. At the same time, he underlines the being of the self and the other at the same time never unites, but stand alone as different parts of one being. It is like two different fluids with different densities mixed in the same cup. They never mix, but stay together. It is not black and white combining to make gray, but being “white in black” and “black in white” together. The yin/yang of Chinese philosophy, which Jung has studied, defines this togetherness very well.

¹ Arthur Rimbaud as a poet had covered his thoughts on the “other” by using his poetry. Poetry is a way of expressing one’s self in literature but it differentiates from the other forms of literature by its use of words. It is similar to the filmic world because poetry is more a production of the imaginary world. The use of language will be discussed in future chapters trying to find out the feelings, instincts and thoughts covered by poetry and slang which are used in one of the selected films, *In The Cut* (Campion, 2003), that will be analyzed.

Yin is the darker and feminine side and the yang is the brighter, masculine side. Yin is downward-seeking and passive as yang is upward-seeking and active. They are the “two primal opposing but complementary forces found in all things in the universe.” (Wikipedia) There is a drawing of yin/yang: a black point in white and a white point in black, and they both form a circular shape. It is a unity of two sides, which both sides comprise some of the other. Clover’s theory on “two sex” seems similar to yin/yang archetypes. She states:

To judge from a rich variety of medical, linguistic, pictorial, and narrative evidence, an earlier world constructed the sexes as inside versus outside versions of single genital/reproductive system, differing in degree and warmth or coolness and hence in degree of value (hot being superior to cool), but essentially the same in form and function, and ultimately fungible versions of one another. It is not that the male body has a penis, a female body a vagina, and the one-sex body both. It is that penis and vagina are one and the same organ; if one happens to extrude and the one to intrude (in an inside-out and upward-extending fashion), they are physiologically identical (and the same words did for both). (Clover, 1992: 13)

Yin representing the anima, the female side and yang representing the animus, the male side are identical as “all humans have testes, the male ones outside and the female ones inside...” (Clover, 1992: 13) “Any yin/yang dichotomy can be seen as its opposite when viewed from another perspective.” (Wikipedia) This round shape shows that whatever happens through time, it ends up the same. From different perspectives the opposites are the same. If one component is the identity, it needs the “other” to describe itself and also includes the “other” in itself. In addition to these, if you start the journey with being one you can end up being the

other. On the other hand, I should state that this is also an illusion. You cannot start the journey being only one of them because even that one contains a part of the other. It is more like there are two scales full of opposing elements but they cannot stand alone without each other. And sometimes one side of the scale is heavier and sometimes the other.

In a TV series, called *Charmed*, one of the main character's, Cole, is a man with two sides. He is both human and a demon. He is a demon inside and a human outside. However, sometimes his inner demon side comes out and forces his human side to stay inside. All through the 4th season, he tries to balance his opposing sides, moreover, get rid of his demon side. Yet all his efforts change him more into a demon. He, even, ends up being the "source" of all evil, affecting the woman he loves, turning her into evil, too. Cole's name reminds "coal"; one of the episodes is named 'Black as Cole' trying to express how he is black as a coal. Trying to define with the help of "binary opposites" looks simple, but it brings out unity and balance of them more. Cole is black and fighting to be white. He never ends up being only one of them. He is neither one nor the "other". The shifting of his identity between the sides is what makes him human. (Charmed, Fourth Season, 8th episode)

As I mentioned previously, shadow is a word which brings to mind visualization when it is uttered and it is a useful metaphor in the filmic world. The monsters' image is reflected on the wall as a shadow when they kill or destroy because the "other" can only reflect as a dark shadow, but, also, in form of the self. In *Alien*, the creature's unbearable killings sometimes reflect on the wall, leaving the audience to imagine how dreadful the real vision is. (*Alien* *Quadriology*: Scott, 1979; Cameron, 1986; Fincher, 1992; Jeunet, 1997) In *Nosferatu* (Murnau, 1922), Nosferatu slowly strolls to his victims as a shadow.² Watching his shadow

² Nosferatu can be destroyed by light which is the opposite of shadow and what makes the shadow. So as a narrational element, the use of light is significant. It finds a meaning in the narrative, too.

and imagining his power to destroy and rebuild as he likes gives us the creeps. Also, in *Charmed*, when the audience was first introduced with him, Cole's dark side was represented as a shadow. His human side was shown as a young, handsome man to the audience, as they identify with Phoebe, who falls in love with him. They were separating the human side and the shadow strictly as if they are two different beings. His dark side was reporting to the evil world in form of a shadow, as Cole stays in the world we live in, in his human form. The shadow was unattaching from its body. (*Charmed*, beginning of the 3rd Season)

Seeing the relation a person and its shadow has can bring out an uncanny feeling, it frightens us. It is the unknown side which we would not like to explore, leave in the dark world of its. Ego is like the self, as shadow is like the other. The shadow represents everything that the conscious person would not like to know about himself/herself. Conscious/unconscious, heimlich/unheimlich, self/other, ego/shadow, ying/yang can be from different paradigms, or different interpretations in the same paradigms but they all share the same basics. As oppositions to each other, these doubles all have common structures. Each double has the same relation between each other like the other doubles. Conscious, heimlich, self, ego, and one face of the ying/yang are on one side as unconscious, unheimlich, other, shadow and the other part of the yin/yang is on the other. It is useless trying to predict which side of the yin/yang dichotomy will be listed with conscious, heimlich, self and ego or otherwise.³ This also shows that there are no good or bad sides in these definitions. "One" has both sides and none of the sides can exist without the other. Shadow is the balancing element of the self. Someone can be known nice but his/her shadow can be rude. It works with the binary

³ Many would try to categorize Yin with shadow, other, unconscious and unheimlich on the same side because it is the anim side which is feminine. The feminine sides are mostly classified as the dark elements and are oppressed by society's rules. But I still think that there is no need to choose one of the sides. The unity of doubles is more meaningful than trying to separate them. Also we can easily add anima/animus of Jung to our doubles. Anima is on the other's side and Animus on the self's side.

opposites but it does not strengthen the opposition of them but unites them in one. Self cannot do without the shadow and vice versa. As a result, this leads us to a world which is not one dimensional but at least two dimensional, maybe many more. But the social system works oppressing one side and forming the other according to its benefits by giving it an “identity” using cultural elements. When an individual is left with only “identity” and try to repress his/her desires, s/he is left with two ways to deal with his/her needs: introjection or projection. In this case, “other” is projected onto others when it is only a part of the “self”. Resisting the conscious awareness of the wholeness of the self and the shadow, leads a person to project the repressed side onto others. Austin states that:

Self-reflection in Jungian depth psychology is a process through which the personality turns back on itself in an asymmetrical fashion... The mirror at work in the Jungian hermeneutic does not reflect the self-same face. Rather, it mirrors back the face of the Other... Inner Otherness is assumed, however, to be more than a matter of Lacanian alienation, and is, instead, taken as a matter of awe, fascination, terror, enlivenment and radical powerlessness. (Austin, 2006)

As Austin tells, the fear and fascination of this doubleness comes together in a package. The fascination when we watch a movie and share the same collective unconscious in a dark movie theatre with others is similar. It contains both the terrorization and fascination for the reflections on the screen.

Psychoanalyst Jaques Lacan also worked on creation of identity and the “other.” Lacan suggests that the “self” is constituted in the "other", which is composed of things that are exterior to the self. He stated that a person is born into the Real, where he is surrounded by

“Everything” and “No-thingness”. When the child faces with something that will make him/her recognize himself/herself in the mirroring image. This image does not have to be a in a real mirror. It is a mirror that reflects back to him what s/he is in the eyes of the others according to her/him. So, in Lacan’s words:

Insufficiency to anticipations- and which manufactures for the subject, caught up in the lure of spatial identification, the succession of phantasies that extends from a fragmented body-image to a form of its totality that I shall call orthopaedic – and, lastly, to the assumption of the armour of an alienating identity, which will mark with its rigid structure the subject’s entire mental development (Lacan, 2002: 5)

As the subject starts to build up his/her identity, s/he passes to the Imaginary Stage, where s/he collects the qualities of her/him that s/he wants to keep and objects the one s/he thinks as the “other.” Identifying the self, in terms of the Other, is a process that goes on through lifetime. After the Imaginary, Symbolic Order comes. It is the stage, where child start using language to understand and show his/her desires by using speech. Therefore, the person comes and goes between the Imaginary and Symbolic again and again, building up his/her identity over and over. The shifting between the self and the other continues at the self-identifying process. We sometimes end up being the Wolf and sometimes the Red Riding Hood. Still, being the Wolf is constituted in the Red Riding Hood and the Red Riding Hood in the Wolf. The oppositions share the same cup, sometimes one increasing and the other decreasing; sometimes the other way round.

1.3. Are Serial Killer Films with Female Heroes Slasher Films?

1.3.1. Clover's Identification Theory

Clover, builds up her theory on identification of the audience according to difference of sexes. She analyzes Laqueur's theory, "Representing One Sex in a Two Sex World". (Clover, 1992: 16) She asserts that horror films create their characters by the differences/oppositions of their sexes. Initially, taking Laura Mulvey's theory of the "male gaze" on her back, she claims that mostly the victims are female. Clover states, "Laura Mulvey has famously maintained that the cinematic gaze (constitutive of primary identification) is not gender-free but is structured by male or masculine perceptions, a fact revealed when the camera's object is a woman." (Clover, 1992: 8) She continues "Sex in the universe, proceeds from gender, not the other way round." (Clover, 1992: 9) According to Clover the monster's, hero's and the victim's places in horror movies are confirmed by the audience through identification and this structure is based on gender. She states that:

A figure does not cry and cower because she is a woman; she is a woman because she cries and cowers. And a figure is not a psychokiller because he is a man; he is a man because he is a psychokiller. (Clover, 1992: 9)

In general, horror films seem like placing the male roles mostly as the hero and the killer where they represent something strong both physically and mentally. At the same time, female are mostly placed as the victims, where they run around suffering, with no power over what will happen to them. However, there is another placement for female roles, that they are the monsters of the film. In cases when the monster is female, she holds power but that power is classified as dark, evil and extraordinary. Clover claims that, in general horror narratives are born out of the theme of "mobile heroism wanting male representatives, and passive dank

spaces wanting female one.” (Clover, 1992: 13) As heroism finds itself in male representations, the passiveness and darkness find themselves in female representations.

After Clover has watched *Texas Chainsaw Massacre* in 1985, she constructed her theory on slasher films. She understood that these films were bringing “suffering victim and avenging hero” (Clover, 1992: 17) in one body. Slashers were not separating the general female and male roles but combining them. In this sense, I find Clover’s theories similar to mine. Her discussion on gender roles in horror films is where my argument starts from. She suggests that “The world of horror is in any case one that knows very well that men and women are profoundly different (and that former are vastly superior to the latter) but one that at the same time repeatedly contemplates mutation and slidings whereby women begin to look a lot like men (slasher films), men are pressured become like women (possession films)...” (Clover, 1992: 15) What Clover states, exactly suits what I think of the serial killer films with female protagonists who share an odd relationship with the killer. The female protagonists appear with masculine properties as the male killers appear with female properties or killing because they have issues with their female sides.

Andrew Tudor comments on films: *The Silence of the Lambs* and *Alien*. They both have female protagonists with masculine properties. They appear as one of the firsts of the films I would like to discuss. Tudor who tried to analyze the female heroes of these films and suggested that:

They and their sisters remain significant exceptions to the continuing pattern of male domination of the genre’s central situation. Women have always featured as horror-movie victims... (Tudor, 1989: 127)

Tudor finds the change in the female role in horror films as a new thing. However, Clover disagrees stating:

But by Tudor's own account, it is not only in their capacity as victims that these women appear in these films. They are, in fact, protagonists in the full sense: they combine the functions of suffering victim and avenging hero. (Clover, 1992: 17)

Clover underlines that these women present not only poor victims but also the heroes. I would like to remind where I have first started from: I was planning to work on films which have the qualities as listed below:

1. The films narrate a serial killer's crimes.
2. The serial crimes are investigated by a female.
3. No matter how important the serial killer is, the story is the female protagonist's story.
4. These females relate to the serial killer in an odd way and they share an affectionate and sexual relationship.

These serial killer films intersect with Clover's slasher films because they all have female protagonist, especially, who become the "suffering victim and avenging hero" in all cases. This is where I meet with Clover. The films are serial killer films, suitable for Clover description of slashers. There is a serial killer who murders his victims one by one, especially women. In cases where the victims are not female, the killer has issues with feminine qualities. No matter how important the serial killer in the film, the film's leading role is a woman, just like Clover's slasher films' protagonists are females who, at the end, survive and overcome the killer. In my films, the female protagonists do not only overwhelm the killers

physically but, also psychologically. I say psychologically because they have a relation with the killers where they see their inner world and, even, share it with them.

I also follow the same lines with Clover when she opposes Tudor, stating that *The Silence of the Lambs* or *Alien* is not the first of their kind, but they are the ones that are accepted by general audience. She asserts that

Tudor very much underestimates the number of such women in modern horror; at least two genres, rape-revenge and slasher, are organized around them, and to judge from such films as *Alien*, *Sleeping with the Enemy*, and *Silence of the Lambs*, the phenomenon has moved to the mainstream.”

(Clover, 1992: 17)

The Silence of the Lambs or *Alien* are not their first kind, they are just first examples of their kind which is appropriate for the mainstream audience. So can we state that slashers are changing and becoming digestible by the general audience? They do not lose their essential elements but mask them elegantly.

1.3.2. A Movies vs. B. Movies

In slasher films, we see lots of stabbing and slashing as Clover states but the first essential example she gives, *Psycho*, does not include any scenes of bloody stabbing. Clover states that “Of the forty-odd shots in as many seconds that figure the murder, only a single fleeting one actually shows the body being stabbed” (Clover, 1992: 41) about the shower scene in *Psycho*. But the scene which makes *Psycho* “the *Psycho*” is this slashing scene where the woman victim is stabbed in the shower. The scene does not include much blood or any slashing of the skin but was edited in a way that the audience catches the affect of the stabbing. The editing

has too many slashed shots, which do not have a meaning solely but reforms a meaning when they are groups of shots. *Psycho* was an A class movie on the contrary to other slasher movies which are B class because they have too much blood and violence.

Julia Kristeva constructs the theory of Abject. It is “our reaction (horror, vomit) to a threatened breakdown in meaning caused by the loss of the distinction between the subject and object or between self and other.” (Felluga, 2002) Slashers show scenes full of abject visuals where *Psycho* does not show but reminds us of the abject, making us create the visualization in our minds. *Psycho* was shown in movie theaters; however most of the other slashers were mostly rented from video stores because of their abject quality. There were some movie theaters which show slasher films but they were movie theaters for B class movies; they were not showing mainstream films. In addition, the audience of slashers like *Texas Chainsaw Massacre* (Hooper, 1974), *Hell Night* (DeSimone, 1981) have basic differences from the audience of *Psycho*. Clover describes slasher audience as mostly male teenagers. She suggests that “... for some twelve years the slasher was the “exploitation” form of choice for junior horror fans” and she adds “the majority audience, perhaps even more than the audience for horror in general, was largely young and largely male...” (Clover, 1992: 23)

Slasher finds its roots in rape and revenge videos in which a woman and her friends are raped harshly in the first half of the film and she takes her revenge by killing her rapers one by one in the second half. The male audience of these films was applauding the male rapers in the first half and cheering the female victim who was taking revenge in the second. Then, it seems like it was absolutely not suitable for the general audience. Clover claims that “Drenched in taboo and encroaching vigorously on the pornographic, the slasher film lies by and large beyond the purview of the respectable (middle-aged, middle-class) audience.”

(Clover, 1992: 21) As a consequence, slashers came into movies theatres turning into teenage nightmares. They were not pornographic and violent in degrees as the rape and revenge movies. However, they were keeping all the essential elements of rape and revenge movies. Likewise, if we try to understand slasher films by their essential elements, then it is easier to comprehend why Clover considers *Psycho* a slasher film. *Psycho* was digestible enough for the general audience because it does not include graphic violence in contrast with other slashers but, Clover comments on *Psycho*, asserting “it suggests so much but show so little” (Clover, 1992: 41). In the same way, the serial killer films that I plan to analyze also do the same. These serial killer films which are shown in movie theaters are also A class movies where there is no restriction to the audience. They do not put out the violence scenes, but reduce their affects to tolerable, limiting the blood color out, or not showing the killing scenes in detail. I will examine *In the Cut* (Campion, 2003), *Taking Lives* (Caruso, 2004) and *Mary Reilly* (Frears, 1996) which suits what Clover suggests as films with “oblique rendition of physical violence.” (Clover, 1992: 41) They are suitable examples that carry the properties of serial killer films which have a female protagonist who have a relationship with the killer and, at the end, overcome the killer. This dissertation tries to analyze the basic qualities of these three films which also can be found in other films, such as *Twisted* (Kaufman, 2004), *Copycat* (Amiel, 1999), *The Silence of the Lambs* (Demme, 1991), 1996), *Kiss the Girls* (Fleder, 1997), *Murder By Numbers* (Schroeder, 2002), *Tesis* (Amenábar, 1996) and *The Bone Collector* (Noyce, 1999).

In the Cut shows some scenes with graphic violence in black and white to lessen the harsh effect. It uses a narrative motivation for showing them in black and white as if it is recorded on police camera. *Mary Reilly* mostly do not show the murder scene as it happens in the chronological order. The murder of the prostitute in the bawdy house is shown as a murder

scene. We do not see the murder happening but comprehend how it is done by the blood stained sheets and red colored walls. Similarly, the murder of the spokesman was given as a flashback of the police where the scene is formed of blurry, oblique, quick-cut shots after each other, as if the scene is also slashed like the victim.

