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Gabriel García Márquez’ postcolonial, postmodern novella Of Love and Other Demons (trans. Edith Grossman, 1994) conjures an intricate world of neo-Gothic vampirism that joins Latin American magical realism and the fantastic. García Márquez transforms and adapts elements from one of his favorite novels—Dracula (1897) by Irish author Bram Stoker. The two authors share similarities in themes of colonialism—the misuse of empirical powers by colonizers and the evangelizing Catholic Church—and the abuse of women by those wielding these powers. The key focus for Of Love and Other Demons is Sierva María de Todos los Angeles, an ‘exoticized’ twelve-year-old girl who is demonized, molested, and killed by authorities from the Catholic Church—the church that later martyrts her.

The controversy over the novella’s depiction of pedophilia—In the exorcist priest, Father Cayetano Alcino del Espiritu Santo Delaura Escudero—continues and shares such controversy with Vladimir Nabokov’s Lolita, and the deranged, postmodern-schizoid narrator Humbert Humbert, who lives in a perpetual present, his adolescent moment of lust with the young Annabel, as he presently molests his twelve-year old stepdaughter, Dolores Haze, aka Lolita. Anthony Elliot—expanding on Deleuze and Guattari’s thesis—finds that the postmodern-schizoid’s desire is a “kind of schizophrenic overflowing of desire that produces and reproduces itself in aimless circulation [and] libidinal articulations…[that] short-circuit capitalism…[as] capitalist production…‘creates’ injurious traumas of repressions” (234). The authors use
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perversion in an ironic context in order to exacerbate the political conversations being enticed, yet literal readings of the texts continue to create controversy.

On 28 September 2011, Russian Orthodox church official, Father Vsevolod Chaplin told Ekho Moskvy/Echo of Moscow Radio that works by Nabokov and García Márquez were “justifying pedophilia” and should be banned because they “romanticize perverted passions that make people unhappy” (Moscow Times). Yet, I find the authors mimicking and mocking metafictional texts, such as the Bible, and the story of the older Joseph and Mary (age 12-14). In Church teachings, Joseph is not the literal pervert, who traumatizes his child-bride. Joseph is revered and sainted as the blameless husband of the virgin, a union sanctioned by God. Márquez and Nabokov use such disconnections to create the spaces for inversions and disruptions to draw attention to corrupt systems, supported by such fictions.

This essay looks at how García Márquez’ Of Love and Other Demons uses themes of vampirism and the postmodern blurring of the real, the magical, and the fantastic to antagonize the reader into understanding the postcolonial, political message in the ambiguous space where the absurd and repulsive acts of perverted seduction and ‘romance’ depict and evoke the disturbing and the ironic. María Beville’s “Gothic-postmodernism: Voicing the Terrors of Postmodernity” identifies such usage:

for Gothic-postmodernist writers, [who] attempted a deconstruction of the narrative construction…to fulfill the expression of the darkness of postmodernity, while postmodernist aspects operate to establish ontological and epistemological standpoints that query accepted ethical and moral ‘realities’, which have long been the focus of Gothic subversion. (16)
In *Of Love and Other Demons*, these subversions are located within a history that contains colonialism and conversion stories and are ignited through the fictive story of Sierva María, who lives in the port city of Cartagena de Indias in the late-eighteenth century. She is bitten by a rabid dog and protected and healed by her fostering caretaker, Dominga de Adviento’s African community. The child is removed by her father, Don Ygnacio de Alfaro y Duenas, the second Marquis de Casalduero, Lord of Darien, and later given over to the Catholic Inquisitor, Bishop Don Toribio de Caceres y Virtundes to be exorcised of the devil that possesses her (55). The Bishop cannot allow the enslaved African’s Yoruban beliefs to prove more powerful than the magic offered by Catholicism; thus, a power struggle ensues. García Márquez deliberately evokes the historical fact that Cartagena was the center for the Inquisition’s Holy Office Court, established as the *Tribunal de Penas del Santo Oficio de la Inquisición* from the seventeenth through early nineteenth centuries. María is confined, under the auspice of the rebellious, ambitious, Clarissan, “The Abbess [Josefa who] brandished the crucifix as if it were a weapon against Sierva María” calling her “‘Spawn of Satan’ who ‘become[s] invisible to confound us’” (67). María is incarcerated in the Convent of Santa Clara: [in] a solitary pavilion that had been used as a prison by the Inquisition for sixty-eight years and still served the same purpose for Clarissans gone astray. It was in the farthest cell of this forgotten corner where they would lock Sierva María ninety-three days after she had been bitten by the dog and showed no symptoms of rabies. (63)

While there, María is molested by the thirty-six year old exorcist, Father Delaura, who is later removed and condemned for heresy; then, “Bishop [Toribio] resumed the exorcism with an
energy that was inconceivable” (146) and the child dies. The extremes of history that García Márquez infers relate to María-Elena Angulo’s idea that in such circumstances “the reader is forced to reflect on the issues presented and starts questioning historical facts, and finds that many times reality surpasses the amazement of the imaginary” (40).