Clover explains her research on slashers, “[I] check out three more movies on the basis of their box covers (screaming women, poised knives, terrified eyeballs).” (Clover, 1992: 19) I have gone through the same process, when I placed the DVD boxes of the three films I will analyze in detail in front of me, when I began my research. On all the covers there is a woman, either grabbed by or cornered by a man. On *Mary Reilly*’s cover, Mary Reilly is cornered by Mr. Hyde. She looks downward, cannot face Mr. Hyde. He touches her face. She does not look scared or crying but she seems like she is thoughtful and thrilled. Her expression contains mixed emotions which are hard to define. On *In the Cut*’s cover, Frannie faces us, the audience, over her shoulder. The “gaze” Mulvey mentions reflects back to us. Detective Malloy is holding her. He touches her face with his hand and at the same time he stands so close to her that he touches her face with his face. Frannie’s expression, like Mary’s, is indefinable, which makes us feel uncanny in a way. On *Taking Lives*’ cover, Illeana faces us. The gaze has more fear than the other two. Still it can be mixed with other expressions. The fear on face also seems like lust. She is also grabbed by somebody who we cannot see the face of. The person, who grabs her, holds her from her back and, even, tightly squeezes her hands. She is trapped by somebody who stays in the dark, who is faceless. The other two pictures has the same quality that none of these women can move from their position. They are all held tightly or cornered. They all have a facial expression that contains both fear and desire. The difference of the covers to Clover’s films’ covers is that these women do not run, do not scream but, seems like, kind of enjoy being in that entrapment and have pleasure out of

it. They are not in hell like Clover's slasher films, but they are in a place where it does not seem like hell but dangerously threatening for them because of their desires. These differences in representations of slashers and these new kinds of slashers relate to the change of the target audience. The women on the covers of *In the Cut*, *Taking Lives* and *Mary Reilly* do not have a different facial expression than Hitchcock's women.

1.4. Serial Killers in Serial Killer Films with Female Heroes

Serial killers differ from monsters of slasher and many other horror films. They do not show their monstrous features from outside. This problem occurs the same way in both fiction and real life. They cannot be spotted as monsters by their appearance. They cannot be identified as monstrous easily. I would like to remind what I have planned to argue at the beginning; whether the serial killers are supernatural like most of the other horror film monsters or not. In addition, the meaning changes according to this particular quality. If they appear as supernatural monsters, they have different meanings and the audiences' reactions change according to that. In contrast, if they are not, the audiences' comprehension of such films differs. To understand the serial killer in these narratives, first we should understand what monsters represent in films and how they are constructed.

1.4.1. Monsters

Different theoreticians defined monster from various points of view. The monsters are the embodiments of what is not appropriate for the society ideologically so they took a form of the undesirable things in the social system. Noel Carroll says "within the context of the horror narrative, the monsters are identified as impure and unclean" (Carroll, 1990: 23) and Susan

Stewart claims that monsters are creatures “between the human and the other, between nature and culture” (Stewart, 1982: 42) Monsters carry the visual elements such as impure, unclean, unnatural, inhuman to have a shape of something that is unsuitable for the society. Consisting these kinds of elements in outlook, the monsters give audience, the uncanny feeling.

Steven Schneider classifies what he calls “Monsters as (Uncanny) Metaphors” into three and creates a table. The surmounted beliefs are horror film monsters conceptual metaphor:

- I. SURMOUNTED BELIEFS THAT THE DEAD CAN RETURN TO LIFE ARE **REINCARNATED MONSTERS**
 - A. SURMOUNTED BELIEFS THAT DEAD BODIES CAN RETURN TO LIFE ARE **ZOMBIES**
 1. **NON-NATURAL ZOMBIES**: Dracula, The Mummy, The Golem, Jason, *Night of the Living Dead*
 2. **MEDICO-SCIENTIFIC ZOMBIES**: Frankenstein's monster, *The Crazies*, *Shivers*, *Rabid*
 - B. SURMOUNTED BELIEFS THAT DEAD SOULS CAN RETURN TO LIFE ARE **SPIRITS**
 1. **DISEMBODIED SOULS**: ghosts, haunted houses (*The Haunting*, *Poltergeist*, *Amityville Horror*)
 2. **EMBODIED SOULS**: demonic possessions (*The Exorcist*, *Fallen*), Candyman, Chuckie
- II. SURMOUNTED BELIEFS IN THE OMNIPOTENCE OF THOUGHT ARE **PSYCHIC MONSTERS**
 - A. SURMOUNTED BELIEFS IN THE PROMPT FULFILLMENT OF WISHES ARE **TELEKENETICS**: Carrie, Freddy
 - B. SURMOUNTED BELIEFS IN MENTALTRANSPARENCY ARE **TELEPATHICS**: Patrick, *Scanners*, (vampires)
- III. SURMOUNTED BELIEFS IN THE EXISTENCE OF A DOUBLE ARE **DYADIC MONSTERS**
 - A. SURMOUNTED BELIEFS IN THE EXISTENCE OF PHYSICAL DOUBLES ARE **REPLICAS**
 1. SURMOUNTED BELIEFS IN THE EXISTENCE OF NATURAL REPLICAS ARE **DOPPLEGANGERS**
 - a. **TWINS**: *Sisters*, *Dead Ringers*, *Raising Cain*
 - b. **CLONES**: *Invasion of the Body Snatchers*
 - c. **CHAMELEONS**: Carpenter's *The Thing*, *Phantoms*
 2. SURMOUNTED BELIEFS IN THE EXISTENCE OF NON-NATURAL REPLICAS ARE **REPLICANTS**
 - a. **ROBOTS**: *The Stepford Wives*, *Westworld*
 - b. **CYBORGS**: *Bladerunner*, *Terminator*
 - B. SURMOUNTED BELIEFS IN THE EXISTENCE OF MENTAL DOUBLE ARE **PSYCHOS**

1. **SCHIZOS** [same body, different consciousness]: Norman Bates, *Dressed To Kill*, (*Sisters*)
2. **SHAPE-SHIFTERS** [same body, physical transformation]: Jekyll-Hyde, werewolves, vampires
3. **PROJECTIONS** [different body]: *The Brood*, (Frankenstein's monster)
4. **SERIAL KILLERS** [same body, same consciousness]: Henry, Lechter, *Peeping Tom*

(Schneider, 1999: 167-91)

Schneider's attempt to categorize monsters into groups by their relation to unconscious and how they appear on screen is an important effort. Still he has some problems putting them into groups. The category "Psychos" consist of four different types which in fiction narratives can be found together. Some of the categorizations cannot be divided. Norman Bates who is the "Schizos" group does not have any difference to the fourth group which is "Serial Killers". Norman Bates is a serial killer as many serial killers in fiction can be categorized as "Schizos." Also the character in the film *Twins* can also be identified as "Schizo" but was put in to "Doppelgangers" group. Scheneider's categorization helps us to see the monster types from a broader point of view but we still should keep in mind that these groups are transitive with each other. One monster can consist of qualities from different groups at the same time.

Also Schneider mixes the terms conscious and unconscious. He states that some of the monsters have the same body and different consciousness or vice versa. He, also, has developed his theory on Freud's theory of uncanny, stating that horror is born out of the unconscious. So there is no question of consciousness in these conditions, but the unconscious. Serial Killers are stated as monsters that have the same body and same consciousness as Norman Bates is classified as a monster that has the same body but different consciousness. As I have opposed to the categorization of these two monsters being put into different groups, I resist the term "consciousness" being used instead of the "unconscious." If

Schneider tries to separate Norman's conscious into two parts: one being his mother's conscious and the other Norman's conscious; there is still a problem in defining terms. Norman's unconscious is his mother and it cannot be called conscious. To make it clear, Norman has a conscious side and an unconscious side.

If the state of their relation to their unconscious and conscious are examined, and Schneider tries to say that serial killers are conscious of what they are doing as Norman Bates is not; still, it is a problem. Serial killers in fiction are embodiments of repressed substances in the unconscious, so they cannot be conscious of what they are doing.

In fiction, serial killers appear as representational figures of the repressed substances of the unconscious, so what do they represent and what kind of resemblance do the real life serial killers have to the fiction ones? If the serial killers in the representation world are born out of the unconscious, what do they symbolize in real life? Who are real life serial killers?

1.4.2. Serial Killers in Real Life

To examine serial killers in fiction films, it would be better to understand what real life serial killers are like. Serial murder is one of the murder categories. Murder is defined as "To kill (another human) unlawfully", "To kill brutally or inhumanly", "The unlawful killing of one human by another, especially with premeditated malice" in dictionaries. (Answers.com) The Thompson and Gale Legal Encyclopedia explains murder as "The unlawful killing of another human being without justification or excuse."(Thompson and Gale Legal Encyclopedia) From various dictionaries' definitions, it is clear that murder is an "unlawful" act towards a human

being which destroys that person's life. In real life, law, the department which keeps public order, deals with murder.

Murder act can happen from various reasons, and it can be committed in different conditions. Due to the conditions it occurs, a murderer can be defensive according to the law. In their book *Serial Murder*, after classifying murder according to its degrees and justifiability, Ronald M. Holmes and Stephen T. Holmes categorized murder according to the quantity of victims into three: Mass Murder, Spree Murder and Serial Murder. (Holmes, 1998) A mass murderer is "an individual who kills three or more people in a single event and in one location." (Wikipedia) It can be caused by a political or military idea but it does not have to be like that all the time. Mass murder is murder of at three or more people within one event. Spree Murderer, on the other hand, is a person who "commits multiple murders in different locations over a period of time that may vary from a few hours to several days." However they do not return to their normal behaviors in between their killings as serial killers do. A serial killer is an individual who commits murders on multiple occasions over a period of time, as spree killer do but they appear as they are normal in between the criminal act. The law examines three elements to call someone a serial killer. They are:

1. There should be at least three victims.
2. The murders should occur in the same way. (As an example: the choice and use of weapon, or the leave of the crime scene...)
3. The murders should be motiveless.

Motiveless murders are crimes which the killer and the victim has no direct connection. They cannot be justified or excused in agreement with the self-defense and provocation claims. It is

not surprising that serial killers are even inhumanly monstrous figures in real life. A killer can have motivations that explain his/her behaviors and these will serve him/her as an excuse in front of the justice system. However with no clear motivation, a serial killer is extremely dangerous to the society. Any individual who is a part of the society will be terrified with the thought of next door neighbor being a blood-thirsty murderer. For a person, it is unacceptable that another person can kill somebody with no motive and with no sign of the act coming. Moreover, thinking that they commit their murders with detailed plan really gives a person the uncanny feeling.

However, in real life, the source of this uncanniness is not examined by psychoanalysis. In real life, serial killers are the subject of psychology, sociology and criminology. These departments in the social system, finds serial killers' acts, mostly, caused by psychological problems. The serial killers are psychopaths according to psychology, and sociopaths according to sociology. And for creating a safer environment for the society, serial murders are examined by the criminology department in the justice system. When the same symptom is analyzed by different paradigms, it finds different solutions. Psychological and criminological searches assume the root of serial killer's problems which motivate him/her to act is the humiliation and abuse s/he is exposed in the childhood. These systems define a serial killer's act as sadistic where s/he cannot identify with another's feelings and take a pleasure out of when others suffer. That is why, in real life, serial killers are called psychopathic or sociopathic. The professional psychological name given to them is antisocial personality disorder.

1.4.3. The Difference between Real Life and Fiction

For the same element, real life and fiction gives similar but also different meanings. Serial killers are horrifying both in real life and in fiction but the paradigms that deal with them are different. That is also why real life institutions define serial killers as psychopaths but fiction uses them as a symbol of the repressed sides. This differentiation also shows how psychology and psychoanalysis works differently. There is difference between the uncanny which is really experienced and the uncanny which is only portrayed. The distinction between real life and fiction makes the heaviness of the uncanny feeling bearable. Psychoanalyst Otto Rank explains this difference stating “While we excuse emotional maladjustment as “neurotic,” and are willing to help the individual towards a normal adjustment, we condemn and punish anti-social behavior as “criminal.” (Rank, 1958: 39) When studied in psychoanalytical paradigm, one’s behavior can be found neurotic or in a more evolved situation, psychotic. Psychoanalysis tries to cure the person, helping him/her understand how his/her unconscious works to unite her self’s parts into one. But sociology and criminology finds the behavior of one person’s acts dangerous to the society. In order to destroy the threat, the individual should repress his/her unacceptable desires. The society oppresses the individual and, in exchange, gives him/her an identity to hold onto, to find a place in the system. The given identity is like a substitute to fill the individual’s desires which are not compatible with the order. If the individual still cannot adjust to the social system and act according to his/her desires, s/he is punished.

As a result, psychoanalysis suits for analyzing filmic world more than sciences like psychology and criminology. Fiction narrates the stories of people who are more or less like the audience, neurotic. Even in a story of a serial killer, the protagonist who is a monstrous

figure does not categorized as a psychopath but s/he is a representation of the repressed desires. They can be represented at the stage of psychosis but still, never, as psychopaths who should be excluded from the society. The monsters, created in the fiction world, represent only the ideas, not the real serial killers. So they are not embodiments of psychosis, but neurosis of individuals. They are valves for expressing the inner desires in safe areas. By watching a movie people face with their inner fears. Sometimes, this communal event helps them to deal with them.

1.4.4. Serial Killers in Fiction

It seems like it is easier to domesticate the monsters to deal with them. In slashers, monsters have some supernatural qualities. They are not dangerous as real life serial killers. The slashers have monsters that the audience will express their repressed desires comfortably in safe areas. Making them fantasies feels better. The urban legends of serial killers, just like mythology, serves to turn what is threatening socially into safer terms by domesticating them.

Joseph Gixti comments on this situation:

Fictionalizing figures... [Ted] Bundy as inhuman monsters is one way of coming to terms with the dislocation that they generate in order to preserve the preferred contours of our own identity... The process involves locating the criminal-outsiders within a tradition, and identifying their affinities with antecedents- which have in their turn been made part of a mythology. What we and our cultures are engaged in when we endeavor to contextualize serial murderers within its broader mythology is an exercise designed to allow them to be habitually perceived in the same

unthreatening terms as is the case with domesticated mythic monsters like the werewolf or the vampire. (Grixti, 1995: 90)

Seeing the perilous elements of daily life as “other”s in representational world helps us to see them in a safer area. As Grixti asserts so, the most useful way to represent the frightening terms are shaping them as vampires and werewolves. Thinking they are only fictional makes us feel comfortable.

1.4.5. Serial Killers vs. Supernatural Monsters of Slasher Films

Facing with real monsters is unbearable. Vampires and werewolves, as unnatural and unbelievable creatures, are safer than real life serial killers. Brian Meehan describes this situation as:

The culture’s intension... is not to fictionalize the crime, but to lessen the threat such irrationality poses to a belief in an ordered world. In a universe of angels, devils, and human beings, all over –seen by an omnipotent god, vampires are far less disturbing than a real Ted Bundy. (Meehan, 1994: 4)

As long as these horror embodiments stay supernatural and unreal, they are safer. So the best way to create monsters of daily narratives, such as urban legends, is to form them as incredible in every way. The serial killer in fiction films are appropriate to this idea: they are inhumanly strong, clever as if they know what will happen in the next step so they can work their way out of it, and moreover, more bloodthirsty than any supernatural monster can be.

However, when it comes to the fiction narrative, with their supernatural qualities, the fictive monsters look dangerous and gross than fictive serial killer. Serial killers in fiction make the audience feel uncanny mentally, as the supernatural monsters visually. Clover describes slasher monsters as “superhuman: their virtual indestructibility.” (Clover, 1992: 30) She gives examples: “Just as Michael (in *Halloween*) repeatedly rises from blows that would stop a lesser man, so Jason (in the *Friday the Thirteenth* films) survives assault after assault to return in sequel after sequel.” (Clover, 1992: 30) This quality of slasher monsters differ them from serial killers. In addition they differ from Norman of the *Psycho* because of the same quality. Clover claims that, “Norman may have a normal half, these killer have none.” (Clover, 1992: 30) Norman looks human and acts like a human as the serial killers. So Norman and serial killers may look less dangerous in contrast with these monsters that do not die easily and bleed their victims to death. However, we know that they are not real and only fictional monsters. So, Norman and the serial killers who give the same amount of damage without showing the signs of it before seem more threatening. Clover asserts that “In films of the *Psycho* type (*Dressed to Kill*, *Eyes of Laura Mars*), the monster is an insider, a man who functions normally in the action, at the end, his other self is revealed.” (Clover, 1992: 30) Just like *Eyes of Laura Mars*, my films with female protagonists dealing with male serial killers are *Psycho* type. Slasher films stay “At the bottom of horror heap...” (Clover, 1992: 21) because of their monsters’ violence is screened as bloody as they can be. In “Psycho-type” films, the monsters’ monstrosity is mirrored in such way that the visual representation does not show much, but suggests more. That is why the serial killer films that I plan to analyze are mainstream movies with slasher properties.

1. 5. Are Serial Killer Films with Female Heroes A Movies with Slasher Qualities?

It seems like serial killer films with female heroes have slasher qualities, but stay as A class movies. Following, I would like to examine *In the Cut*, *Taking Lives* and *Mary Reilly*, finding their qualities which make them both slasher and *Psycho* type, which lets them be A class movies. They have common qualities but they are also very different in their properties. They each feed from different genres without losing their common qualities of slasher. *In the Cut* reminds us of a fairy tale by having a happy ending. *Taking Lives* uses the strong and beautiful FBI agent theme. And *Mary Reilly* constructs its structure with Gothic elements. They all represent different subgenre; however they serve “the serial killer with female protagonist who has a sexual relation with the serial killer and overcome the killer at the end” theme which feeds from slashers’ basic structure appropriately.