The historical facts that García Márquez fictionalizes in order to antagonize the reader are not just from the colonial past; child molestations by Catholic priests continue into the twenty-first century. Gerald Martin—*Gabriel García Márquez: A Life*—observes that this novel “though set in the colonial period, is conceived from the world after 1989 and is a much darker world…García Márquez saw a world going backwards” (490). García Márquez is depicting what Jacques Derrida understood in his discussion of hauntology, as the haunting cycle and recreation of history (*Specters 2*). *Of Love and Other Demons* aims to deconstruct the specter that is the haunting idealism of history, “faith in god, [and] humanism” (Toth 18). This is the Gothic-postmodern space Beville identifies as “The blurring of the borders that exist between the real and the fictional, …an interplay between the supernatural and the metafictional; a concern with the sublime effects of terror and the unrepresentable aspects of reality and subjectivity” (18), as well as the themes of terror, good and evil, haunting, gloom, the monstrous, and demonized for *Of Love and Other Demons*. In Jon Anderson’s 1999 *The New Yorker* interview, García Márquez said he “likened Colombia’s afflictions to a ‘Biblical holocaust’” and of the world that emerged after 1989, when García Márquez wrote this novel, he declared:

> [that] During the last fifteen years, a million and a half Colombians have been displaced from their homes by political violence. Forty percent of the country is controlled by Marxist guerrilla groups, who are at war with government troops.
and with right-wing militias that are financed by rich landowners and drug traffickers…. (Anderson)

García Márquez calls himself “‘the last optimist in Colombia,’ [and says he was] …closely involved in peace negotiations” (Anderson). Faith N. Mishina understands that García Márquez uses fiction in order to destroy political extremes and to open those factions to conversation.

Moreover, García Márquez looks at the ‘real’ historical and political landscape and understands the world that truncates to biased extremes: good and evil, the past and present. He uses spaces of intersection in those extremes—joining the real and fictive—for antagonism and negotiation, asking the reader to make the connections. Carlos Fuentes—La nueva novela hispanoamericana—understood such discourse and “the realization that reality is not…simple, Manichean dualism” (Payne 6). Judith A. Payne restates Fuentes and specifies that “Novels…possess the strength to confront Latin American reality, no longer as a regional fact but as part of a life that affects all men and that, like the life of all men, [it] is not definable with Manichean simplicity but that reveals a movement of ambiguous conflicts” (7). Fuentes believed that political novels with “romantic idealism [turn] into ironic dialectic” (Payne 7).

The novella’s title Of Love and Other Demons initiates García Márquez’ use of duality to draw the reader into the ambiguous space and his ironic romantic dialectic, two features borne out when María is “dead of love” (147); ironically, killed by the demonic bishop, who tortures her to death in exorcism, declaring her satanic, to protect the secret of protection and the deluded cleric, who has repeatedly molested the child and is obsessed with her. I dispute interpretations that Of Love and Other Demons is literally a story of romantic ‘love.’ Jean-Francois Fogel celebrates García Márquez as “one of the few novelists capable of evoking love without irony or
embarrassment” (Martin 491); however, I find that the novel is an example of Márquezian irony mocking and deconstructing such misinterpretations of abuse. Beville finds that within Gothic-postmodernism exists:

multiple levels of self-irony [that] tender a unique set of meta-discourses which run subversively against mainstream society and the literature that claims to represent it. Its meta-narratives operate to disrupt the dominating narrow accounts of history, religion, culture and identity by referring to inverted versions of the same, often implied by fantastic devices. (16)

This postmodern blurring of lines; here, between the real and the fantastic and magical, joins Tzvetan Todorov claim, in The Fantastic, that “There is an uncanny phenomenon which we can explain in two fashions, by types of natural causes and supernatural causes. The possibility of a hesitation between the two creates the fantastic effect” (Todorov 26); for García Márquez, it invokes the ironic, ambiguous space in which to deconstruct and disrupt the limits of historical ‘facts.’

The ironic space of ambiguity in Of Love and Other Demons is represented in the absurd musings of the deranged, postmodern-schizoid priest who like Lolita’s Humbert preys on a child “insulting and degrading childhood essence” (Amis) and invokes the “trauma of repression” (Elliott 234); from which, comes the parallel to the historical colonizers and evangelizers that committed atrocities and abused the native populations, their captives and converts, while pledging themselves as actors for God’s work. Michel Foucault like the Marquis de Sade would implicate that the priests’ perversions and abuses of power tie to their ambition, and child abuse becomes the ultimate representation of such perversions of power. The child, María, is
victimized by such a misuse of power by actors from a corrupt system that tortures those made powerless, in the name of God and ‘love.’ María is tortured, raped, murdered, and then worshipped, in death, as the “virginal” child-bride, who ironically died of perverted love. Such inversions create conflict and confusion, drawing the reader back to an ambiguous space in which to question history, ‘facts,’ and biblical teachings and religious dogma.

In the “Prologue” to Of Love and Other Demons, García Márquez joins his political and historical message to the mythic mysticism of the Catholic Church and to the regional reality of Cartagena. He heightens the message and impact of the novel’s intentions and displays the Gothic-postmodern that joins his use of magical realism. These complex combinations depict what García Márquez stated—in a 1981 interview with Peter Stone in The Paris Review—that “Caribbean reality resembles the wildest imagination.” His italicized, journalistic “Prologue” recounts the actual destruction of the convent of Santa Clara, seat of the Cartagena Clarissan nuns. The site of María’s incarceration and crypt are set in the former convent of Santa Clara that is now the Hotel Santa Clara near García Márquez’ Cartagena home. He weaves his intricate magic around the (1949) opening of the convent’s crypts, where María’s two-hundred-year-old corpse is found with twenty-two meters of copper-red hair flowing out. This event invokes magical realism and the fantastic in several ways, one example of which is the child having her head shaven before her death. Afterwards, “[María was] …found dead of love in her bed…Strands of hair gushed like bubbles as they grew back on her shaved head” (147). María’s African foster-mother, Dominga, “promised her saints that if they granted the girl the grace of life, her hair would not be cut until her wedding night” (42). After María’s death, tortured and raped in the name of God and love, an inversion and mockery of marriage, her hair grows.

Hispanet Journal 6 (March 2013)
María’s hair is the grotesque restoration of life and manifestation of immortality promised, used by García Márquez as a mocking nod to the church and the Christian promise of eternal life that hinges on unwavering fidelity and adherence to church scripture and dogma.

In their mythic weaving, the church creates a saint in the child the men killed. María, who “was venerated... for the many miracles she had performed” (5) had never performed miracles and is now victimized by the revision of her life and death, as seen in García Márquez’ “Prologue.” Here he says that he creates and frames such fantastic imaginings in the same “way my grandmother told things that sounded supernatural and fantastic... she told them with complete naturalness”; he uses this “journalistic trick which you [sic] can also apply to literature” (Stone), offering as an example the creation and addition of details to hyperbole and strange phenomena. García Márquez’ sister, Ligia, stated that “The world Gabo writes about, the one they call magical realism, is actually real; it’s the one we live in” (Anderson). This use of the real and the fictive becomes that space of ambiguity that antagonizes questions about history, power, and politics.

Although Of Love and Other Demons is mimetic of aspects of Dracula, García Márquez’ Latin American perspective is unique and complex. He tries to appropriate the fantasy of the purely Gothic narrative; however, his use of magical realism, postmodernism, and the underlying political message attach new aspects to the traditional gothic. Literary critic Kumkum Sangari argues:

the nonmimetic modes of García Márquez ... inhabit a social and conceptual space in which the problems of ascertaining meaning assume a political
dimension qualitatively different from the current post-modern skepticism about meaning in Europe and America. (157)

These spaces of difference enforce the fantastic, the uncanny, the ‘étrange,’ and the historical and the political. These form a center, an apex where García Márquez uses magical images to draw forth topics of religion, the suspension of reality and belief, the reality and fictions of history, and the related politics, here via the theme of vampirism destroying something by removing life via the guise of perverted love.

Love in the story is represented in various ways that fail the child María and are thus demonic, perhaps not in their initial constructions, but in their execution and results. The only pure, unadulterated love the child knows is the parental, unconditional love of her African foster mother and the African community that protects María. García Márquez’ biographer, Gene H. Bell-Villada remarks on García Márquez’ identification as a mestizo and states that “Of Love is the first and only García Márquez’ novel that gives some close attention to the African presence and the history of slavery in Caribbean Colombia” (250). Love and domestic attention by the spectral, incarcerated ‘lunatic’ Dulce Olivia, Ygnacio’s ghost bride and moral compass, is one of observation, and may be the memory of María’s own ghost looking back at the child-self, revisiting history with knowledge and experience from the future. The late and ineffectively performed parental love her incapable, aristocratic father finally finds for her fails. The violent Bishop ‘loves her to death’; “for the sixth session of exorcism found her dead of love in her bed” (147)—which I interpret as María’s rape and murder. Finally, María suffers the perverted ‘love’ of Father Delaura, who, when asked about his motivation to ‘heal her,’ declares, “Because I love you very much” (93). Delaura confesses he is “dying of love for her” to the Jewish healer,
Abrenuncio (144), who logically identifies these emotions as “extremes of lunacy” (144) and confronts Delaura by saying that Ygnacio thinks “you attempted to abuse the girl. And now I see that from a Christian’s point of view, he was not mistaken” (145). María will die from love—abuse, the ‘cure,’ the perversion and misuse of Godly/divine love—that for García Márquez means demonic love and evil. The Church creates a fiction in order to justify her torture and death, which means, one must suffer in adherence to the church’s interpretation of God’s will and God’s Laws.

María understands the horrible death that awaits her at the hands of Delaura or Toribio and says, “What I want is to die” (131). She understands what Derrida warns: “prepare your self to experience the future and welcome the monster” (Beville 16). Delaura’s response to María is that “God will reward us on the day of resurrection” (131). He uses the myth and the suffering of Christ in order to prolong the child’s inevitable death and to perform his own monstrous sexual acts for sexual pleasure and feelings of power. In contrast to doing Christ’s work, the priest is more akin to Count Dracula.

This demonic ‘love,’ the Catholic representative’s cure for evil, is the inversion of the Christ myth and message, and is more akin to Dracula’s cruel, murderous three-bite conversion that perverts the message of Christian evangelism. Ironically, when Dracula’s three “bride-maidens” (87) feed on Jonathan Harker, the vampire claims, “This man belongs to me” and the women mock him, “You yourself never loved; you never love!”; Dracula counters, “Yes, I too can love; you yourselves can tell it from the past. Is it not so?” (33). Love, for Dracula, is the third bite into the flesh, drinking his victims’ blood, and the ultimate union, the “transfusion of his blood” which turns Harker’s wife, Mina, into “my life and my bride” (47).
Jesus instructed his followers, “He who eats My flesh and drinks My blood has eternal life, and I will raise him up on the last day” (John 6:53). Dracula is the literal actor of these instructions. Symbolically, Christians drink red wine as a taking of Christ’s blood; Dracula, in contrast, drinks the living blood of his victims and is an immortal, the undead, the Anti-Christ. In the name of ‘love’—his stealthy conversion of women—Dracula visits them in different forms; he climbs down “the castle wall over the dreadful abyss, face down with his cloak spreading out around him like great wings…[as] He vanished into a hole” (29). On his visitation to Harker’s wife, Mina, Dracula appears as mist; “he throws no shadow…can transform himself…come on moonlight rays…He becomes so small…[he can] slip through a hairbreath space at the tomb door” (205).