Clover tries to define slasher by categorizing the subgenre’s essential elements. She proposes “To apprehend in specific terms the nature of that mutation, let us, with *Psycho* as the benchmark, survey the genre by component category: killer, locale, weapons, victims, and shock effects.” (Clover, 1992: 26) In her book, she continues describing each category one by one and gives examples. I would like to follow the same structure to show that these serial killer films have the same basic elements of slasher films, especially; they are even more compatible to *Psycho* with their use of narration and target audience.

2. From Clover's Slashers to Serial Killer Films with Female Victim-Heroes

2.1. Clover's Killer to Serial Killers

Clover starts with defining the killer of slasher films. She suggests that the killers in these films are driven by psychosexual fury. They either have gender issues or childhood problems or are sexually disturbed. She states that the serial killer films support “The notion of a killer propelled by psychosexual fury, more particularly a male in gender distress...” (Clover, 1992: 27) They have problems with their mothers which lead them to an identity crisis in their adulthood. They never can balance their inner desires and conscious roles in the society. Their unconscious sides start taking control of their world. Trying to repair what is hidden and broken inside; they reflect the inner confusions outside by slashing their victims. Even though, slasher films find their roots in rape and revenge movies according to Clover, the killers of slasher do not rape their victims. Clover assumes that “Actual rape is practically nonexistent in the slasher film...” (Clover, 1992: 29) The victims never get raped but they are killed in such a way that the killer gets sexual pleasure out of it. The killer kills because his sexual repressions return. And what Robin Wood suggests about *Texas Chainsaw Massacre I*: “Sally [the victim] is the overtly sexual threat; she is to be tormented, killed, dismembered, and eaten, but not raped.” (Wood, 1978: 31) They are not criminals of sex but criminals of gender and identity. They try to build a new identity for themselves to wear, each time they kill a victim. And these tie up with their issues about their mothers. They cannot part from their mother and commit to the society, so they continue carrying their mothers in their unconscious. Keeping the mother inside, leads them to live a life under the control of their

maternal superego. Slavoj Žižek has theorized the idea of the Maternal Super-Ego when he was analyzing Hitchcock films. He stated that the situation where

the father is absent, the paternal function (the function of pacifying law, the Name-of-the-Father) is suspended and that vacuum is filled by the 'irrational' maternal superego, arbitrary, wicked, blocking 'normal' sexual relationship (only possible under the sign of paternal metaphor)." (Žižek, 1997)

Maternal Super-Ego forbids and tries to destroy everything that the subject gets pleasure from. On the other hand, Paternal Super-Ego forbids the pleasure that is not shaped by the society's rules. It gives permission to have pleasure if it happens according to the norms of the social construction. Norman Bates in *Psycho* is under the influence of his maternal superego. Clover states that he "has introjected his mother" who is "in life a clinging, demanding woman..." (Clover, 1992: 26) She draws attention to Norman wearing his mother's clothes when he kills. Clover suggests that "...she [Norman's mother] constituted his other, controlling self." (Clover, 1992: 27) He has two sides where the conscious one is Norman and the unconscious is his mother. But his unconscious side takes control of him in his mother's form. She finds *The Silence of the Lambs'* Buffalo Bill similar to Norman Bates because he, wants to have a sex-change operation. But he is rejected for the operation so he tries to sew a dress from his female victims' skin which he is planning to wear to become a woman. He is also "a mother-fixated" man. (Clover, 1992: 28) These men feel like a woman inside, especially their mother rules their inside world, so they want to have the same appearance of their inner selves when they commit acts with their mother sides. As a result, the real killers responsible for the murders are their mother sides. Clover states that "Not Norman but "the mother half of his mind" killed Marion- had to kill Marion – when he (the Norman half)

found himself aroused of her.” (Clover, 1992: 27) The mother side forbids them to have a sexual relation with other people. They shift between the need of sharing sexual intimacy and keeping the mother inside because of their gender issues. Due to the fact that these killers cannot find a balance with their unconscious desires and social life, they break the rules. All these men’s minds remain “frozen in infantile fury.” (Clover, 1992: 28) They cannot accept that they have to grow up, become adults, depart from their mothers and become mortal. They try to stay alive by becoming their mothers; however, they give birth to their own disasters because they cannot be reborn as mature adults.

Taking Lives’ Asher/Costa suits the male killer profile because he gets sexual satisfaction when he kills. The female protagonist Illeana mentions about it, she says that “there is a sexual element to all this” as she investigates the murder scene. In addition, we understand that the first victim arouses him sexually by the eye contact and smile between them. He kills his victims with a psychosexual fury and gets pleasure out of it. He does not rape them, but kill them instead.

Asher/Costa’s psychosexual fury finds its roots in his relation with his mother and his twin brother. He has childhood issues, especially with his mother and this shapes his adulthood where he tries to stay alive by killing other people and wearing their identities. He takes on his mother’s role and tries to give birth to himself. He does not give himself birth literally, however every time he creates his new identity; he is reborn again into the society. At the beginning of the film, we see somebody destroying his identifying elements. A man scratches his finger points with pumice so that he will not have an identifying fingerprint. Wearing contact lenses, he hides his real eye color. He changes his hair color and length so that he will suit to the profile of his victim.

He had a twin brother who her mother favored more. According to her mother, his brother was the wonderful child and he was the dangerous and troubled. When Illeana visits the mother's house, she sees that his photos were behind the frames of his brother's photos. He was always left in the second place in his mother's eyes, moreover aside, because his photos do not only stand behind his brother's but positioned in a way that they would not be seen. Asher/Costa's mother appears as a woman with bloody red nail polish on her sharpened nails. She is over her 60s but, still well-cared. She looks more than nice for her age that she seems very feminine but in a dangerously threatening and dominant way. Asher/Costa's mother is like Norman's mother but alive and kicking. Instead of a knife in her hand she has her own blood-colored nails. She is not dead like Norman's mother but so alive that she makes Asher/Costa feel dead all the time. Whereas, Norman's mother lives in Norman's unconscious, Asher/Costa is trapped in his unconscious because of his mother. In psychoanalytical terms, he is dead, living in his unconscious, trying to be reborn so that he will be able to live in the conscious world. Asher/Costa is reborn again and again but he cannot satisfy his needs that he wants his mother to fulfill. No matter how he tries to be his own mother, he can never be. Therefore his need for changing his identity never ends. When he has to confront his mother again, he kills her but this does not help to end Asher/Costa's story. He falls into the same storyline again, learning Illeana is pregnant. She is the new mother. His issues with his mother never end and he tries to be reborn repeatedly until he dies.

Asher/Costa takes his victims' places in the society. Correspondingly, he has to destroy his victims' faces so that they cannot be identified. He burns them or slashes them into pieces, in order to tear down their identity and take them to the unconscious's side. Then he wears slashed identity parts as a mask to cover his unconscious. He wears a murder-made conscious

mask over his unconscious. He transfers his sexual fury into a social fury, killing people and living in the society without a real identity.

In *Mary Reilly*, Dr. Jekyll/Mr. Hyde kills his victims penetrating them in different ways. He kills when he is sexually aroused. One of the victims is a prostitute and she is killed in the bed. Dr. Jekyll/Mr. Hyde also kills Mrs. Faraday who is the head of the prostitute house. His victims show that he has a psychosexual fury as his weapons represent that he has put sexuality into killing. He penetrates his victims with sharp objects from close-distance.

Dr. Jekyll, also, like Asher/Costa, tries to be his own mother, moreover literally. He suffers from an incurable illness that he will die from. Therefore, he works on a project to find a cure and isolates himself from his previous studies and friends. He thinks that he has to be reborn to treat his illness. That is why Mr. Hyde is born from him. And when he becomes Dr. Jekyll again, he has to be born from Mr. Hyde. In *Psycho* we first see the mother in the shower scene where Marion was stabbed. In the same way, when we see Dr. Jekyll becoming his own mother, it is the first crucial scene where we see a human tearing apart. Mr. Hyde's body open apart from his chest and slowly a baby is born. The scene passes showing each step Mr. Hyde turning into Dr. Jekyll. In one shot, the body appears as having two heads. In the end, when the body is only Dr. Jekyll, his suffering from the transformation is seen. He looks like a woman who has just given birth, breathing hard, tired and all sweaty.

In addition to these, Dr. Jekyll breaks all his connections with the social system to find a cure for his illness. His illness comes from his inside and the cure appears as Mr. Hyde. Mr. Hyde is a mother metaphor in this case. Dr. Jekyll is a doctor and has to serve his society saving people, but, Mr. Hyde who literally comes from Dr. Jekyll's inside (from his unconscious)

“cuts” all his connection with his conscious side. Mr. Hyde regards medicine as butchery. He tells Mary when they go to the meat market. He attacks his own social values when he is under control of his unconscious. As a result, Mr. Hyde slashes Dr. Jekyll’s connections to society one by one, killing each victim.

In the Cut narrates that the “psychosexual fury” appeared because of “gender distress” (Clover, 1992: 27) by reflecting it onto the problems of the killer’s relation with institutions of the society. The main serial killer of the film has significant issues with another female in his life, not his mother but his wife. She represents his effort to be a part of the society, having an intimate relation other than his mother but failing to do so. Therefore, he has problems with the institute of marriage. He commits his murders over the thought of engagement. He is a policeman whose gun was taken away from him because he has attacked his wife with it. He has committed to society, being a policeman and a husband. Clover’s comment on *The Eyes of Laura Mars*’ killer “put[ting] his boyish anger to good use in police work” (Clover, 1992: 28), is exactly the same in this case. Like the killer in *Eyes of Laura Mars*, *In the Cut*’s killer has found a place in society by sacrificing his unconscious. He has put his anger to good use by being a police and a husband, until his marriage is cracked by his behaviors. *In the Cut*’s killer is a part of the police forces; committed to the society by his act for saving the society from dangers. He attacks his wife, who is his ties to the social system. Consequently he is a threat himself. Therefore, he “cuts” his relations with the society one by one because all the institutions he has committed affect each other. First he cheats on his wife. Secondly, he attacks his wife because she finds out the cheating. He loses his status in the system because he breaks his commitment to his marriage. Like Norman Bates, he loses his conscious sides, which are his policeman and husband roles, and his control is taken by his unconscious side when he commits crimes. He kills women cutting them into pieces and putting an engagement

ring on their finger as a sign. He feels shattered into pieces from inside when he has to obey the rules of the society. Marriage symbolizes slashing for him. That is why he slashes his victims. He mirrors his inner world onto his victims. Like Clover and Wood agree on the theme of rape and slasher movies, *In the Cut's* serial killer never rapes his victims but cuts their bodies, separates their heads from their bodies. This can also be a link; thinking that he separates the conscious which is generally thought being in the mind existing in the head and the unconscious desires which covers sexual desires expressed by the body. He detaches the head and the body, driven by his unconscious desires which want to be separated from his conscious self.

In addition to these, *In the Cut's* killer kills women when he is aroused by them like Clover stated about Norman. The first victim is killed after she performs oral sex on him. At the end, he dances with Frannie, putting an engagement ring on her finger. Dancing, especially like in a ritual of a wedding dance reminds us of making love on feet. He finds himself aroused first, and then he puts it into an institutional form. This form, which has slashed him into pieces, gives him permission to slash his victims.

In the Cut does not only have a storyline consisting of only one murderer. There are other murderers, even serial killers in the film's narrative. One of Frannie's students works on a paper about a serial killer. When Frannie teaches at her class, one of her students tells that a murder would not be interesting if there were not at least three murders happened in series. From Frannie's dreams we meet her father who appear to be first serial killer, metaphorically, of the film. From the conversations between Frannie and her half-blood sister Pauline⁴, we understand that Frannie's mother is not the one and only "victim" of her father. He has

⁴ The name "Pauline" reminds of *Perils of Pauline* that was made by Eclectic Film Company in 1914. Clover discusses about her in her book. (Clover, 1992: 42). In addition, she is the child of a slashed relationship.

married many times and left women, breaking their hearts, killing their inner sides. Moreover, Pauline, Frannie's half-blood sister, stalks a doctor and his wife because she desires this doctor, who is married to someone else, sexually. Even another institution finds a part in the fabula of the film: the law court. A lawsuit is opened to hold her away from the doctor and his family. With these other potential serial murderers, the film narrates a story of a serial murderer society.

As a result, serial killers in these films have common qualities with Clover's killers. In addition, they have changed a little bit. First, they do not have any supernatural power; secondly, they are more terrifying because they are more "real." They do not show up as a monster in filmic world but remind us of the real serial killers that can be wondering around in our neighborhood.

2.2. Clover's Terrible Places to Wicked Cities

Clover describes the "Terrible Place" as "most often a house or tunnel, in which victims sooner or later find themselves is a venerable element of horror." (Clover, 1992: 30) Houses are mostly old, big and alone in a land where nobody can reach. They seem to carry a long history of families with buried secrets. Clover states that "What makes these houses terrible is not just their Victorian decrepitude, but the terrible families- murderous, incestuous, cannibalistic- that occupy them." (Clover, 1992: 30)

However, in contemporary serial killer films, the effect of the Victorian house starts with the city. I would like to remind that John W. Frick has linked the gothic narratives and contemporary films which pass in metropolis to each other. After he theorizes the "wicked

city motif” he continues stating that “the city mysteries narrative successfully negotiated the unstable border between the public and private spheres to examine the depravity and danger of modern metropolis.”(Frick, 2004) In addition, a study guide on *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* illustrates the Victorian Era when the story passes as:

Queen Victoria’s reign was a period of intense change in many arenas. Railroads and postal system expanded to link almost every corner of the nation, making transportation and communication much faster. Medical and sanity advances led to improvements in health... Industry grew rapidly, while agriculture became less important to the economy. Cities like London, Manchester, and Glasgow became densely populated as masses of people flocked to them in search of work (The Glencoe Literature Library)

This atmosphere of the city shows the narrative’s psyche. The streets of 19th century London was dangerous because of the industrial movement and colonization. It was a time London was a center of drug use, especially opium which is brought from the east. The prostitute houses have increased. Also, there were different nations living together in London because of the people coming from east and joining the London community. So it was a time of doubles like agriculture/industry, nature/science, west/east, and upper class/lower class.

Returning to Clover’s statement about the slasher houses, they look abandoned but at the same time haunted. They are houses that are neatly planned, showing that there was once life in it. But now, the only thing left is like the skeleton of the building containing all the memories but in an uncanny way. The houses seem to be the unconscious places, first, because they are homes, giving a nice feeling of familiarity, like in Freud’s theory of

uncanny. Then, they turn into dangerous places as the victim runs inside more and find out about the unfamiliar parts, by getting trapped in the killer's unconscious which is abandoned but at the same time haunted like the houses. As a result, starting from the atmosphere of the city, we watch a journey going into the unconscious of the killer.

The transition places like tunnels, long corridors and stairs takes us to the inner rooms of the unconscious as we enter each room in the films. The tunnels are like the houses makes people feel uncanny, similarly big, endless, and dark. The skeleton of the tunnels are as simple as the houses which are like big, dark cavities. Clover describes these tunnels as "dark, exitless, slick with blood, and laced with heating ducts and plumbing pipes." (Clover, 1992: 30) They are endless and even just to travel through it brings out the fear. However, the emptiness and simpleness do not give comfort but makes people feel uncanny. Nobody can guess where they will end up at the end of these dark, moisty rooms or tunnels. These remind us of the travel everybody takes to be born. The journey to life is as scary as it can be because nobody can guess what is waiting for them out there. But what is more important in slasher films is that "The house or tunnel may at first seem a safe haven, but the same walls that promise, to keep the killer out quickly become, once the killer penetrates them, the walls that hold the victim in" (Clover, 1992: 31) The victims' run away bring them back to the starting point, moreover to a point where they are in more danger than at the beginning of their journey.

The staircases are important elements of the "Terrible Places." When the victim runs up a stair, we know that it is a hard journey. She can be trapped or fall down. When you are going up the stairs, there is only one end, and that end leads you to the house's top where you cannot run away any more. As Clover suggests, the house starts trapping the victim. Also, "going up"

means “going inside” more. You do not go outside by going up the stairs. You go in more and more.

Kiss the Girls shows the journey, passing from dangerous tunnels very well. The girls (victims) are kept in a house situated in the mountain by the serial killer. It is not exactly a house but more a cave with rooms like prison cells. The female protagonist escapes and she finds herself trapped in a labyrinth-like tunnel. When she reaches the end, it is not the end of the labyrinth because the woods outside the cave construct a new labyrinth formed by trees. She runs as trees’ branches scratches and slashes her. Even one of her eyes gets injured and covered with blood. She loses her sight because she is slashed. In addition to these, the “eye” and “I” sounds similar. Her ego (I) is also slashed in this sense.

In *Mary Reilly*, everything passes in the big mansion of Dr. Jekyll and foggy London city. In general the city is composed of foggy labyrinth-like streets and passages. What Clover defines as “Victorian decrepitude” (Clover, 1992: 30) suits both to the mansion’s and the London city’s description in *Mary Reilly*. The city is composed of streets where the “eye” cannot see anything clearly. These properties of the atmosphere connect the film to gothic genre, but also the gothic genre meets with slasher films because of the same elements. *Mary Reilly* both brings out the gothic atmosphere by showing the first serial killer, Jack the Ripper’s foggy London town and creates a slasher tunnel-like passages and labyrinth-like streets.