The Count’s symbolic blood-’bride,’ Mina, is forced to drink Dracula’s blood to be unified with him: “his left hand held both Mrs. Harker’s hands, keeping them away…his right hand gripped her by the back of the neck, forcing her face down on his bosom” (242). While molesting her, Dracula, to heighten his anti-Christ representation, quotes biblical text from Genesis, the Adam and Eve myth, where Eve is created from a rib, taken through a wound in Adam’s chest, in order to be his ‘partner’ in the utopian Garden (Genesis 2:21-3). Dracula repeats to Mina Adam’s unification prayer with Eve: “you, their best beloved one, are now to me, flesh of my flesh; blood of my blood; kin of my kin; my bountiful wine-press for a while; and shall be later on my companion and my helper” (Stoker 247). The literal translation of Genesis becomes an adulteration of biblical text. Dracula continues by interpreting God’s punishment to Eve: “you are to be punished for what you have done…you shall come to my call” (247), in the dystopic world after expulsion, where we find Dracula and Mina in the corrupt.
Empire. The drinking of Dracula’s blood is also a mockery of the act of communion, in which the representation of drinking Christ’s blood to become part of him is grotesquely perverted, as is the idea of the unification of Mina and the monster. Mina is entranced and being forced to couple with him as the “transfusion of his blood…made her truly his bride” (47), as is María, the powerless child trying to stay alive, with Delaura.

Like the bloodthirsty Dracula, Delaura tunnels under the Convent of Santa Clara and “climbed the wall” in his cloak of “a burlap tunic…”; then “He showed her his bloodied fingernails” (123); he claims he “becomes invisible” similar to “Lucifer [who] is quite a villain…[and] has made me invisible too” (127). García Márquez’ sister, Ligia, recounts the family’s belief in Scriptures that say, “when Satan’s accomplices were vanquished,…they were left without their bodies, but their spirits lived on…some…float around looking for openings in human beings” (Anderson).

The ‘invisible,’ Satanic Delaura mocks the bible, limitations, and equates his power and passion with evil. An arrogant and inverted anti-Christian representation, he quotes biblical text while molesting María. He makes her chant:

‘Into your hands at last I have come vanquished’…as he opened her bodice with icy fingers… ‘So that in myself alone it might be proven how deep the sword bites into conquered flesh.’ Then he kissed her on the mouth…He passed his fingertips over her skin…and experienced for the first time the miracle of feeling himself in another body. (127)
The delusional priest thinks their final union waits for marriage: “For he had resolved to keep his vow until he received the sacrament and she with him” (127). Yet, like Dracula, he has a corrupted view of his coupling.

García Márquez joins this couple in order to evoke the historical context, which, in this case, is the Church’s misuse of biblical myths in order to justify violence during colonization and conversion. García Márquez draws us into these parallels with a sarcastic aside that Delaura “entered the life of and Sierva María and the history of the city” as “one of those rare figures who adorned the Christianity of his time” (77). Todorov relates such ‘rare figures’ of history and conversion in “Enslavement, Colonialism, and Communication” that begins:

Las Casas loves the Indians and addresses Bartolome de las Casas and divine punishment, under the pretense of saving souls in the recruitment to Catholicism in an absurd, extreme, murderous violence. Las Casas recounts the Caonao massacre: ‘And just as the young man came down, a Spaniard who was there drew a cutlass or half sword and gives [sic] him a cut through the loins, so that his intestines fall out….The Indian, moaning, takes his intestines in his hands and comes fleeing out of the house. He encounters the cleric [Las Casas]….and the cleric tells him some things about the faith, as much as the time and anguish permitted, explaining to him that if he wished to be baptized he would go to heaven to live with God. The poor creature, weeping and showing pain, as if he were burning in flames, said yes, and with this the cleric baptized him. He then fell dead on the ground’. (Todorov Conquest 169)
Here, the promise is for salvation and resurrection, an eternal life after torture, submission, and conversion. It is a vampiric world, where life is drained to support an evil system.

Michel Foucault found this type of power absolute and “numerous, its rituals so visible, and its instruments ultimately so reliable in this society that has been more imaginative, probably, than any other in creating devious and supple mechanisms of power” (History 86). These vast systems of power—colonialism and conversion—draw the true vampiric line toward the exorcists and executioners in such power systems, Bishop Toribio and Father Delaura.

The Inquisitor-Bishop Toribio is attracted to his protégé Delaura’s aristocratic musings and pretentions of heritage to Garcilaso de la Vega, a lover and fighter; also, there is “The fiction that Cayetano Delaura was the Bishop’s son [that] had replaced the older rumor that they had been lovers” (García Márquez, Of Love 138) antagonizing the Father/God and Son/Christ pairing. García Márquez has the older vampiric and powerful Church leader, the Bishop, mentoring his young ‘lover-son’ to do his bidding and promulgate the faith, which adds to their personal power, yet the inversion of the purpose, ungodly acts upon a child, creates Marquez’ ambiguous, mocking space.

The vampiric Delaura questions if “clerics go mad with joy in the Indies” (78). The Bishop confirms the Indies are “menaced by sodomy, idolatry, and anthropophagy” that Delaura confirms as “its greatest attraction” (78). Ironically, such men will violate, seduce, and devour the local population to add to their own power. The victim that serves the men’s lust is Sierva María, who was rumored to be “sequestered in the convent to satiate the satanic appetites of Cayetano Delaura” (138-9). The exoticized, Othered child becomes sexualized and is served for the men’s vampiric cravings.
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Similarly, Bram Stoker’s anti-Christ figure, Count Dracula, focuses his homoerotic longing on the solicitor Jonathan Harker, who is imprisoned in Dracula’s Transylvanian castle. Dracula cites his aristocratic lineage to Harker, as “a boyar the pride of his house and name …[with] the story of his race” (Stoker 24). Dracula devours the native population for blood that keeps his immortal life flowing, and prepares for his invasion and conversion: “…in your London, none there are who would not know me for a stranger. That is not enough for me. Here I am noble; I am boyar; the common people know me, and I am master. But a stranger in a strange land, he is no one; men know him not” (17). Stoker, of course, exoticizes and ‘others’ Dracula as a stranger. Larry Wolff finds “The Enlightenment had to invent Western Europe and Eastern Europe together, as complementary concepts, defining each other by opposition and adjacency” (5). Lars Kleberg finds that “Dracula’s vampirism has more often than not been interpreted in terms of ambiguous sexuality, an elementary force which threatens to undermine the norms ruling our libido and to spread its rebellious ‘message’ like a contagious disease.” Dracula is the example of such fears and rationales by empirical and church powers that contain the Other and spread the fear of difference and retribution by the Other. Kleberg cites Mikhail Bakhtin, who observed that “We raise new questions for a foreign culture, ones it did not raise itself; we seek answers to our own questions in it; and the foreign culture responds to us by revealing to us its new aspects” (Bakhtin 7). Ironically, the exoticized, Eastern European Dracula personifies fears, as he arrives to the Empire, London, where he bites, transforms, and enslaves English women, for sexual promulgation, in order to create his army of the undead, converted followers from the Empire for his anti-Empire. In Skin Shows, Judith Halberstam finds Stoker’s portrayal of the anti-Christian Dracula anti-Semitic, where I focus on the postcolonial manifestations of the
characterization. He is the inversion of the Empire coming back to show the destruction the mono-cultural English perpetuate.