The mansion in *Mary Reilly*, which is divided by a courtyard, has two sides. One side is the house where all the servants work and Dr. Jekyll lives and it is open to all the guests. The other side is the laboratory, where only Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde can go in, and Mary sneaks in after her intercourse with both men. The house is divided into rooms by areas of social

gathering and personal, inner world. The mansion represents everything the social system constructs. It is the house of a doctor. Let us remember that a doctor is a person who serves to his society. He is part of an institutional structure. The servants represent the lower class of that society which serves the upper class. The kitchen where the servants spend their time, the bedroom of the servants, the dining room where Dr. Jekyll eats his meals and interacts with his servants and the courtyard are the social places. All the ritualistic and social scenes take place in the house, especially in the dining room. Dr. Jekyll's bedroom, study room and the laboratory are Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde's personal rooms where they only interact with Mary Reilly. They are the little valves leaking, as the unconscious appearing in conscious times. Dr. Jekyll's bedroom is like a little outer cover of his unconscious. We see him in bed every morning after his transformations. He appears tired, exhausted. Also this waking up gives signs that everything happening can be a dream, which turns into a nightmare. In *syhuzet*, we do not see Dr. Jekyll turning into Mr. Hyde. Instead we watch Mary's dreams at the occurrence of the transformation. Mary sees her dreams of uncomfortable views in her bed. Her bed appears as one of the unconscious places. In addition, the camera move links Mary's bed, her unconscious, to the city, the collective unconscious by moving towards the window from Mary's bed.

Likewise, the study room where we see Mr. Hyde often is also a significant place. It is Dr. Jekyll's study room where he keeps his books. All his commitment to the society as a doctor is symbolized here. But when Mr. Hyde appears inside, he destroys all Dr. Jekyll's attachments to society. Mr. Hyde creates his own world in the world of symbolic system. He scratches penises on books, changing anatomy drawings, making jokes of the system with sexual content. He represents the sexual desires of the unconscious fighting with the social structure Dr. Jekyll comply.

Mary Reilly uses stairs like the levels of conscious and unconscious. The stairs appear as a transition place between the conscious and the unconscious, like the tunnels and the courtyard. Mr. Hyde attacks Mary on the stairs, grabs her with sexual desires and takes her to the bedroom of Dr. Jekyll. After this, there is another scene at the stairs where Mary and Dr. Jekyll talk and the camera angle brings out more meanings to it. He tells Mary about his situation, that Mr. Hyde came out of him when he tried to find a cure for himself. In this scene, the camera is placed at the top of the stairs showing the stairs like an endless spiral, and proposes us as if the stairs are a passageway between the conscious and unconscious. Mary and Dr. Jekyll are situated at the bottom of the stairs but we see them from up, far away. Keeping in mind that it is the scene that Dr. Jekyll explains his unconscious to Mary, the shot makes us to think that we are seeing Dr. Jekyll's unconscious from a far.

However, there is a more visible division of the conscious and unconscious by the appearance of the mansion. The real unconscious place in *Mary Reilly* is the Laboratory. Laboratory is the unconscious of Dr. Jekyll and is a suitable example for a slasher movie. Moreover, it becomes a collective unconscious place when Mary, Mr. Hyde and Mrs. Farraday, the prostitute, enter the laboratory. It is separated by the house, where the social system continues, by a courtyard, which works as a passageway. It is composed of three parts. The first room which opens to the courtyard has an altar. It was used as a teaching amphitheatre when Dr. Jekyll was connected to the world he lives in. After his inner researches have started, he quitted giving lessons. This room functions as the outer protection layer of the unconscious. One has to pass this room to reach into the depths of Dr. Jekyll's mind. The next room is a laboratory literally with a lot of breakable and sharp pointed objects like glasses, experiment tubes, and injection syringes. I will relate these kinds of objects to slasher weapons in the next section, but,

moreover the laboratory's structure looks like a labyrinth with needles and sharp objects pointed out from everywhere. The third room is more interesting that it contains a cable suspension bridge which leads to an exit to the streets. It is a strange room, with no proper use but consist metallic sounds from the cables of the bridge reminding the chainsaws of slasher films. At the same time, the bridge lets Mr. Hyde to the streets of London, the collective unconscious of the era. He commits all his murders passing from that backdoor. The leak valve of the unconscious comes to visualization as the backdoor of the laboratory.

In the Cut uses the same atmosphere, using the city as a bigger plane covering the collective unconscious, like *Mary Reilly's* London, although it is not a gothic related film. The streets of New York in contemporary times do not seem to have much difference from 19th century London streets, especially at night. Frannie is attacked on street once. We never learn who the attacker is exactly. It can be related to the serial murders or can only be a thievery. What comes out from that scene is that the city covers her with danger as in *Mary Reilly*, London covers Mary with danger.

In addition to these, Frannie wonders around on the streets of New York. She watches the world only collecting images. She sees people from different nations, different sexes, and different classes. These are the elements of identity which are used to define a person's place in the society. Sometimes her gatherings have mixed signs, like the gay male transvestite African American pimp who sits at the entrance of her sister Pauline's apartment building. She goes underground to take the metro. She collects slang words written on the side walls of the stairs which go down underground. She takes a journey underground which is, psychoanalytically, the collective unconscious. On the metro, she takes notes of poetry written on sides of the tram. She calls these little particles of poetry and slang "Passion". She likes

little details which gains a meaning differently by every single person according to their unconscious. These slang words, phrases and poems are like dreams. They are productions appear in the symbolic system but they are closer to the imaginary system, like film. Poems make us fill in the gaps like we do constructing the fabula of the film. As a result, although the contours of the structure are given, everybody shapes and fills it the way they like. In psychoanalytical sense, “the way they like” is the unconscious. So, her journey to her unconscious starts when she gets underground. Her inner world is represented on the walls of the metro as poems and slang words.

In the Cut has the same use of the bed as *Mary Reilly*. Frannie has a small house where all the elements of her vital needs are stocked together. The house, mostly, represents her unconscious, but especially her bed. She does not let everybody in the house. Her collection of poems and phrases hangs around on the walls. The city appears in Frannie’s room by her collections of slang and poetry. She designs a microcosmic city by her own selection in her house. In her bed she shares her body, her intimacy with Malloy. Moreover she dreams there. Her dreams, also, cover her past like Mary.

On her journey from the city to her house (unconscious) she passes from tunnels and stairs, like in the other movies. There is a scene in *In the Cut*, exactly like *Mary Reilly*’s stairs. Her student, who writes a paper on a famous serial killer, grabs her foot on the stairs to her apartment and catches her to kiss. He desires a sexual relation with her teacher strongly. As a result his sexual desire creates a violent scene which looks like a man grabs a woman on the stairs and makes her fall down. After that, he corners her in her little apartment.

There are some significant scenes passing in a laundry and in a bathroom. Washing represents getting stripped from social roles. *In the Cut*'s killer's second victim is found in a washing machine in a laundry. It is a very graphic scene that the some shots were taken in black and white. The blood pours out of the washing machine. Similarly, Frannie finds her sister's head in a nylon bag in the sink of Pauline's bathroom. The killing has happened in a place, in a bathroom, where everybody is naked, being what they are. The bathroom covered with blood reminds us the room in the prostitute house in *Mary Reilly*. Furthermore, they are the exactly the "Terrible Places", Clover suggests. Bathroom, mostly contain the toilets inside in apartment building. Toilets are used for taking our inside out. Correspondingly, Pauline's inside, blood, was all over the bathroom. Her head was left in the sink where people use to wash their hands. A lavatory is used for washing hands after using toilet. After her inside was put out, her head was left to be washed from everything.

Taking Lives passes in Montreal, Canada, at the present day. The city is not much different from contemporary New York. It, also, represents mixture of different identities. Asher/Costa's mother, seeing her son, rushes to the police to tell about it. She speaks in English as the police officer answers in French. Canada is a country where people from different nations live together. There are various languages spoken, officially. Canadian society is composed of many different identity elements. It seems like anybody can survive with various combination of these identity elements. In addition, it is hard to identify somebody who does not have any identity or shifts between these elements of identity.

Asher/Costa's mother's house is exactly like the slasher houses, being like "Victorian decrepitude" (Clover, 1992: 30) It is situated in the woods, away from other locations of settlement. The mother seems to live there alone. It holds old furniture and items which evoke

the thought that the house “enfolds the history of a mother and son locked in a sick attachment...” (Clover, 1992: 30) like the Bates mansion Clover mentions about. Illeana senses airflow and finds out that there is a door behind a bookcase leading to a secret room. She gets in the house secretly and goes downstairs to the room behind the bookcase. A bookcase being in front of the hidden room should not be a coincidence. Books, created by using language are indicators of the symbolic system. In addition, when it covers an entrance of a hidden room, it becomes more meaningful. The room, especially situated at the end of a staircase which goes down, reminds us Hades, the kingdom of death. The room represents the unconscious of the serial killer as the stairs the passageway to it. Asher/Costa is a serial killer who is both a dead person himself and he brings out death killing others. So, it would not be much to call him and his place Hades. Illeana, passing to his room, tries to understand his unconscious to solve the crime also seems like secretly entering Hades.

Similarly, we meet with Illeana first, when she is lying down in a grave. It is the grave of one of the victims. Her efforts to understand the killer puts her in the situation of both the victim and the killer. She, also, lies down on the bed she finds in the hidden room, to see the world from the killer’s eyes, from his unconscious. Similarly, in her room at the hotel, she lies down on her bed and places the murder scene photos above her head. She goes to sleep watching them. She connects her unconscious with Asher/Costa’s, the killer’s. Grave hole, hospital corridors and hospital elevator appear as transition places, like stairs, in *Taking Lives*. They represent the passages to the unconscious. There is also a scene where Illeana runs down the stairs to reach the mother who goes down with the elevator. It just looks like the stairs scene in *Mary Reilly*, which shows the stairs like an endless spiral. Illeana dives into the unconscious of Asher/Costa as she runs down the stairs.

It seems like the terrible places Clover described has combined with modern city's urban legends and formed a wicked city. This city of danger finds its roots in both gothic narratives and slashers. The wicked city atmosphere takes the jungles of the pursuing scenes of slashers and creates a jungle formed of streets. In addition, it uses the ancestor of serial killer films, Jack the Ripper's foggy London atmosphere. The wicked city looks like a big labyrinth where you cannot decide where to go and guess what will come out at the next corner.

2.3. Clover's Weapons to Penetration and Decapitation Objects

Clover describes, in slasher, "The preferred weapons of the killer are knives, hammers, axes, ice picks, hypodermic needles, red hot poker, pitchforks, and the like" (Clover, 1992: 31) Anything pointy, that can pierce or cut the flesh works in slashers. It can get better if the slashing view is combined with a disturbing sound. Clover asserts that "the use of noisy chainsaws and power drills and the nonuse of such relatively silent means as bow and arrow, spear, catapult, and sword would seem to suggest that closeness and tactility are also at issue." (Clover, 1992: 32) Bow and arrow and other weapons are used from a far distance do not work because they do not show the strong feelings the killer has in the murder event. Clover, also, adds "Knives and needles, like teeth, beaks, fangs, and claws, are personal extensions of the body that bring attacker and attacked into primitive, animalistic embrace." (Clover, 1992: 32) The use of body parts, of animals or humans, make the scene look like violence of wild nature.

In *Mary Reilly*, Mr. Hyde hurts his first victim, a little girl, with his foot, stepping hard on her. He uses his foot to hurt somebody. He murders his second victim by the help of rats. We do not see the murder happening, but see what is left after it. The delicate bedcovers appear with

blood stains all over because of the rat's bitings. The actual murderer becomes the rat, in this case. It is not only an instrument but also a living thing which becomes the murderer. Mary also sees the rat, which reflects murderer, dead in the scene. This reminds Dr. Jekyll's trying to cure himself, destroying what makes him, breaking himself into bits to be born Mr. Hyde. His transformation between Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde leaves his handkerchiefs in blood, too. As he becomes the murderer, he also becomes the victim. Dr. Jekyll/Mr. Hyde decapitates his third victim. We do not see the scene where he cuts the head but the murder weapon should be something sharp to cut. And, Mr. Hyde kills the fourth victim with his baton, putting the pointy side of the handle of the baton into his cheek. As a part of the face, it seems like he attacks the identity, especially the identity of someone who has an important place in the social system. Similarly, Mr. Hyde attacks him on the face and head. As head is the holder of the mind, what holds a person from desires of the unconscious; it is the right part to be attacked by a murderer driven by his unconscious. The fifth victim is most significant one, being Dr. Jekyll himself. Mr. Hyde uses a hypodermic syringe to have himself turn into Dr. Jekyll again, but he mixes something in the medicine, so that they will both die. In order, Dr. Jekyll/Mr. Hyde uses his own body part, a rat, a knife (probably a medical one), a baton and a syringe. They are, like slasher weapons, used from close distance and have tactile intimacy to the victims' bodies.

In *In the Cut*, Frannie learns how the female victims are killed from Police Detective Malloy. He explains the process as "...her throat was cut. And then she was disarticulated..." To do such damage, the killer must have used a sharp weapon. In addition to these, he does not only kill his victims but continues slashing them. Frannie as a word collector notes down "disarticulated" on her notepad. Her taking note was shot with a close-up, which is also a disarticulated shot. Close-up brings objects in detail, where the viewer cannot identify what is

around it. It shows the object so close that nobody can define its borders. To understand something, we should be informed of what it is not, but close-up shows so much of something that you cannot identify it in its conditions. That is why the killer in *In the Cut* uses sharp objects as weapons to slash his victims so that they will not be identified in the social system. One of the victims body was found in bits and pieces in a washing machine in a laundry. The police had to collect the different body parts but could not identify who they belong to. The female victim's identity was first disarticulated and then washed away. Even the washing machine becomes a weapon in this sense, erasing the victim's identity elements. In one of the scenes, Malloy describes Frannie how the killer slowly works on cutting his victims to pieces. He uses his blades as a penetration tool.

In *Taking Lives*, the killer uses many objects to kill his victims. He uses cables to cut the throat or throws the victim in front of a speedy car. Illeana tells his co-workers that the weapon use "is tactile, it is immediate" when she analyzes the murder scene, explaining that the crime has a sexual element to it. Asher/Costa uses everything that will smash, destroy, and ruin the victims' bodies and faces, which are identities in the system. He does not stand back from bloody scenes. His only aim is to strip of the identity of the victim, leaving him identity-less and wearing the identity he skinned on himself. The killer, as if it is a sexual act, undresses his victims from their identities and penetrates them with his knives and cables. At the end, he attacks Illeana with a cable to cut her throat. Like the others, he wants to decapitate her. Illeana acts as if she is pregnant to his twin boys. She takes a scissor in her hands to attack him. The scissor with its two sides, like a double knife, is similar to the idea of twins. Asher/Costa who is a serial killer, who changes his identity all the time, became a killer because of losing his twin brother her mother favored more. As their family name "Asher" reminds us of "ashes to ashes, dust to dust" about body decomposing, dying and becoming a

part of the earth, his new name “Costa”, reminds us of the “coast” he has got out of the water leaving his twin brother die. He has left his brother to death in the water, which mostly in filmic world represents the mother. His twin side, his conscious, has died drowning in the mother. The unconscious side has lived through shifting between different people’s identities. And when Illena tricks him, making him think that she is pregnant, especially to twin brothers, he has to come and destroy the duality. As a result Illeana kills him with his own weapon, the duality. Scissor, with its two sides is the best weapon for killing Asher/Costa who has a split conscious. And, again, with its characteristics as a weapon, scissors suit the slasher genre.

In serial killer movies, the slasher weapons are used because of their close distance use. However, the main weapon, chainsaw, does not find a place in most of the serial killer films. Slasher is a show with lots of color and sound, as the serial killer movie horrifies with the thought of the things that can happen without showing them at time they occurred. Serial killer films prefer to show what is left over the scene. In this sense, the weapons close distance usage and sharpness is more important than how it sounds.

2.4. Clover’s Victims to Disarticulated Bodies

Clover bases her theory on the victims of the slasher film on *Psycho*. *Psycho*’s Marion was a beautiful young woman. According to Clover, in slasher films,

Where once the victim was an adult, now she is typically in her teens (hence the term “teenie-kill pic”). Where once she was female, now she is both girl and boy, though most often and most conspicuously girl. For all this, her essential quality remains the same. (Clover, 1992: 32-33)

She bases her theory of victims being, mostly, young beautiful women on Schoell's theory. Schoell states that "the only thing better than one beautiful woman being gruesomely murdered was a whole series of beautiful women being gruesomely murdered." (Schoell, 35) seeing something beautiful cut to pieces is a significant element in slashers.

In addition, according to Clover, slashers use a theme of sexual transgression. She gives *Psycho*'s Marion as the "first and foremost a sexual transgressor." (Clover, 1992: 33) Clover explains her theory as:

In the slasher film, sexual transgressors of both sexes are scheduled for early destruction. The genre is studded with couples trying to find a place beyond purview of parents and employers where they can have sex, and immediately afterward (or during the act) being killed. (Clover, 1992: 33)

In slasher, you are, probably, going to die if you have a sexual intercourse. Everybody, who reminds the killer of sexual desires, becomes a victim. Especially, the ones who break the rules, annoying the mother side of the killer. Clover states that:

Killing those who seek or engage in unauthorized sex amounts to a generic imperative of the slasher film. It is an imperative that crosses gender lines, affecting males as well as females. (Clover, 1992: 34)

However, I must underline that the "unauthorized sex" symbolizes the mother's prohibition to desires as I have mentioned when I defined Maternal Super-Ego; and it is not related to the social system's construction which represents the paternal Super-Ego. The mother, the

unconscious, forbids the killer to face with life. Having a sexual intercourse symbolizes life. But, if you live, having a sexual intercourse, you depart from the mother and she dies. For holding her in, the killer, kills the threats to her.

Clover adds to her victim's list, the "...men and boys who go after "wrong" sex" (Clover, 1992: 34). They "also die." (Clover, 1992: 34) Females are not the only victims; any side of the sexual intercourse can be a victim. As Clover suggests, "Boys die, in short, not because they are boys, but because they make mistakes." (Clover, 1992: 34) A man relating to a female in the unauthorized area can also deserve to die according to the killer; or any male who reminds him of his sexual identity crisis.