The Anglo-Irish Stoker uses such prejudice and fear to heighten the argument from his political position for Irish homerule and his mocking of the English obsession with domination and racial purity. Joseph Valente sees this political crosshair in the homoerotic, doppelganger relationship between Dracula and Jonathan Harker (Stoker 87), an Englishman and the now-bitten visitor to Dracula in Transylvania, and understands: “This was the being I was helping to transfer to London, where, perhaps, for centuries to come, he might, amongst its teeming millions, satiate his lust for blood, and create a new and ever-widening circle of semi-demons to batten on the helpless” (44).

The arrival of the vampires ties to the arrival of the colonizers and inversely to the fearful ‘revenge’ of the colonized and enslaved that the colonizers use as propaganda for control, by creating climates of fear. Wole Soyinka finds such “emotive rhetoric” can blind a nation “even further, driving that nation deeper into an isolationist monologue” (Climate of Fear 79). This climate of fear exists because totalitarian regimes control the populace that lives in fear, creating a dependence and trust in the leadership; opposition to such power systems equals death (10). These are the places where García Márquez and Stoker bring the vampire in order to elucidate the conversation about feeding the parasitic monster and identifying that which is used for fear.

In both Dracula and Of Love and Other Demons these representatives, tired of the perversion of their purpose, arrive to port on death ships in the form of rabid, killer dogs to manifest the propaganda of fear, the bloodthirsty inversion of the godly. Both authors use the palindrome with God-Dog and connect this to religion. In Of Love and Other Demons, the rabid
dog has arrived at the Cartagena port on the slave ship, Compania Gaditana de Negros, which carried dead African slaves:

an unexplainable series of deaths [occurred] on board [the ship]. In an attempt at concealment, the unweighted corpses were thrown into the waters…The tide brought them to the surface and washed the bodies, disfigured by swelling and a strange magenta coloring, up on the beach….everyone feared an outbreak of some African plague, until it was verified that the cause of death was food poisoning. At the time the dog ran through the market, the surviving cargo had already been sold at reduced prices on account of poor health. (García Márquez 7)

Just as the story of María is revisioned for the church’s political purpose, so is the story of the enslaved glossed over; politics puts truth and fiction to its own uses. Soyinka’s “This Past Must Address Its Present” (1986), discusses the real in the fictive, re-enacting and inverting history within fiction, a process that omits a “strong odor of perenniality…[where] ‘The past enacts its presence.’ In such an instance, that sense of perenniality can serve both as exorcism, a certificate of release, or indeed—especially for the audience, a soporific…that such efforts can provoke changes.”

Such arrivals of change, also initiate fear. In Dracula, the death-ship Demeter arrives to port in England from the East and contains a dead crew, a mysterious dog, and Dracula’s coffins, filled with his native earth, that are to be placed in his new home, the Gothic ruin of the chapel at Carfax Abbey. The terrified Demeter’s captain represents a similar symbol of the ‘satanic’ upon the ‘holy’ as his dead body “was simply fastened by his hands, tied one over the other, to a spoke of the wheel. Between the inner hand and the wood was a crucifix” (Stoker 68) while “A good
deal of interest was abroad concerning the dog which landed when the ship struck...a fierce
brute” who “fought a mastiff and tore its opponent apart” (70). This fierce horror is the replay of
colonization and the Church’s misuse of religion coming in to port. The captain’s hands are in
prayer, holding a crucifix, an object representing Christ’s sacrifice in life for an eternity after
death, dying in one world—with eternal life in the next—as one sacrificed.

This inversion is used similarly by García Márquez, who writes of “the carcass of a dog
that had been hung from an almond tree to let everyone know it had died of rabies” (Of Love 14).
The rabies brought by the colonizers and the slavers equals the horrors that have been committed
in the godless place they have just arrived into, a place where the dog/god is dead. Todorov
retells a historical account by Bernal Diaz, who told of a monk who baptized a man. After which
“The Spaniards [who] hanged him from a silk-cotton tree, [and] a cross was placed in his hands”
(Todorov, Conquest 169). The cross is a blessing as well as a warning that with conversion one
suffers death and an afterlife in a system that first destroys. Perhaps it is the myth that does not
protect, yet, rather, kills before fictionalizing the Othered, in order to control via propagandized
actions and images.

This idea of false stories, conversion via a cultural vampirism, meaning the literal
draining of life in submission before death, is the scenario for García Márquez’ María. In
Dracula the dog/Dracula/the evil god moves into London to continue biting victims in the
unholy conversion. Similarly, the dog García Márquez creates holds a magical power to
transform victims into representations. The dead slaves’ bodies are representative of the truth of
slavery—that it is vampirism. The dog begins his siege and bites five victims, María and four
Africans, who all remain well: “the population of blacks [...] spirited away the victims to cure
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them by African magic in the settlements of runaway slaves” (García Márquez, Of Love 13). The message is that Africans are the pure beings that the fictions of the Church cannot harm; the harm is caused by the actions of men.