As I mentioned before *Mary Reilly* have four victims. The first one is a little girl running on the streets, at night. This little girl seems to resemble Mary's childhood that is narrated with the dream scenes. Mary had broken her father's cup and was punished for it. She was like a free-spirit who had been trapped under the authorization of her father. The little girl running at night on an empty street leads us to think what, on earth, a little girl is doing at time of the night on a street of London in 19th century. As a result, she is punished by Mr. Hyde's foot. He kicks her in the chest hard but does not kill her.

His second victim is a prostitute, who has raised his sexual desires. She is killed in the bawdy house. Mary sees the room where the murder has happened and the room is covered with blood all over, making red stains on the white sheets. Mr. Hyde, the unconscious side which acts like mother, has forbid the sexual relationship, so that the prostitute who serves any men sexually has to be killed in a bloody way. She was parted into pieces of flesh and blood that she will not be whole any more. She will not be a danger, being a sexually attractive object.

The third victim is Mrs. Farraday who runs the prostitute house. She symbolizes the place of sexuality in the social system. She is the institutionalized form of sexuality. She, also, should be destroyed according to Mr. Hyde. He cuts Mrs. Farraday's head, separating her head from her body. He separates the sexual desires from the head, making them stay with the body, not letting them cross the lines, and combine with the head. From another point of view, we can see Mrs. Farraday's head as a symbol of being "head" of the sexual desires that has been institutionalized. By cutting it, Mr. Hyde makes the institution "head"less and he obstructs the "head" from the nutrition of the body and organs that gives life. Finally, the last victim is Mr. Danvers, who is one of the important spokesmen on foreign affairs in the House of Commons. He is known visiting the bawdy house a lot, especially, interested in exotic tastes. His foreign affairs, as a job, continue in his sex affairs. He also crosses the borders shaped in Dr. Jekyll's head, so that he is attacked by Mr. Hyde on the face and head. His mentality is destroyed by Dr. Jekyll/Mr. Hyde duality.

In the Cut's first victim is a girl called Angela Sands, who has performed oral sex on the killer. She is also a prostitute, representing sexual desires, which are gathered in a social institution. She was found her head cut, her body parts detached from her body. The second victim appears as a med student, reminding us Dr. Jekyll. There is no detailed information on her that shows the killer is aroused by her sexually. But she is a young, med student who is part of an institution. She is found cut up, in a washing machine in a laundry. Malloy complains about not being able to finding her head. And the killer also had left an engagement ring on her finger which represents that he was annoyed when he interacted with her because of something related to marriage institution. The third victim is Pauline, Frannie's half-sister. She shares her father with Frannie, but their father has never married to her mother. Pauline

was born from “out of the wedlock”. She was not a child of an institution. Moreover, she wants to get married but is having an affair with a married man. She has all the problems that a person can have related to marriage. She is, also, found dead with an engagement ring on her finger. The killer chooses this beautiful young woman who can not balance her inner desires and life. She is, like the others, beautiful and young like Schoell has stated. Moreover, she has problems like the killer on the same planes. He slashes her with the things she always desired for but never had. Frannie finds her in the bathroom. Her head was separated from her body put into a nylon bag, in the sink. After her inside was put out, her head was left to be washed from everything. However, it was left in a nylon bag, which blocks the head to be washed. The killer separates the head from the body first, in need of splitting the unconscious desires and the conscious life. Then he takes what is inside of his victim out, as if it will help his inside to be shown. He wants his unconscious to surface, like the serial killer in *The Silence of the Lambs* or *Psycho*. He kills a woman who arouses his sexual desires and leaves a sign, the engagement ring, which points to his problem in life. Then he wants to wash away everything but shows that he cannot by putting his problem in a nylon bag which nothing can pass through, especially water. Malloy describes what the killer has done cutting Pauline’s head as “Cut through the windpipe, the jugular, the epiglottis, the hyoid, the tongue...” Pauline’s murder relates everything in the film. First of all, Malloy use of words is also like slang. Slang, being “language peculiar to a particular group or class” (Babylon English-English Dictionary) is suitable to describe the medical terms. In addition, she was cut through her neck until her tongue was slashed. The killer destroys anything related to “talking” which symbolizes language, and consequently the symbolic order.

In contrast with other films, Asher/Costa kills men. In other films, the male killers deal with their “psychosexual fury” caused by “gender distress” (Clover, 1992: 27) by killing women.

Here, Asher/Costa, every time, kills his victims to show that he is the victim. He kills himself and gives birth to himself again with every victim. He tries to build himself up again, losing what is exactly him. He tries to bury his self which is not accepted by his mother. He runs away from himself who is rejected by his mother's. He tries to be somebody else, anybody but not himself. He changes his hair color, hair length, eye color, signature and other elements of identity until he can be absolutely somebody else, other than himself. We cannot keep a track of his murder that he has done so many. The credits is composed of him killing males and changing identities. The credits part shows who had made the film. Different people appear in different duties one by one. What we see about Asher/Costa shows what combinations of people have made contemporary Asher/Costa.

In *Taking Lives*, the killer's first victim is a young boy his own age. He kills the victim to get his identity, but just before he decides to kill him, there is an important scene. The boy sings, playing his guitar and the killer looks at him with eyes full of desire. Singing a song is similar to reading a poem. I would like to suggest, in this film, this song represents what the poems and slang represent in *In the Cut*. There is not an explanation on it, but the killer seems to have problems with his gender role. He seems to be a repressed homosexual. He runs away from home, when his brother, who is favored by her mother more, dies. His brother had jumped into sea to save Asher/Costa, but he ended up dying. There is no such indication that Asher/Costa had killed him but this information leads us to the thought that one side of Asher/Costa has died with his brother, especially the side his mother loved and cared more. He wants to be his brother, and at the same time, wants to have him. He wants to be what his brother is from the inside to take the affection of their mother. Similarly, his brother is the brilliant child that rides horses, swims, who is charming and cheerful. Asher/Costa tries to

wear the identity of his brother as a suit which will adapt him to the social system. So, maybe we can state that the first victim is the brother, or can it be Asher/Costa, who dies with him?

The film starts with somebody finding the last victim, after the credits. He is found in soil, in a state of “dust to dust, ashes to ashes.” It was a grave, especially, digged for the victim according to the protagonist Illeana who is an FBI agent. She also states that the killer takes a sexual pleasure out of killing his victims. His faced was bashed that he cannot be identified. Asher/Costa’s second victim Illeana studies, also, is found faceless and cut. The victims seem to represent Asher/Costa’s brother who was beautiful, brilliant, sportive, charming and successful in his short life. So the victims became faceless by Asher/Costa’s attack. He wants to rip their faces that remind him his brother and end their life as soon as it can be as he did to his brother. As a result, when he rips their faces and identity elements, he is able to wear those identity elements like a dress, becoming his twin brother who is nice looking, charming and accepted.

In the same way, he tries to victimize males again in his last attempt. But, this time the victims are directly related to him. He tries to murder his twins which Illeana is pregnant to. She takes the part of his mother, who has turned her affection away from him to her sons. He wants to be a part of the family but Illeana refuses him calling the babies James Costa’s and telling him that she does not know who he is. Asher/Costa was again left without affection that he needs from the woman of his life. So he decides to destroy what is preventing it from him. He does not attack Illeana. He attacks the twin boys in her womb.

There is a small but important difference: in most of the slasher movies, we see the victims run, shout, cry as the slasher killer attacks them. In serial killer movies, we do not see the

victim run away from the serial killer. We follow the story of the female protagonist who investigates the murders, so we find clues with her and try to bring them to a conclusion. The terror comes from combining the details that will make us imagine what has happened and how it has happened to the victim.

2.5. Clover's Final Girl to Final Woman

Although all the victims are distressed, Clover describes the Final Girl as “The image of the distressed female most likely to linger in memory is the image of the one who did not die: the survivor, or Final Girl.” (Clover, 1992: 35) In slasher, or similar genres and subgenres, the Final Girl is the girl who survives until the end when all her friends or people in similar status are murdered one by one. Clover states that “She is the one who encounters the mutilated bodies of her friends and perceives the full extent of preceding horror and of her own peril...” (Clover, 1992: 35) to explain what she goes through. In general, horror and action movies make women suffer. They stay alive to be rescued by the great male hero. But, in slasher, the history changes. Clover suggests that “from 1974 on, the survivor figure has been female.” (Clover, 1992: 35) She survives with her own abilities. She runs away, fights back; moreover, she stays alive in any case, so that, she will overcome the killer with her own hands. Clover defines the relation between the Final Girl and the blood-thirsty killer by explaining how she stays alive. She states that “She [Final Girl] is the one [...] who is chased, cornered, wounded; whom we see scream, stagger, fall, rise and scream again.” (Clover, 1992: 35) Final Girl goes through hard time to stay alive. “..., but she alone also finds the strength either to stay with the killer long enough to be rescued (ending A) or to kill him herself (ending B).” (Clover, 1992: 35), asserts Clover. She goes through the pain of birth again until she is exactly reborn again. She finds her way through the blood covered tunnels until she reaches the end of it. She

finishes her story by killing the threat behind her, surviving with blood all over her. But what make them different from other female victims?

The Final Girls appear as strong, beautiful female characters. They do not seem to be sexually attractive as the other girls, but have meaningful faces. In Clover's words, "The Final Girl is boyish..." (Clover, 1992: 40) She is cleverer than others, has interest most of the girls do not care about. Clover describes "She [The Final Girl] is the Girl Scout, the bookworm, the mechanic." (Clover, 1992: 39) She understands mechanics and other detailed schemes. She loves books and spends her time with them, instead of enjoying sex with boys. As everybody around her dies, she walks her way through the danger. Clover claims that "If her friends knew they were about to die only seconds before the event, the Final Girl lives with the knowledge for long minutes or hours. She alone looks death in the face..." (Clover, 1992: 35) The Final Girl realizes what is coming and she fights back. She is terrified, runs away but, in any case, finds a way to overcome the killer. She challenges the killer. They are all stone faced, like a beautiful dead woman. They do not express their feelings well. All the Hitchcock women fit into this category. They look male in this sense but in a very feminine way. Clover describes this facial expression as, "Just as the killer is not fully masculine, she is not fully feminine – not in any case feminine in the ways of her friends." (Clover, 1992: 40) She attracts the killer but not because she is like other girls, sexually attractive. "Unlike her girlfriends (and Marion Crane) she is not sexually active." (Clover, 1992: 39) She can stay away from sex because she is a virgin or she does not want to have sex. "...she is not available..." (Clover, 1992: 39) She does not care about boys much. She is not easily interested in them. In many films she appears as the "newcomer in town, she is unattached and lonely but declines male attention." (Clover, 1992: 39) If she is not new in the town, then she refuses male attention in different ways. Clover suggests that "...early in the film she

pointedly turns down a date, and we are given to understand that she is, for the present, unattached and even lonely.” (Clover, 1992: 39) She wonders around in beauty but her body stays untouchable, not because she is not wanted, because she does not want to be touched. She does not only refuse men who want to have sexual intimacy with her, also she has problems in her relation with all men, in different areas, too. Clover states that “Her smartness, gravity, competence in mechanical and other practical matters, and sexual reluctance set her apart from the girls and ally her, ironically, with the very boys she fears or rejects, not to speak of the killer himself.” (Clover, 1992: 40) She is like a male character which is not male. This even reflects on their names. Final Girls, mostly have names like Stevie, Marti, and Terry. The names are boy’s names turned into girl names. The Final Girl is boyish with all her qualities, but never a boy. She stands in front of male power with a power equal to theirs but not male nor female only. She intimidates her co-workers and classmates, any men who are near to her without sexual intimacy. In *The Silence of the Lambs*, Clarice makes all her co-workers feel uncomfortable. She is not accepted in the group but they cannot leave her outside either. She is clever and strong enough to stay in between them. She is better than them, collecting evidence, solving crime. The other Final Girls, even the ones that do not have any relation to being a crime-solver, analyzes the world around her differing from the others; consequently, she understands how the killer thinks and finds out his next move before he commits it. Clover suggests that “The Final Girl is also watchful to the point of paranoia; small signs of danger that her friends ignore, she registers.” (Clover, 1992: 39) Her alertness to any kind of information leads her to paranoia, which comes out to be right way to look at things in her case. In addition, she is smart to use stuff around her in her benefit. Clover gives an example from *Halloween*, “...Laurie even at her most desperate, cornered in a closet, has the wit to grab a hanger from the rack and bend it into a weapon...” (Clover, 1992: 39) With all these excellent qualities, Final Girls are the heroines of the films. From the beginning, they

are introduced as the protagonists of the slasher films. It seems like Final Girls are identical with the female protagonists of the serial killer films I am examining according to their qualities.

Mary, in *Mary Reilly*, is the main protagonist of the film, as it can be understood from its title. Robert Louis Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll Mr. Hyde* is a story narrating male world. There is no female character in it. In addition the book is named after the male characters as *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll Mr. Hyde*. However, in *Mary Reilly*, the story is Mary's story. *Mary Reilly* takes its name from its female protagonist. Also, the film opens and ends with views of Mary. The narration starts with her and ends with her, not Dr. Jekyll or Mr. Hyde.

Mary is a maid at the house of Dr. Jekyll. However, she is different from the others in her class, like the other Final Girls. She does not get involved with anybody. She is sensitive but clever. She obeys the rules but finds little leaks that she can satisfy her needs. She cleans the house and does not relate to other maids and servants if she does not have to, but when she cleans Dr. Jekyll's study room, she secretly reads books. When she has to have distant relation with the master of the house, because she is only a maid, she shares kind of an intimate relation with him. She even gets the permission to have a garden of her own in the courtyard, although the head servant has contrary ideas. Dr. Jekyll trusts her more than he does the other servants, even in duties that should not be given to a woman in that era, like taking a letter to the prostitute house to hand Mrs. Farraday or going to the meat market with Mr. Hyde. She is not male but can handle male duties. She should not be reading books in her state, being a maid and a woman, but she continues doing it in her way. She does not look feminine like Mrs. Farraday and her girls. She does not wear make-up. She contrasts the

female victims who are sexually attractive and share sexuality. She is not similar to the girls in her class, too. She does not look girly. Julia Roberts has acted in films where she symbolizes the wonderful beautiful woman. This screen persona has started with *Pretty Woman* (Marshall, 1990), as it can be understood from the title of the film. However, in *Mary Reilly*, her screen persona crashes down. We never see her legs which is the most famous part of her body. It is always covered with long and large-cut skirts.

Mary does not get along with her co-workers very well. Especially, the head servant does not approve her relation with the master of the house. She does not talk with her female co-worker much either. She mostly lives in her own little world. In her past, she has suffered a lot from her father's tortures. She still carries the scars her father left on her, both psychologically and physically. She is a silent and introverted woman.

Mary does not have a sexual relationship with anybody; even she does not think about sex that she finds it unacceptable when she hears about Dr. Jekyll going to the prostitute house. She is neither feminine like the women in the prostitute house nor asexual like the ones at home. She is a little bit boyish but, still attractive to both, Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. They cannot help wanting to touch her. As she gets closer to Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde her sexual instincts start to surface in her dreams. As productions of her unconscious, her dreams show us that she has repressed her sexuality until then. She finds what Mr. Hyde does in every case inappropriate, but she is attracted to him a lot. However, she can only accept her attraction in her dreams. Mr. Hyde chases her, catches and corners her several times in the film. She, like Final Girls of slasher, screams when she is terrified in front of Mr. Hyde's acts. But, she is more similar to Hitchcock women who look directly in the eye with an expressionless face. She faces both Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde in the eye and she uses her affection as her weapon

against them. Her desire saves her. Mr. Hyde decides to kill both himself and Dr. Jekyll to save her. Mr. Hyde tells her that “I always knew you’d be the death of us.” Mary represents the mother Dr. Jekyll wants to be saved by. He tries to be his own mother being born Mr. Hyde, but both sides of him need a mother that will save them. Mary’s name reminds the holy mother in Christian mythology. She is the holy virgin who gives birth to Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. The male killer shifts between his two sides because of Mary, being born out of himself again and again. At the end, he injects himself with a different mixture than the other ones he took to become either Dr. Jekyll or Mr. Hyde; and he dies. Both Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde die for the survival of Mary. The film ends with her going out of the laboratory’s doors into a cloud of fog. She enters the fog as a big black object and then fades into it. She takes her dark sides from Dr. Jekyll/Mr. Hyde and accepts them to enter the new life she is getting into. The film finishes with her story.

In *In the Cut*, Frannie is a school teacher in her thirties. She studies language, especially, slang and poetry. As I have mentioned before, they symbolize her unconscious world in the symbolic order. She breaks the rules of the symbolic order, starting with its own contents. She uses language and words but transforms them into imaginary elements. As a teacher who is dealing with language, there is no need to tell she is a bookworm like the other Final Girls. She does not only relate to books, moreover, she reads everything she sees, writes down everything she hears. She collects everything literal.

Frannie, also, lives in her own little world like Mary of *Mary Reilly*. She does not establish relationship with many people. She does not like people passing her borderlines. She has her half-sister very close to her. Pauline is her only family. She prefers to live in her dreams and imagination. We see her dreams and hallucinations several times through the film. In addition,

when she is in the outer world, she holds onto her imaginary world by relating with the poems and slang of the outer world. If she does not do both, she watches. She does not talk much, but watches. She, also, collects visions. In the underground, she sees little scenes with people related to her unconscious. She collects the images, poems and slang words but do not share it with other people. She chooses to be lonely.

She is not only lonely socially; she chooses to be lonely in her sexual life, too. She has slept with a doctor but does not want to have a relationship with him anymore. He still chases her but she refuses him. She does not want to have sex and turns down her student's interest, too. She does not look feminine like other women. Next to her sister, she is even boyish. She does not have hair-cut fashionable. Her body is not with round contours but she is feminine in her own way. In most of films she has played, Meg Ryan is known as the sweet funny girl who gets herself into trouble. Still, with her movements, she is kind of boyish in films like *French Kiss* (Kasdan, 1995), *You've Got Mail* (Ephron, 1998). In addition, there are two films where she looks masculine. In *Addicted to Love* (Dunne, 1997), she first shows up on a bicycle with a helmet, where we cannot decide whether she is a man or a woman. In *Proof of Life* (Hackford, 2000), she also has masculine qualities, acting a soldier. In *In the Cut*, there is a clear distance between her and the other girls who are victimized. The other girls are sexually attractive and share sexual intercourse with men. They are extremely feminine; as a result the killer is sexually aroused by them. Frannie is not feminine in the way the other victims are.

Frannie is not sexually attractive to the killer but his police partner who is the lover. When Frannie meets with Malloy, she desires him. She shows her feminine side to him. Still, she stays back from Malloy for some time. She prefers thinking and dreaming about sex, than having it. She continues to live her desires in her unconscious. In one scene, she, even,

mentions about this to her sister, saying that she thinks about sex. That is why she resists calling Malloy.

Her relation with Malloy leads to her a triangle which is composed of her lover, the killer and herself. Malloy, who she doubts to be the killer, is not the murderer but his twin-like, police officer partner is the real killer. Their relation all together has a significant tension. In the car scene, where they take Frannie to her sister's apartment, asking her questions and the scene at the police office shows the tension of their triangle relationship. Men are intimidated by Frannie, either decide to love her or kill her. The relation combines sexuality and violence, like Mary's relation to both Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.

Like other Final Girls, she hears about women being murdered, sees their photos. Frannie even experiences her sister's death like the other Final Girls see the death of their friends one by one. She is also chased and cornered by the killer. She is even cornered, grabbed and wounded by a thief during the film, besides from the killer's attacks. At the end, the killer traps her in the light house where she cannot escape any where. As she understands that Malloy's partner is the killer, she takes her Hitchcock woman face and deals with it. She evaluate her options like Clover states about Laurie of the *Halloween*, "Above all she is intelligent and resourceful in a pinch" (Clover, 1992: 39) and remembers the gun in the pocket of Malloy's jacket which she wears. So she also "at her most desperate, cornered" (Clover, 1992: 39) state overcomes the killer. Her paranoia about Malloy helps her to survive. She looks in the eyes of the killer and acts as if she is obeying his rules. This reminds what Clover says about "look[ing] death in the face..." (Clover, 1992: 35) as a result, she overcomes the killer, just like the other Final Girls.

In addition to these, Frannie's name reminds boy names like Stevie, Marti or Terry. It does not have feminine resemblances. It is a name derived from Fran which is male first name. And Frannie's sister's name, Pauline, has a direct connection with slashers, as I mentioned previously.

Ileana, like Mary and Frannie, is in her late twenties or early thirties. She is an American FBI agent who comes to Canada to solve a serial murder case. She is literally what Clover calls the "newcomer in town, she is unattached and lonely but declines male attention." (Clover, 1992: 39) She reminds of *Silence of the Lambs*' Clarice with her smartness and aim to work. She is, also, a strong woman who does not relate to others much. She works hard that her life seems to be composed of her work. She does not. She does not have a boyfriend. Moreover, she intimidates men around her like the other Final Girls. Even, her co-workers in Canada feel disturbed by her interference with the case. The Canadian police she works with are two men who remind us of the police partners in *In the Cut*. They are like two teen-age boys, making dirty jokes, trying to put Ileana out of their conversation by talking in French. One of them is crueler than the other. And the nicer one seems more sentimental. The cruel one seems to represent the killer police and the nice one the lover police of *In the Cut*. Still, they are not important characters. They are there to show how Ileana is better than men at men's work.

Ileana is a brilliant FBI agent, waking up with her work and going to bed with her work. We first meet her lying in a grave, where one of the victims' bodies was found. She, to understand how the unconscious of the killer works, follows a path to become both the victim and the killer. She lies in her bed at the hotel and puts the photos of the case in her view. She goes to sleep with them and wakes up with them. She even visits her own unconscious with the effects of the murderer's unconscious. She eats her meals going through the files. Her

incorporation of the food is accompanied by the murder case and the victim's photos. "She alone looks death in the face..." (Clover, 1992: 35) In taking Lives, Illeana literally looks death in the face, examining photos of dead people. It is her job to look death in the face. She investigates death. She lives with the case. Moreover, we can say that she is alive because she has the case. She chooses to be in the social system, trying to put her unconscious sides into good use.

Illeana is boyish in a way but she is the most feminine character according to the other films. Angelina Jolie, who "In the "100 Most Beautiful" issue of People Magazine, [she] was referred to as the world's most beautiful woman" (Wikipedia), plays Illeana character. She is known to play the beautiful and athletic play-station game character Lara Craft in *Lara Craft: Tomb Raider* (West, 2001). Illeana does not wear skirts or feminine clothes, but she is feminine. At the same time she carries male properties like fighting, investigating crime. We do not see her with her female friends. Furthermore, she is the only female character in the film, other than the mother of Asher/Costa.

Illeana's paranoid side comes out related to her job. She thinks that there is more to the house of the mother. She goes back there to find out. She feels airflow and decides to go after it. This reminds us what Clover suggests about Final Girls being "watchful to the point of paranoia; small signs of danger that her friends ignore, she registers." (Clover, 1992: 39)

Illeana does not have any sexual intimacy until the case is solved according to her. She is attracted by Costa but she holds herself from being with him. When the case is closed, she gets involved with him. But her paranoia does not save her. She never suspects that Costa can be the real killer. At the end, she tricks Asher/Costa by looking like she is pregnant. She

knows that Asher/Costa will follow her, come to her. She is different than other victims by gender but there is something more significant to her being a female. She represents “the mother” who is the source of all the murders. When Asher/Costa comes at the end of the film, the scene evolves into a real slasher film. Illeana, as the Final Girl, “is chased, cornered, wounded [by Costa]; whom we see scream, stagger, fall, rise and scream again.” (Clover, 1992: 35) However with her cleverness and mechanical tactic she traps Asher/Costa in his own game. She kills him with his weapon. He tries to kill the twins by putting a scissor into her womb, but her womb was fake, so that she does not get injured. Then, she takes the scissor out and kills him by stabbing his heart.

The serial killer female heroes generally do not differ from Final Girls, but they have some significant transformed qualities. They are females, not teenage girls, but older women. They work and earn their money in life. In addition, they differ from Final Girls as they start sharing an intimate relation with the killer. At the beginning, they act like the Final Girls and stay away from sex, but as the narrative develops, they start sharing intimacy. First of all, it is meaningful that, that they have sexual relation. And, secondly, it is extremely important that they share it with the killer of the story. I would like to work on this difference in the following chapter.

2.6. Clover’s Shock to Imaginative Terror

Clover describes the shock effect of the slasher films by their gross, bloody scenes. She states that “Audience express uproarious disgust (“Gross!”) as often as they express fear...” (Clover, 1992: 41) by these scenes. Clover gives Psycho’s shower scene as an example, because of its “rapid-fire sequence of shots of the knife, of the shower, of Marion’s face, arm,

and feet.” (Clover, 1992: 41) She describes Hitchcock narration as “oblique rendition of physical violence” and comments on slasher as being “more complicated.” (Clover, 1992: 41) The psycho killer runs after his victims and slashes them into pieces and blood covers everywhere. She suggests that the “shock” in slasher comes from the sight of the slashing scenes. She asserts that: “Spectators tend to be silent during the stalking scene (...), scream out at the first slash, and make loud noises of revulsion at sight of the bloody stump.” (Clover, 1992: 41) According to Clover, slasher shows “heads squashed and eyes popped out, faces flayed, limbs dismembered, eyes penetrated by needles in close-up” (Clover, 1992: 41) to create the shock effect. These scenes make the audience react to its abject quality. As I have mentioned above, in Kristeva’s theory, abject is reaction to a “meaning caused by the loss of the distinction between subject and object or between self and other.” (Felluga, 2006) As the protagonists try to create their identity by putting what is them in and what is not them out, staying in between the boundaries of subject and object, but being none of them, brings the abject reaction. As the spectators watch “the act of selfing (identitying)” that “is never-ending” (Wikipedia) they feel “shock” by the “abject” scene.

Contemporary serial killer films with female protagonist have several shock scenes but they do not equally show the same amount of blood. They shift between the films like *Psycho* and Clover’s slasher building up scenes of shock. They show so little but give effect of it. At the same time, most of the serial killer films have at least one bloody shocking scene to satisfy their audience. The audience wants to see such scenes because they represent the leaks in the system. They relax by expressing their fears and disgust in safe areas, just by watching a film. The unconscious and its effects surface without changing the whole structure. In addition, they are effective as slasher giving clues of more shocking and disgusting scenes that will be

created in the mind. As a result, these films do not show shock much but remind it. They have scenes with abject quality like the slasher films but not as many as slashers have.

In *Mary Reilly*, there are not many scenes that will shock the audience. Moreover, most of the murder scenes are narrated after the incident. All the murder of the victims, except Mrs. Farraday, is narrated by somebody in the film after the real murders' time. We watch what has happened with their narration, as flashback. We see visuals of the murder scene but it is narrated by some characters who do not have any intimate relation with the killer or the victim. As a result, they narrate the event by their point of view which shows their reaction to the event. They talk with eyes-opened, whisper in a thrilling way to produce fear, like telling an urban legend and the narration of the flashbacks are mostly composed of rapid, short, unclear shots. In addition, there is a scene where Mary Reilly goes to the bawdy house and sees the room covered with blood. The murder is not seen; she does not see the killer or the victim. But she sees what is left over from the victim: her blood. Seeing somebody's blood cover everywhere and not seeing the person is abject because "of [its] loss of distinction between subject and object." (Felluga, 2006) Still, it is not powerful as a slasher scene where it is shown how all that blood come out a person's body. However, there is one scene that has abject quality similar to slasher films. In the end, we watch Mr. Hyde turning into Dr. Jekyll. Mr. Hyde's chest opens apart as another head grows out of it. The view is totally abject.

In the Cut, contains two scenes of shock created by views of abject. One of them is the laundry scene, where the part of the victim's body is collected by the police officers. They take the parts out of a washing machine. Again, "the loss of distinction between subject and object" (Felluga, 2006) brings out the abject reaction. The body reminds us of a living person as we only see its parts mixed together. The body has lost its form of human shape and the

inside has come outside. The scene is shot in black and white to reduce the shock effect by not showing the real blood color. A visualization of red colored blooded body parts coming out of a washing machine would have made it unbearable to watch. As the police officer opens the door of the machine, some fluid mixed with blood comes out. The director prefers to show what happens, but from a filtered view. With narrative motivation, these shots were taken in black and white as if they are the point of view of the police camera. The abject view is shown, but with reduction so the audience would not scream out loud as the slasher audience, but have the abject reaction within their imagination. The second scene is where Frannie enters Pauline's apartment. At first, she does not understand anything but she spots a part of Pauline's hair on flesh left on her bed. She slowly realizes that her sister has been murdered. The music coming from the night club downstairs fades out as she slowly paces to the bathroom. And, the sound of water coming from the shower is foregrounded. A handycam follow her slow steps viewing her face but her face stays in the dark until she reaches the bathroom door. Her walk to the bathroom was shot in a way as if to express her need to see what has happened and her denial to see it. She resists the thought but cannot stay away from it. The corridor, she paces slowly in, to reach to the bathroom door is like a passageway of "Terrible Places" Clover mentions about slasher films but more similar to *Psycho* by its narration. It is not a corridor full of blood but it thrills the audience, by the thought of what Frannie will find out at the end of it. When she enters the bathroom, the audience, also is shocked by what s/he sees. Blood dripping down the bathroom walls makes us say "gross" out loud.

Taking Lives starts with a shock scene. Asher/Costa kills a boy by pushing him in front of a speedy car. By the impact of the car, we see the cars window crash in close-up, as both the boy and the car fly in opposite directions. The bodies covered with blood, fallen into pieces

do not die but continue moving. Their animateness in such conditions looks very abject because they are objects but are animated like a subject, thus creating a “loss of distinction between subject and object. (Felluga, 2006) It brings out the words “ew, gross.” The victim found in Canada, also, looks disgusting because the man is found half-decomposed in the soil. A close-up on his over waist shows that his face had been smashed and he is identity-less.

Serial killer films shows “shock” scenes, that include “heads squashed and eyes popped out, faces flayed, limbs dismembered, eyes penetrated by needles in close-up” (Clover, 1992: 41) but it reduces the number of this kind of scenes. We do not see the gross visual as they are created by the killer who is chasing the victim. We see what has happened to the victim after the murder incident. The scene where we see what is left from the victim is constituted, mostly, from short and quick shots. The quality does not change but the temporal quantity is reduced. In addition, the narration of such scenes reminds us the movements that have occurred when the killer murders his victim. The camera has oblique angles, the vision is flu, close-up shots are so close that it is hard to define the thing seen. As a result, like in *Psycho*, without seeing the real stabbing of the knife, we create a vision of terror in our minds by the narration.

2.7. What is Different?

I tried to provide evidence that films such as, *In the Cut* (Campion, 2003), *Taking Lives* (Caruso, 2004), *Mary Reilly* (Frears, 1996), *Copycat* (Amiel, 1999), *The Silence Of The Lambs* (Demme, 1991), *Kiss the Girls* (Fleder, 1997) and *Twisted* (Kaufman, 2004) which have a female protagonist, who shares an intimate relationship with the killer and at the end overcomes the killer, are slasher films, basing my theory on Clover’s statements. And I

analyzed the three films, *In the Cut*, *Taking Lives*, and *Mary Reilly* in terms of characteristics as the essentials of a slasher film. Initially, I indicated the elements that are identical. Then, I examined the basic features that has transformed into something else but kept the same effect on the audience.

As a result, I figured out the basic transformed features. First, the female protagonists in these chosen films carry the properties Final Girls but they differ from them being older by age. In addition, they differ from Final Girls by sharing sexuality. They evolve into Final Women.

Second, the narrations of violence scenes in these serial killer films change and, thus differ from slashers. The violence scenes in slashers are defined as graphic violence where the audience sees lots of slashing and blood. In serial killer movies, the graphic violence is shown so short that it leaves a mark on the mind but the audience just cannot see enough of what has happened. Also, most of the time, the graphic violence is not shown but implied. So, the contemporary serial killers approach to *Psycho*, which Clover defined as the first film that has slasher qualities, by their narration. They do not show what is happening clearly by changing the quality and quantity of temporal and spatial elements, but they give the sense of how it is done. The narrations of these films themselves transform into slashing literally, like the *Psycho*'s shower scene, composed of short rapid-edited shots.

Third, in slasher films, the "Final Girl" does not share sexual intercourse; however, the "Final Women" in serial killer films do share. In slashers, there is a sexual element to the murder scenes but they are not rape scenes. The murder takes the place of sexuality. In contemporary serial killers films, the killer gets a sexual joy out of killing his victims like the slasher killers, so there is not much difference to the serial killer character. Nevertheless, the adult female

protagonist starts her story like the Final Girl of slashers but changes. They either prefer not to have sex or share sexual intimacy without an attachment to their partner. At the beginning, they are similar to Final Girls. Then, they meet the male character, who the audience and the female protagonists suspect that he is the killer; and they prefer to share their repressed sexuality with these men. In *In the Cut*, Frannie evolves into an older version of Final Girl as she shares intimacy with Malloy. They make love through the film. In *Taking Lives*, the sexual scene comes as the climax point of the film. Illeana and Costa/Asher make love and Costa/Asher bleeds this time instead of his victims. After this scene, at the hospital, Illeana discovers that Costa/Asher is the killer. In *Mary Reilly*, Mary and Dr. Jekyll/Mr. Hyde have a sexual tension through the film but they never share sexual intimacy. Their repression does not end so *Mary Reilly* differs from the other two films I have examined. *Mary Reilly* indicates the same theory by reversing the narrative and the narration. Although they follow different patterns, they all end up with the same conclusive idea.

Therefore, I would like to carry on analyzing the female protagonists in serial killer films and try to find the answers to questions such as: Who is the female protagonist? What do they represent?

3. Lover vs. Killer as Opposites Become Identical

Clover has worked on the identification process in slasher films and she examines the relation between gender and identification of the audience basing her theory on slasher film's qualities. I would like to carry on my theory building it parallel to Clover's structure. However, I will move from identification to identity.