In Dracula, the dog arrives in London, kills the dock master’s protective guard dog/god and moves forward in a declaration of power, the counter-conversion: “the dog which landed when the ship struck…may be…frightened and made its way on to the moors…There are some who look with dread…[on the] fierce brute [that killed] a large dog, a half-bred mastiff…It had been fighting, and manifestly had had a savage opponent, for its throat was torn away, and its belly was slit open as if with a savage claw” (Stoker 70). Dracula is not a subtle messenger, and his message is one of revenge.

After arriving to London, Dracula’s first victim is Lucy Westenra, the flirtatious, aristocrat, and a representative of the corrupt Empire. Dracula hopes that Lucy, the undead, his death-bride will act in her ‘dual life’ as the inverted Mary figure, helping Dracula in his evangelism, conversion, and colonization. As the walking dead in her wedding gown, she searches the streets for children to convert: “the children, indeed all who had been missed at night, have been slightly torn or wounded in the throat” and “the common story to tell [was] of being lured away by the ‘bloofer lady’” (152). Lucy also tries to seduce men in order to bite and convert them: “Come to me…My arms are hungry for you. Come, and we can rest together. Come, my husband, come!” (181). The solution to end the seductive woman’s conversion powers is to execute her undead corpse:

more and more they [the children] lose their blood and by her power over them they come to her; …if she die in truth, then all cease;…and they go back to their
plays unknowing...Un-dead be made to rest as true dead, then the soul of the poor lady whom we love shall again be free. Instead of working wickedness...in the assimilating...blessed hand for her that shall strike the blow that sets her free.

(184)

The violent deaths of the undead others, the exoticized Dracula and vampire women, occur at the hands of powerful men from empirical countries: the English aristocrat Lord Arthur Holmwood, esquire, and Dr. John Seward, overseer of the “lunatic-asylum,” the American cowboy Quincy Morris, and the medievalist-like Dutch scientist, Van Helsing.

For García Márquez, the aristocratic Ygnacio and his slaver, drug-addicted wife, Bernarda Cabrera, represent the destroyed, old system of the empirical colonizers that enslaved Africans and the native populations; in the novella those populations are the true spirits that the Spaniards and Catholic Church exploited for power and material gain. Ygnacio is a weak ghoul, who is vampire prey: “funeral, effeminate...as pale as a lily because the bats drained his blood while he slept” (García Márquez, Of Love 9). Like the English that Dracula feeds off of to convert, Ygnacio is the figurative victim and creature, the result of corruption—the neo-Gothic, Márquezian vampire.

Ygnacio lives in a house “of melancholy ruin” filled with the “oppressive damp of neglect and doom”; the family’s heritage is uncovered like their “teardrop chandeliers draped in cobwebs” (10). The vampirism that the father represents is invoked in García Márquez’ “Prologue” when, in 1949, Ygnacio’s crypt is “opened [;] they found it empty; it had never been used” (4). Ygnacio is the living dead that haunts the history of place. The empty tomb of a soul lost to his corruption, as he relinquished his healthy child to the ‘cure,’ the false hope of Catholic
magic; he is in collusion with these dominating vampires who represent a system draining life. His family built their fortunes trading in human lives, running plantations, and now the “estate that had been the best…was reduced to nothing” (139); “The house was in ruins…chairs devoured by termites, the clock that had been stopped at the same hour…all of it in an air filled with invisible dust” (140).

Ygnacio wanders the timeless earth, useless, invisible like the dust of his empty house. He shares the vampiric invisibility of Delaura and Dracula, purveyors of evil systems. This invisibility and evil is confused by Bernarda, María’s mother, who fears the child is a spirit looking for a body: “Her movements were so stealthy that she seemed an invisible creature” (12) with a “phantasmal quality” (44). The mother ties a cowbell to the child’s wrist, in order to hear her coming. She does not see the child as a hopeful future, but as livestock, cartel. Both parents see María in their own narcissistic reflections of unrepentant evil, while the parents are the evil vampires, colonists and slavers, that search for hosts—food for their parasitic appetites. María’s invisibility in the novel says more about the political condition for women, representing those without power. Additionally, the mother may be correct; as the child is also a ghost of a former self, a lost potential. The dead women of the novel represent the doom for women. María is the unified hope that survives only as a specter. Derrida explains such a ‘phantasmagoria’ for Marx, as the representative “that is going to open up the question of fetishism and religious [; she] is the very element of this social and spectral becoming” (Specters 196). The mother, Bernarda Cabrera, a mestiza, antagonizes question of motherhood, the spectral women, as she is the dying aristocrat, the female representative of insatiable, immoral capitalist greed.
Bernarda’s vampirism takes the form of a drug smuggler and slave trader; she is addicted to fermented honey and cacao leaf; she is used to draw the novel to contemporary politics and the cocaine trade that haunts and destroys Colombia into the twenty-first century. This connects back to Derrida, who cites Freud’s conceptions of mourning, and “the body [that] is rotting in a safe place”, proclaiming “long live capitalism” (13). Ironically, Bernarda, the capitalist, is literally rotting inside her house “like a three-day-old corpse” (García Márquez, Of Love 9). Bernarda’s takes “dramatic purges[s]” as “she shat blood and vomited bile” (8). This connects to what Derrida sees as a purging and an exorcism that exacerbates the truth.