3.1. Identification

Clover starts with describing the general audience of slasher by stating "the majority audience, perhaps even more than the audience for horror in general, was largely young and largely male." (Clover, 1992: 23) In the serial killers with female protagonists, starting with *The Silence of the Lambs*, the quality of the audience has changed from "largely young and largely male" (Clover, 1992: 23) to general audience that is composed of both males and females from various ages. Clover describes that, in slasher, the audience is "largely young and largely male" (Clover, 1992: 23) because the audience's general propensity is to identify with male characters who are mostly the heroes of the film. E. Ann Kaplan explains this suggesting that "within the film text itself, men gaze at women, who become objects of the gaze; the spectator, in turn, is made to identify with the male gaze, and to objectify the woman on screen..." (Kaplan, 1983: 15) As a result, the audience identifies with the male character most of the time. Slasher's audience, being largely male, easily identify with the male character. The construction of the films helps audiences' identification process, making the male character the hero from the beginning, showing him as the protagonist of the film. We usually watch a man turn into a hero through the film and his journey is the story. If they do not appear as protagonists, still, most of the time a male hero comes and rescues the female

protagonist. But Clover argues that, in slasher films, “conspicuously groups of boys who cheer the killer on as he assaults his victims, then reverse their sympathies to cheer the survivor on as she assaults the killer.” (Clover, 1992: 23) The gender roles in filmic world shift, when it comes to slasher films. So do the audiences’ identification shifts in between. Clover comments on cinema, stating that it generally genderize by appearances. She assumes that “screen males represent the Male and screen females the Female; that this identification along gender lines authorizes impulses toward violence in males and encourages impulses toward victimization in females.” (Clover, 1992: 43)

In slasher, the “killer is with few exceptions recognizably human and distinctively male; his fury is unmistakably sexual in both roots and expression; his victims are mostly women, often sexually free and always young and beautiful” (Clover, 1992: 42) Male killer, as I tried to analyze in the previous chapter following Clover’s theory, has problems with his sexual life and shows it by killing people, not raping them. But the killing scenes have sexual properties. Secondly, he has problems with his mother from childhood, which is the root of all his problems. And, thirdly his psychosexual fury changes into a social fury. He denies anything that will satisfy his sexual needs because of his mother side. So he ends up trying to get sexual pleasure by killing people. Slasher’s male killer does not seem like a male hero who the audience would like to identify with from the beginning. And, if the male audience decides to identify with him by discharging their sexual fury in a safer area, watching a film and cheering the killer, the film does not continue as it has started and leads them to somewhere else. The victimization of young beautiful woman gives them satisfaction because she is controlled by the killer, in everyway. Her life is in the killer’s hands. And she is not only a woman, but a beautiful and young one who is sexually attractive. She is victimized because she arouses the killer sexually. Clover asserts the female viewers’ identification happens the

same way the male viewers do. (Clover, 1992: 43) So the male viewers' and female viewers' identification at the beginning of the film is constructed according to the satisfaction of the male killer's power over a woman sexually and vitally.

3.2. Identifying with the Final Girl

However, slasher deconstructs the general structure making a girl, who is not like the other victims but still being a girl, the heroine of the story. Clover describes her as "The one character of stature who does live to tell the tale" and she calls her "the Final Girl." (Clover, 1992: 44-45) Final Girl comes and destroys the male hero's world by taking his qualities.

In every word, the female protagonist becomes the Final Girl following the hero's path. As the film moves towards the end, the Final Girl stops running away and traps the killer. She overcomes him. As she becomes the Final Girl, audience starts cheering her. But Clover asks "how are we [all the male and female audience who identify with the male gaze] then to explain the appeal to a largely male audience of a film genre that features a female victim-hero?" (Clover, 1992: 43) Audience starts their own journey being at the side of the male killer and ending at the side of the female victim-hero. Clover adds "She is what the killer once was, he is what she could become should she fail in her battle for sexual selfhood" (Clover, 1992: 50) to show the psychosexual development of the final girl who represents the adolescent male audience. She enters her adulthood choosing a different path from the killer as she "stands at last in the light of the day with the knife in her hand..." (Clover, 1992: 49) The new day is a new beginning for her, representing her adulthood life which she has gone through painful struggles to see the sunrise. At this stage, the audience identifies with the Final Girl, to feel like the hero of the story who reaches the end successfully.

Clover tries to explain audience's shift of identification between the male and female characters of the film by analyzing the male killer's and female victim-hero's roles in the film. She suggests that the slasher film's male killer have feminine qualities. She states that:

In this respect, slasher killers have much in common with the monsters of classic horror- monsters who, in Linda Williams's formulation, represent not just "an eruption of the normally repressed animal sexual energy of the civilized male" but also "power and potency of a non-phallic sexuality." To the extent that the monster is constructed as feminine, the horror film thus expresses female desire only to show how monstrous it is. (Clover, 1992: 47)

The killer represents a monstrosity which finds its roots in femininity. In his daily life he is an ordinary man, but when he kills he is a man with female properties. He represses his sexual desires and his repressions forms into a female. In *Psycho*, his killer side is the mother side which represents the maternal super-ego. In *Taking Lives* the maternal super-ego of Asher/Costa urges him to kill. The monstrous side is female as the male side is an ordinary human.

Splitting the killer into to two sides, where one is a monster shaped as female and the other is a human being shaped as male, reminds the theory of Jung on Anima and Animus. Anima and Animus are suitable archetypes based on binary oppositions to define this situation according to gender. But, we can analyze the killer's situation by other dualities, too. As, I have mentioned before they all are parallel to each other. Each double has the same relation with each other like the other doubles. Conscious, heimlich, self, ego, and one face of the

ying/yang are on one side as unconscious, unheimlich, other, shadow and the other part of the yin/yang is on the other. So when, the killer represses his anima side in his unconscious, it means that his unconscious is composed of his “other” and “shadow” sides. He is the killer, when his anima side surfaces because his shadow sides, his “other” side surface. This is why Norman Bates wears his mother’s clothes when he commits murder.

3.3. The Double

When I try to analyze from this context, I find it similar with Otto Rank’s “The Double” theory. The repression of the one side does not destroy the unneeded half but makes the unity split into two. The two sides start to live independently but, of course, they both affect each other because they cannot separate bodily, literally.

The Double is a theory which psychoanalyst Otto Rank has stated. He explains how he theorized the “Double” in his book *Beyond Psychology* (1958). One day he watches a film called *The Student of Prague* (Wegener, 1913), and starts working on this theory. The narratives which include the Double theme tell the stories of heroes who suffer the tortures of his own self. Different stories tell the same theme in various ways, but, mostly the protagonist fights with some other person who is in flesh, however identical in every way to the hero. Otto Rank studied Robert Louis Stevenson’s *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll Mr. Hyde*; Dostoyevsky’s early story *The Double* (Dostoyevsky, 1972), *The Possessed* (Dostoyevsky, 1989) what Rank calls “his most fascinating study” and *The Brothers Karamazov* (Dostoyevsky, 2003); Edgar Allen Poe’s *William Williamson* (Poe, 1850), Guy de Maupassant *The Horla* (de Maupassant, 1971), Mark Twain’s *The Prince and the Pauper* (Twain, 1983) and many fiction narratives contain the double design. Starting with these

narratives, he examined the doubles in fiction world- like shadows, portraits, reflections, psychic projections, literal doubles. Even the relationship between fathers and sons, or two brothers have the same theme, especially the relation between twins. These remind us the shadow which Jung has studied as an archetype. The shadow as our instincts is the dark side of the ego which we try to repress in our unconscious because our shadow side contains properties which cannot suit in the norms of society. Otto Rank's double also is born out of the shadow side. Otto Rank claims that the design of "man's encounter with his double" (Rank, 1958: 67) has been narrated throughout history. He gives "...the subject of antagonism between brothers... [in literature] at the end of eighteenth century..." (Rank, 1958: 65) as an example. Michael Foucault, similarly, assumes that:

... the Other that is not only a brother but a twin, born, not of man, but beside him and at the same time, in an identical newness, in an unavoidable duality... it is both exterior to him and indispensable to him... (Foucault, 1973: 326-27)

Rank suggests that the male character being double into two, appear as a brother in some cases. Especially, in filmic narratives we see the double as different people, with different bodies, literally. Foucault describes the inner process. He does not mention about the situation literally, but asserts that we carry our "other" sides inside and outside. His description finds a literal meaning in narratives, especially in films.

Otto Rank continues asserting that "modern man, who, having created civilization and with it an over-civilized ego, disintegrates by splitting up the latter into two opposing selves." (Rank, 1958: 65) This is exactly what Clover argues about the killer's splitting. He is a male character holding a female inside, which wants to come out because it is repressed. As Rank

states, “Those two aspects of the self which modern man are opposing and fighting each other provide, to be sure, the original raw material for his personality make-up.” (Rank, 1958: 65) the killer’s confusion comes from him splitting himself into two. He lives two lives which cannot be separated from each other. He kills because his mother side wants him to do so. His mother side wants him to kill because he is aroused sexually by the victims. Otto Rank explains this situation, “Yet it makes all the difference whether they are united in the expression of a total personality or driven by conflicting strivings between the two selves...” (Rank, 1958: 65) The conflict of the killer turns into a vicious circle because he cannot unite the two sides of himself.

If we look at the films, *In the Cut*, *Mary Reilly* and *Taking Lives*, from this point of view, the killers appear as doubles. As I suggested previously, in “Clover’s Killer to Serial Killers” section, serial killers have parallel qualities with the slasher killers. They are identical with slasher killers because they have sexual fury which leads them to kill female victims. They do not rape but kill, having sexual pleasure out of it. Their sexual fury comes from their repressed desires which form their maternal super-ego. Consequently, their sexual fury changes into a fury in social life. Their conflict between maternal super-ego and paternal super-ego urges them to kill. As Otto Rank’s definition, they are split into two, the mother and the self, cannot become whole.

In *Mary Reilly*, it is not hard to state that Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde are each others’ double, as Rank has already studied them as a case. The two men do not appear as different bodies but they appear in different times, with different bodily qualities. When Dr. Jekyll is alive, Mr. Hyde is dead. And when Mr. Hyde is alive, Dr. Jekyll is dead. It is not exactly a literal dying, but a symbolic one. They do not live, walk and talk when the other one takes control of the

body, like Foucault claims. The one hidden inside sees and hears everything but cannot control anything. Norman becoming his mother is no different than Dr. Jekyll becoming Mr. Hyde. So Dr. Jekyll carries his brother, his twin, his identical self in him. He represses the Mr. Hyde in him. And as Wood claimed before, Mr. Hyde is the “true subject of the horror genre” (Wood, 1986: 75) He is what Dr. Jekyll has repressed, coming back to haunt him.

In *Taking Lives*, there is literally a case of twins. The good one has died, and the bad one has survived. The bad one had fallen into the sea and the good one had jumped in to save him. Remembering the collective unconscious theory of Jung and its relation to mythology, the sea represents the mother in most of the narratives. So, the struggle between the mother and Asher has been interrupted by the twin brother. Asher had tried not to drown in his mother, as his favored brother tried to help him. But, Asher stays alive as the brother dies. The brother is left to the mother, as Asher runs away from the mother. In addition, Asher could have killed his brother to be his mother’s favorite child. But, as he loses his other self, he fills the emptiness with his mother. The mother becomes both the cause of the problem and conclusion of it. Asher tries to be a man who is accepted by the society like his brother and runs away from his own identity. He runs away from his mother but carries her inside. He becomes double in his self as his literal double dies.

In *In the Cut*, there is not a twin case like in *Taking Lives* or the one like in *Mary Reilly*. There are two men who work as partners at police office, carrying identical tattoos on their wrists. They are like brothers, being at the same age and working for the same aims. Their behaviors together seem like teenagers. They make sexual jokes and brag about themselves when they are together. Also, the tattoo, carried by only two of them is a sign showing how identical they are. And this sign is a body sign. It is not something they were born with but something

they preferred to have. They choose to have it together. This is more like a blood-brother situation. In addition, it is an element of identity in the society. Frannie sees the killer at the beginning of the film, but cannot see who he is because of the shadow falling on his face. The face loses its identifying quality because of the shadow falling on it. The other comes out and falls on him as a shadow, taking him away from his social identity. However, he is not exactly cut away from his identity. His tattoo is seen. This shows that he is connected to society with the tattoo, which he shares with his partner. Therefore, his connection to society comes from his partnership. In addition, the two men seem to symbolize the psychosexual fury in two ways. Malloy symbolizes the “lover”, who has put his sexual energy into his emotional life. He shares a sexual relation with Frannie, which discharge his sexual desires. The killer, however, cannot discharge them and becomes the “killer”. Because he cannot be the lover, he is the killer.

3.4. Who is Whose Double?

Returning to Clover’s theory, the problematic does not finish here. Clover analyzes the role of the Final Girl and her effect on the audience. The identification shifts as the male killer loses his protagonist properties and the female victim-hero becomes the real protagonist of the film. “She is by any measures the slasher film’s hero” (Clover, 1992: 45) But, she is a different type of hero. She is a female hero; she is a female with male qualities and, at the same time, boyish in a feminine way. Clover claims that:

The gender of Final Girl is likewise compromised from the outset by her masculine interests, her inevitable sexual reluctance, her apartness from other girls, sometimes her name. At the level of the cinematic apparatus,

her unfemininity is signaled clearly by her exercise of the “active investigating gaze” normally reserved for males... (Clover, 1992: 48)

When I studied *In the Cut's*, *Mary Reilly's* and *Taking Lives'* female protagonists, in many ways they have suited the profile of the Final Girl. To summarize our findings, they all had masculine sides, being apart from other female victims or other women in the filmic world. Moreover, before relating to the serial killers or the doubles of the serial killers, they are reluctant about sexual intimacy. Clover quotes from director John Carpenter who combines the two characters of his film, the killer and the Final Girl, in *Halloween* by stating that: “She and the killer have a certain link: sexual repression” (Clover, 1992: 49) Clover claims that there is more to it. According to her, the Final Girl and the killer share both masculinity and femininity. Starting with Final Girl being boyish and the killer feminine, all the characters in the film symbolize a gender in another. Final Girl is a masculine female as the killer is a feminine male. The Final Girl represents the “congenial double for the adolescent male” (Clover, 1992: 51) in the audience. If the Final Girls are doubles of the male adolescent viewers of slasher films, then who do the female protagonists of serial killer films mirror? Do they mirror the serial killer or the spectator?

According to Clover, the audience's identification shift between the characters by their gender stress. She states that the slashers are constructed over a “gender-identity game.” In the films I have chosen, this happens in a different way. The Final Girl and the killer reflecting each other are not only a process of identification. Moreover, they are each other's doubles. They are divided sides of one unity.

In *Mary Reilly*, there are many scenes that Mary fills one half of the screen, as Dr. Jekyll or Mr. Hyde does the other half. They, every time, wear contrast colored clothes. If Mary wears

a black dress and white apron, Dr. Jekyll/Mr. Hyde appears with a white suit carrying some black part on it. There are several scenes that Mary and Dr. Jekyll/Mr. Hyde reflect on the same mirror. In one of them Dr. Jekyll turns to see himself in the mirror, but the mirror's image consist of both Dr. Jekyll and Mary. The scenes where it is clear that they are doubles of each other are where Dr. Jekyll leaves the mansion to go in to his laboratory passing the courtyard and Mary watching him move from one of the mansion's windows. The frame appears as Mary's back in the front of the screen. On the next level there is the window showing the courtyard. Mary's reflection falls on the window as Dr. Jekyll enter the frame of the window, but we only see him from his back; we cannot see his face. He goes closer to the laboratory as his shadow falls on the door. There are four vertical levels: Mary, her reflection, Dr. Jekyll, his shadow. They all combine in one frame, narrating that they are the same and parts of one unity.

In *In the Cut*, Frannie is like the killer by disarticulating word and phrases. Her passion for poetry and her work on slang is like the killers unconscious desire to murder women. They both disarticulate. However this similarity is metaphorical. There is a more literal example: Frannie and Malloy create a Yin/Yang dichotomy by making love. Malloy is not the real killer, but Frannie and we, the audience, suspect him to be the real killer throughout the film. The truth that he is not the murderer becomes perceptible at the end of the film. So, when Frannie and Malloy share sexual intimacy, they are like doubles uniting. They are female and male uniting into one, not only as two people becoming one, also each ones' split sides become whole again. They first, unite their inner selves, the shadow and the self; and become an individual. Then, they create a wholeness formed out of two individuals. As a result, the sexual intimacy frees their repressions and rescues them from their splitness.

In *Taking Lives*, Costa and Illeana meet first in the questioning room. They sit at a table, one at each side. They both have white shirts on them. Looking at each other they seem to look into the mirror. Illeana represents the questioning side as Costa is the answering. Illeana is the detective as Costa is the criminal. They form a Ying/Yang dichotomy, too.

There is a scene at the gallery where Costa, wearing a dark suit, comes closer to Illeana who is wearing a white shirt. When she turns her head the other way, we see her back while Costa faces us. The frame is composed of Costa on the left side of the frame, wearing black, facing us and Illeana on the right side of the frame, wearing white, her back turned to us. After they share sexual intercourse, there is a scene where they wake up. They lie in bed positioned the same way they did at the gallery. There is only one difference: Costa's back is turned to us while Illeana faces us. Illeana finds blood on her face when she goes to the bathroom and rushes back to see what happened to Costa. Costa lies down on his face, and there is blood under him on the sheets. He looks as if he was murdered. Illeana finds out that Costa is not dead but his arm is bleeding. This scene seems to represent that Costa cannot unite with Illeana. He bleeds if he tries to. He gets on the role of the victims he has killed. Sharing intimacy makes him bleed. He cannot unite with Illeana, so he never will be the lover, but stay as the killer.

The case of the female protagonist and the serial killer, being doubles of each other, do not come out of the pursuing scenes but scenes of sexual attraction. Making love is equally important to killing. The Final Girls in the films I have chosen evolve into Final Women as they share sexual intimacy. Moreover, their change especially comes out of the sexual intimacy shared with the killer. In slasher, the killer discharges his sexual desires by killing. On the contrary, in these films, just the opposite happens. The Final Women discharge their

violent desires by sharing sexuality. But there is a critical point: the partner they choose to have sex with is the killer. Their inner world reflects on their sexual partner. As a result, their struggle does not end by sharing sexuality but deepens into the unconscious.

4. Conclusion

In *Slashers*, the Final Girl represents the male adolescent viewer that goes through the painful process to become an adult by killing the slasher killer. In contemporary serial killer films, the Final Girls transform into older women and they represent the female audience who takes the journey to the adulthood. She does not repress her sexuality, moreover shares it with the most terrifying character of the film, the serial killer. Her journey passes through the darkest alleys of the mind.

4.1 The Final Girl's Journey into Adulthood

Contemporary serial killer films narrate the story of the Final Girl, like slashers but with different properties. If the serial killer in these films appear as the Final Girl's "Double", then the filmic world does not represent the serial killer's world but shows the depths of the Final Girl's mind. It seems like it is the story of a female protagonist who has repressed her sexual desires. Her repressed desires find a bodily form in the serial killers. So the Final Girl goes through a journey to overcome her psychosexual fury to reach adulthood. She kills the killer or leads the killer to kill himself. Clover asserts that "with her, we become if not the killer of the killer then the agent of his expulsion from the narrative vision." (Clover, 1992: 45) She, either way, overcomes her repressed substances with the death of the killer. She unites herself into one, choosing to share sexual intimacy as the social construction approves.

Mary Reilly starts with a view of Mary cleaning Dr. Jekyll's mansion. Reminding us of the ying/yang dichotomy, she looks like a white spot in darkness. As the camera moves towards her, she and the atmosphere around her diffuses into a gray tone. It is her story where she is

only a little white spot in that dark world. As the camera approaches to her, she is lost in the general view. Her color changes and adapts to the environment. However, because of the scenes where the camera leaves Mary dreaming in bed to frame London city from the window, I would like to suggest that London city represents Mary's unconscious. Therefore, the first scene shows that Mary is lost in her unconscious. She cannot accept her double sides, so she becomes indistinct in the unconscious. The film narrates the story of her facing her two sides. However, she does not share sexual intimacy which will release her repressions. As a result Mary Reilly's ending differs in meaning from the other two films.

In the Cut starts with a view of Frannie dreaming. She is already in her unconscious when the film starts. We see the surroundings of her apartment in parallel editing. Her sister looks at the pollen rain in the garden of her apartment building. Frannie, half conscious, sees the pollens but fades into the dream where she sees her parents skating. The pollens turn into snow. It seems like Frannie is lost in her unconscious from the beginning. She prefers living there, collecting poems and slang words. But, as she shares intimacy, she unites with Malloy. From the beginning to the end of the film Frannie suspects Malloy to be the killer. So, Malloy, being himself and also the killer in Frannie's perception, is Frannie's double. Frannie has confusion between the lover Malloy which reflects her good sides and the killer Malloy which reflects her dark sides.

Similarly, in *Taking Lives*, we, first, see Illeana in a grave. She, even, looks like dead. In addition, her state reminds us of the beautiful dead women of Gothic films. She is like a new vampire who is going to rise up from her grave in a minute. The grave, being underground, represents unconscious, according to Jung's theories on Mythology. She does not only live in her unconscious, she is so deep in that she looks like a dead person. She works so hard that

she does not interfere with anybody. When she chooses to have sexual intimacy with Asher/Costa, Costa side becomes her lover as the Asher side stays as the killer.

4.2 How does the Final Girl Survive?

Final Girl goes through a painful process, screaming, running, crying until she stops and faces the killer. Clover states that “When the Final Girl stands at last in the light of the day with the knife in her hand, she has delivered herself into adulthood.” (Clover, 1992: 49) Clover theorizes the the Final Girl’s development over the killer status, that is why she overcomes the killer with his tools, holding “the knife in her hand”. In my films, only *Taking Lives*’ protagonist suits this example by taking the scissor that Asher/Costa pierced into her womb and thrusting it into his heart. But, even in this case, where the scissor was pierced supports my theory. In the other two, *In the Cut* and *Mary Reilly*, the female protagonists overcome the killer without using their weapons. However, they all combine in the same idea that they free themselves by destroying the killer side.

In *Taking Lives*, Asher/Costa moves with sexual fury caused by his maternal super-ego and he has transferred his sexual fury to Illeana who is his new symbolic mother. Illeana, faking to be the mother, comes out not being pregnant, first. Secondly, she thrusts the scissor into Asher/Costa’s heart, symbolically showing that her power comes from the heart. She destroys Asher/Costa from the heart. Mostly, in slasher, the male killer is killed by being slashed from his sexual organs. This represents that their death comes from the castration of the Final Girl. However, in *Taking Lives*, the end of Asher/Costa comes from the organ of love, moreover, a vital organ. His death represents castration but in a different way. His is castrated emotionally and vitally. Illeana does not kill like the killer having any sexual connotation to the

murdering. Her killing is caused by her repressions but she frees them by killing her killer side. She does not kill to satisfy her sexual needs; she destroys her repressions by freeing them. She gets rid of the (fake) pregnancy caused by his existence which is symbolically the maternal super-ego. She builds up her identity again without him.

Mary Reilly survives because she touches Mr. Hyde. She does not fight him back like Clover's Final Girls. She gazes back at him and desires him. First she equals herself with him and then she stops denying her "other" self. But she cannot overcome her "other" self. She does not fail and become the slasher killer as Clover mentioned but she cannot free herself either. She has to be freed by somebody else. Mr. Hyde kills himself and Dr. Jekyll to save Mary. Mary was left alone because she cannot kill her dark side so she loses both of them.

In *In the Cut*, Frannie, kills the serial killer but not in his way. She does not touch the killer's weapon. The serial killer uses sharp and piercing objects to disarticulate his victims. However, Frannie kills him with a gun, a policeman's gun. She kills the killer not with his weapon, but the weapon of the killer's double which he tries to repress. Her weapon symbolizes the weapon of an institution, being a police force gun. Therefore, Frannie kills the victim with the tool of an institution approved by the society. In the same sense, she finishes disarticulating sentences and phrases. She prefers to share passion instead of thinking about it. She chooses the lover side and destroys the killer side. In her state, she combines herself together, building up herself with the qualities of her lover side and dealing with her killer side.

4.3. Accepting Castration

Final Girls use of weapon and what the weapon represents are not the only significant issues of the Final Girl's rescue. She finishes her journey when she carries responsibilities of her decisions. She stops running away from them and decides to kill the killer. Clover describes Final Girls journey into adulthood as male adolescent's journey because she theorizes the adolescent male viewers' identification with the Final Girl. I would like to propose that it is the female viewer's journey to become an adult that is narrated in these serial killer films with female protagonists.

If Final Girl "is what the killer once was; he is what she could become should she fail in her battle for sexual selfhood." (Clover, 1992: 50), she and the killers are similar on some terms. As Clover claims, they are alike by their confusion about sexual desires. The killer has suffered from resisting his sexual desires and ended up being a killer. So if the film narrates the story of the Final Girl, what we, the audience, wait to see is how she ends. Will she find her way into adulthood or will she loose herself between her doubles like the killer?

From Freud to Kristeva, many psychoanalysts worked on "castration." The threat of castration is born from Oedipal conflict. Daniel Kluge describes Oedipal conflict and its threat of castration as

the child during the phallic stage desires to have the sole attention of the opposite-sex parent, and to consequently eliminate the same-sex parent. One of the fundamental points in the development of a superego is in the

normal resolution of this conflict, where the child's wishes fail (Kluge, 2006)

Growing up brings the acceptance of loss. The castration frees the individual. Sally Miller suggests that "in Lacanian psychoanalysis where entry into the symbolic world of language and order is predicated upon the acceptance of loss, that is to say a symbolic castration." (Miller, 1999) Therefore, the Final Girls in serial killer films have to accept the castration of one of their sides which is evil for the sake of their good sides to become Final Women.

In *Mary Reilly*, Mary's double is both Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. Dr. Jekyll represents her good side as Mr. Hyde the dark one. At the end, she cannot let go of her dark side because she cannot part from her good side. However, her double shows her that she will be freed if only she has to let go of the evil side, although she has to pay with her good side for it. That is why the ending is different from the other two films but narrate the same story.

Therefore, at the end of the film, Mary opens the doors of the laboratory to go out. She wears a black dress and fades into the white fog. She is not white anymore. She still carries her dark sides. She is free for the moment but her future is not clear. She fades into her foggy future because she could not depart from her bad side.

In the Cut, exactly narrates the "Final Girl becoming a Final Woman" story. At the end, Frannie kills the real killer and comes back home to join Malloy. She chooses her side which gives her permission to have sexual intercourse and she kills the side that makes her disarticulate language. She frees herself by killing the killer and setting her repressions free by sharing sexuality accepting the paternal super-ego.

In *Taking Lives*, Illeana does not have a nice choice like Frannie of *In the Cut*. Her lover and killer, reflecting her sides, are formed into one person like Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde of *Mary Reilly*. At the end, she has to kill Asher to free herself. She has to accept the loss of Asher for keeping the love of Costa. She says to Asher that she does not know him, that her twins' father is Costa. She is not really pregnant but she from inside unites with the thought of Costa and kills her Asher side.

4.4. Final Women's Conclusion

Contemporary serial killers with female protagonists are similar to slasher films in narrating a female heroine's journey into adulthood. Carol J. Clover described this journey as the male adolescent viewer's journey narrated over the Final Girl character. Likewise, I have proposed that in contemporary serial killer films, the Final Girl evolves into a Final Woman; therefore it is the journey of the female viewer into adulthood. Clover's Final Girls rescue when they kill the killer. Final Women rescue themselves by learning to free their repressions by sharing sexuality and overcoming the killer with their own terms. They accept the castration, giving up the dark side of their doubled self that is reflected in the serial killer. As a result, because they accept the loss, they unite what is left of them. This unity resulted by the acceptance of castration leads them to their freedom.

Serial killer films with female protagonists are slasher films that have evolved into A class movies by changing their narrational elements. These changes differs the quality of the audience. As Final Girls of slashers have evolved into Final Women, the "largely young and largely male" (Clover, 1992: 23) audience of slashers has turned into mainstream audience.

Therefore, the narrative of male adolescent's journey into adulthood changed into the female heroine's journey into adulthood which represents the female spectator's voyage.

Films Cited

Addicted to Love. (1997) dir. Griffin Dunne
Alien (1979) dir. Ridley Scott
Alien II (Aliens) (1986) dir. James Cameron
Alien III (1992) dir. David Fincher
Alien IV (Alien: Resurrection) by Jean-Pierre Jeunet (1997)
The Bone Collector. (1999) dir. Phillip Noyce.
Bram Stoker's Dracula. (1992) dir. Francis Ford Coppola.
The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari.(1919) dir. Robert Wiene.
Carrie. (1976) dir. Brian De Palma.
The Cell. (2002) dir. Tarsem Singh.
Charmed - Season 3. (2001) Paramount Home Entertainment.
Charmed - Season 4. (2002) Paramount Home Entertainment.
Copycat. (1999) Directed by Jon Amiel.
Eyes of Laura Mars (1978) dir. Irvin Kershner.
French Kiss. (1995) dir. Lawrence Kasdan
Halloween (1978) dir. John Carpenter.
Hell Night (1981) dir. Tom DeSimone.
In the Cut. (2003) dir. Jane Campion.
Kiss the Girls. (1997) dir. Gary Fleder.
Lara Craft: Tomb Raider. (2001) dir. Simon West.
Mary Reilly. (1996) dir. Stephen Frears.
Murder by Numbers. (2002) dir. Barbet Schroeder.
Nosferatu. (2001) dir. Friedrich Murnau.
Pretty Woman. (1990) dir. Garry Marshall
Proof of Life. (2000) dir. Taylor Hackford
Psycho. (1960) dir. Alfred Hitchcock.
Shadow of a Doubt. (1943) dir. Alfred Hitchcock
Sleeping with the Enemy (1991) dir. Joseph Ruben
The Silence of the Lambs. (1991) dir. Jonathan Demme.
The Student of Prague. (1913) Paul Wegener.
Taking Lives. (2004) dir. D.J. Caruso
Tesis. (1996) dir. Alejandro Amenábar

Texas Chainsaw Massacre (1974) dir. Tobe Hooper

Twisted. (2004) dir. Philip Kaufman.

Waxworks. (1924) dir. Leo Birinsky and Paul Leni

You've Got Mail. (1998) dir. Nora Ephron

Bibliography

Answers.com. www.answers.com

Austin, Sue. (2006) Desire, Fascination, and the Other: Some Thoughts on Jung's Interest in Rider Haggard's 'She',
http://www.cgjungpage.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=748&Itemid=40

Babylon English-English Dictionary. www.babylon.com

Boeree, Dr. C. George (2006) Personality Theories: Carl Jung.
<http://www.ship.edu/~cgboeree/jung.html>

Cahoone, Lawrence (1996). *From Modernism to Postmodernism*. Cambridge, Blackwell.

Carroll, Noel. (1990) *The Philosophy of Horror; or, Paradoxes of the Heart*. New York: Routledge.

Carter, Margaret. (1975) *Shadow of a Shade: Vampirism in Literature*. New York: Gordon.

Clover, Carol J. (1992) *Men, Women and Chainsaws: Gender in the Modern Horror Film*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton university Press.

Felluga, Dino. (Viewed on 29.5.2006) "General Introduction to Psychoanalysis." *Introductory Guide to Critical Theory*. Purdue University.
<<http://www.purdue.edu/guidetotheory/psychoanalysis/psychintroframes.html>>.

Foucault, Michel (1973) *The Order of Things: An Archeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Vintage.

- Freud, Sigmund. (1990) 'The Uncanny', *The Penguin Freud Library Volume 14: Art and Literature*, trans. and ed. James Strachey. London: Penguin Books.
- (1991) *The Penguin Freud Library, Volume I: Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*. trans. James Strachey, ed. James Strachey and Angela Richards. London: Penguin Books.
- Frick, John W. (2004) 'The 'Wicked City' Motif on the American Stage before the Civil War', *New Theatre Quarterly* 20, Cambridge University Press. pp: 19-27
- Goswami, Chiranjit (viewed 29.5.2006) Review of *The Silence of the Lambs*. Review Site, <http://www.notcoming.com/reviews.php?id=521>.
- Grixti, Joseph. (1995) "Consuming Cannibals: Psychopathic Killers as Archetypes and Cultural Icons." *Journal of American Culture* 18.1, Spring: 87-96.
- Holmes, Ronald M. and Holmes, Stephen T. (1998) *Serial Murder*. California: Sage Publications.
- Hutchings, Peter (1996) 'Tearing Your Soul Apart: Horror's New Monster', *Modern Gothic: A Reader* Ed. Victor Sage and Allan Lloyd Smith. Manchester UP, Manchester: pp 89-103.
- Jancovich, Mark. ed.(2002) *Horror, the Film Reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Jentsch, Ernst. (1906) On the Psychology of the Uncanny, *Angelaki* 2, no. 1, 1997: pp 8.
- Kaplan, E. Ann. (1983) *Women and Film: Both Sides of the Camera*. London: Methuen.
- Kawin, Bruce. (1984) 'The Mummy's Pool', *Planks of Reason: Essays on the Horror Film* ed. Barry K. Grant. Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, pp 3-20.
- Kluge, Daniel. (viewed 29.5.2006) *Psychoanalysis and Film*, <http://www.dspp.com/papers/kluge.htm>

Kristeva, Julia (1982). *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. Trans. Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press.

Lacan, Jacques (2002). 'The mirror stage'. *Écrits*, transl. by Bruce Fink, New York: W.W. Norton & Co: pp. 5

Longman Active Study Dictionary of English. England: Longman.

Meehan, Brian. (1994) "Son of Cain or Son of Sam? The Monster as Serial Killer in Beowulf." *Connecticut Review* 16.2, Fall: 1-7

Miller, Sally. (1999) 'Nursery fears made flesh and sinew'. *Vampires, the Body and Eating Disorders: A Psychoanalytic Approach*. Royal College of Art, London. http://homepages.nildram.co.uk/~beast/publications/vamp_paper/psychoanalysis.html

Nietzsche, Friedrich (1974). *The Gay Science*, trans. Walter Kaufmann. New York: Vintage, pp. 246

Rank, Otto. (1958) *Beyond Psychology*. New York: Dover Publications.

Reference.com. <http://www.reference.com>

Rimbaud, Arthur (1966). 'Letters to Georges Izambard', *Complete Works and Selected Letters*. Trans. Wallace Fowlie. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rimbaud, Arthur. (1972) *Oeuvres complètes*. Paris: Gallimard, bibliothèque de la Pléiade, pp. 249.

Schneider, Steven. (2000) 'Monsters as (Uncanny) Metaphors: Freud, Lakoff, and the Representation of Monstrosity in Cinematic Horror', *Horror Film Reader* ed. Alain Silver and James Ursini. New York: Limelight Editions, pp 167-91.

Simpson, Philip L. (2000) *Psycho Paths: Tracking the Serial Killer Through Contemporary American Film and Fiction*. Southern Illinois University Press.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. (1994) *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. London: Penguin Books.

Stewart, Susan. (1982) "The Epistemology of the Horror Story." *Journal of American Folklore*. 95.375, Jan./Mar.: 33-50

Study Guide to "The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde, Robert Louis Stevenson." (Viewed 26.1.2006.) *The Glencoe Literature Library*.

<http://www.glencoe.com/sec/literature/litlibrary/strange-case.html>

Taubin, Amy (viewed 29.5.2006) *Silence of the Lambs* Review,

<http://www.criterionco.com/asp/release.asp?id=13&eid=7§ion=essay&page=1>)

Thompson and Gale Legal Encyclopedia. Answers.com.

<http://www.answers.com/topic/murder>

Tudor, Andrew (1989) *Monsters and mad Scientists: A Cultural History of Horror Movie*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wikipedia. The Free Online Encyclopedia. <http://en.wikipedia.org>.

Wood, Robin. (1978) "Return of the Repressed." *Film Comment* 14: 25-32.

————— (1986) *Hollywood from Vietnam to Reagan*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp 75.

Zizek, Slavoj. (1997) *Looking Awry*. London: MIT Press, pp.99.