In the purging comes the exacerbation of truth, yet the corrupt family allows the destruction of hope, María, and not the destruction of the cause of evil. This family represents the horrific evil that being recipients of wealth, trading in human lives and using slave labor causes. The family rots like the colonial systems that are bound to fail, the heritage of vampiric, corrupt profit that García Márquez draw us toward investigating.

Bernarda was sent by her merchant father to “violate him [Ygnacio] when he played the innocent, and how they had planned the cold, certain move of conceiving Sierva María and trapping him for life…she did not have the heart to take the final step” and murder him and, later, fantasizes about “hacking them to pieces with a machete” (141). Her lover, ironically Judas Iscariote, is a free African that Bernarda buys and loses, after that “she had given herself over to unrestrained fornication with the slaves on the plantation…in crews…Then she began to pay [them]…they were fleeing in droves to San Basilio de Palenque to escape her insatiable cravings” (141); “Bernarda had been extinguished by her insatiable vices, and the slave yard
reduced to two wooden shacks with roots of bitter palm, where the last scraps of greatness had already been consumed” (11).

Ygnacio and Bernard should see the hopefulness in Sierva María de Todos los Angeles, whose names are fraught with symbolic meanings. María’s name and age evoke the figure of the Virgin Mary, mother of Christ, the same age as Sierva María during the Annunciation and Visitation by the angel Gabriel, who dressed as a man, and whispered to her the blessing of conception with God and her role as a holy vessel. Mary serves the church’s purpose in the central, Western mythic story used to unify pagan cultures to the Roman Catholic system. The female children (Mary and Sierva María) are doppelgangers that both serve as postmodern disruptions to myths, meta-narratives, and the misuse of God. Like those colonized, the girls are told that visitations are holy events, blessings, yet, García Márquez’ message is the inversion. This ambiguity antagonizing the question, how are either of these sexual visitations to children holy? Carlos J. Alonso charges that postmodern discourse (ala Jean-Francois Lyotard) such as García Márquez’ create “the breakdown of the great legitimizing myths of the West and the enactment in their place of specifically delimited and local narratives. Latin America’s obsessive and solipsistic meditation on its cultural specificity could conceivable be understood as an instance of such a narrative” (169).

Sierva Angeles, the angelic phantasmal servant, will disrupt the myth. She will ‘serve’ the church’s political purpose and, in the end, she will be murdered and venerated. Marquez’ uses Sierva María for his political purpose, creating a metaphoric exorcism that exacerbates and uncovers secret abuses by the clergy. The Bishop counters any idea of María’s angelic innocence and warns Father Delaura that María’s African name María Mandinga means witch, an evil
branding, of the African Mandinga. Yet, to the Africans it could be a name of protection, magic, and the place of power, such as in the pre-Columbian African Mandinga Empire, inhabitants of which are thought to have travelled to the West Indies in the fourteenth century (Sertima 169). This power is what the church must destroy. The child, aka María Mandinga, is bitten by a rabid dog, yet she is protected from disease by Yoruban beliefs, the ‘magic’ of her fostering African community that loves the abandoned child. The Catholic Church cannot allow Africans to have power, thus, they must destroy any proof of another system that protects, thus, María, who is evidence of another power, must die.

The Bishop warns Delaura of the child’s powerful name. Delaura, alone in the room exorcising the dangerous child, while she is imprisoned, shackled, bruised, and bleeding, dresses her wounds, and later molests the terrified child. The scene is a hyper-real perversion and recreation of conversion, in a sadistic ‘compassion.’ Such a scene was acknowledged by the Marquis de Sade in 120 Days of Sodom, where he wrote: “One must do violence to the object of one’s desire, when it surrenders, the pleasure is greater” (32). The sadistic, deranged Delaura “spent delirious nights and sleepless days writing unrestrained verses that were his only calmative for the raging desires of his body” (García Márquez, Of Love 99). The child represents a pedophile’s perverted desire for children, the desire to control humans, feeding off of the enslaved and powerless.

García Márquez takes on the demonic, vampire child-killers, men motivated by power in the systems of church politics and colonialism in the real world using the realistic fictive “reality effect” (139) cited by Roland Barthes, and inverts the evil purveyors’ intentions while he merges his characters with magical realism to bring forth horrific themes and realities within colonial
and post-colonial history. In *Madness and Civilization*, Michel Foucault identifies such collaborations in the seventeenth century’s creation of “enormous houses of confinement” (38) where, in order to exist, “a very particular character of simultaneous competition and complicity between the government and the Church [existed]” (43). Foucault discusses the kinds of power systems that exist for the fictional María, where she is the victim of “aspects of evil that have such a power of contagion, such a force of scandal that any publicity multiplies them indefinitely. Only oblivion can suppress them” (67). Therefore, women in *Of Love and Other Demons* are incarcerated and made invisible. The credibility of women is also minimized by the priests’ labeling them as satanic or insane. They are Eve, the seductresses who men must be guarded from, as female power is deemed a threat.

The lost possibility of power for women, who are sequestered, silenced, and made invisible, is represented in Dulce Olivia. She represents the magical and fantastic, the Gothic “dead-living thing” that Derrida identifies (Beville 19). Dulce Olivia also represents María’s phantasmal future, serving as her Gothic-postmodern doppelganger (Beville18). She lives in the Divina Pastora asylum as an inmate. Her contact with Ygnacio is via “messages in little paper birds” (García Márquez, *Of Love* 34) and phantasmal nocturnal visitations. Dulce Olivia wanted a man’s trade, as a saddle maker, and this “incursion into a man’s trade was the explanation given for her losing her reason” (34). “It was not easy to detect her madness” because she has been moved away (34).

Foucault discussed the use of confinement to spare families embarrassment from madness and illnesses, such as rabies, that caused one to lose control. Oftentimes, one was admitted for “‘derangement of morals’” (*Madness* 66). Herein lays the issue with María and
Dulce Olivia’s confinement. They are not ill; they are victims of a power-hunger political “madness in the world of unreason….[ironically,] concerned with scandal…confinement is explained, or at least justified, by the desire to avoid scandal” (66). These women intrude on male-dominated systems. Dulce Olivia intrudes on work, showing female economic power and independence. Sierva María threatens the Church, as her representation of African power must be contained and drained.

The incarcerated, spectral figure of Dulce Olivia can escape the asylum and appears in Ygnacio’s haunted house, at night, where she cleans and watches over the child. She visits Ygnacio, “the man she had wooed, Dulce Olivia found consolation in nostalgia for what had never been. Whenever she could she would escape from Divina Pastora through breaches in the orchard…and devoted the hours when she should have been sleeping to caring for the house she never had…” (García Márquez, Of Love 39). The ghostly Dulce Olivia loves the monster Ygnacio, and understands and hates his weakness: “You were always what you are now: a miserable devil” (137). She scolds him for not having “found the courage to oppose his father” (137), and for giving up the child. She claims, “the girl is mine, even though [Bernarda] a bitch whelped her…worst of all are the evil hands you’ve left her in” (138). Dulce Olivia can be seen as his dead daughter, the child’s ghost looking back on her lost life, scolding Ygnacio; she is the now spectral woman who loves him, an apparition. He is the destroyed monster, hallucinating, paired with an ‘insane’ ghost. This pairing representing the postmodern-schizoid, the insane, who are the only voices telling us about the corrupt world via fantastic effects that are used as disruptions.
Similarly, Dracula portrays the insane R.M. Renfield, an attorney and soldier, who calls Dracula “Lord and Master” (Stoker 213). Renfield is incarcerated in the “lunatic-asylum,” as he raves what seem absurdities, like “Blood is life,” which is actual scripture, while he eats animals and bugs, a “zoophagous-(life-eating) maniac to absorb as many lives as he can” (62). Here, unsanctified usage equals the rantings of madness, made invisible in the asylum because of his anti-social behaviors. The powerful, empirical men that confine him worry that Renfield “may want to get out to help him [Dracula] in some diabolical way” (213). Renfield’s truths are hidden in the asylum; he succumbs to the English beliefs, and to protect Mina, betrays Dracula, who annihilates him. Delaura, too, will be stripped of his accolades by his God/Father/Toribio who sends the priest to “Amor de Dios Hospital to nurse lepers” as the Bishop kills the child (119).

García Márquez’ portrayals of sadistic misuses of power, particularly regarding the taboo topics of pedophilia and sexual relations with children, continue and have been met with enormous criticism and controversy. In literal readings of the fictive One Hundred Years of Solitude, Innocent Erendira, and Of Love and Other Demons men of power have sex with children. One Hundred Years of Solitude focused on Colonel Aureliano Buendia and Remedios Moscote, who have sex when the child is nine. García Márquez’ (2005) A Memory of my Melancholy Whores finds another ‘perverted’ male voice, as the rapist Lothario bragged that on “The year of my 90th birthday I wanted to give myself as a present a night of crazy love with an adolescent virgin” (3); a drugged, fourteen-year-old prostitute, Delgadina, is chosen, and the novella continues in Lothario’s discussion of the relationship of obsession and in his search for power and immortality. These characterizations, once again, elicit a comparative to the story of Mary, the visitation, her virginal conception, and her marriage to the older Joseph. Delgadina, Hispanet Journal 6 (March 2013)
the fictive child, is a also a mechanism in which to explore the Latin American ‘crisis of masculinity’ that García Márquez portrays in the dying man, who cannot perform his sexual role. This is resolved in his perverse desire: “On the night of her birthday I sang the entire song to Delgadina, and I kissed her all over her body until I was breathless” (72). This scene finds a recurring combination for García Márquez: aging males and sexual acts with female children. These acts represent Ann Twinam’s research on Latin American history and the colonial concept where Europeans contracted “rape and the decriminalization of certain sex crimes” (Gutmann 375). These pedophiliac characters can be read figuratively as exacerbations of the larger political message, regarding the exploitation and sexual abuse of children and the use of force by colonizers, the real cases the fictions implicate.

Many critics have deemed Of Love and Other Demons as a literal love story, and a 2009 film by female, Costa Rican director Hilda Hidalgo, in her own words, “tells a captivating story of forbidden love.” The film found a limited release yet received critical acclaim and an Academy Award nomination for Best Foreign Language Film (2010). Many film reviewers commented that the film avoided the disturbing sexual relationship, the twenty-four year age difference, and the sexual acts of pedophilia, noting instead the film’s rendering of those as artsy, sensual depictions of the novel’s taboo scenes and subject matter. Where Hidalgo creates a moody, allegedly ‘sexy’ art film from the dark trauma of the story, García Márquez’ novel draws us into the rooms where the tortures and abuses occur. From a psychological standpoint, these priests are sadistic. They are the Gothic-postmodern monsters that reflect our worrisome Jungian shadow, as the text allows us to face our fears of the horrors of humans while exploring the
human “desire that instigates” (Beville 16) the actions where “desire to satisfy his longing displaces reason in his judgment” (Sade 228).

Similarly, Stanley Kubrick’s 1962 film version of Lolita depicts the twelve-year-old Dolores as a screen siren, a curvy figured, red-lipsticked seductress, not the dirty-finger-nailed, knobby-kneed child that Humbert admonishes himself for lusting after, as the “maniac” who understands his perverted gaze. This relationship finds similarities to García Márquez’ Love in the Time of Cholera as America Vicuna “a child in every sense of the word, with braces on her teeth and the scrapes of elementary school on her knees” is seduced by Florentino Ariza, who leads the child “by the hand, with the gentle astuteness of a kind grandfather, toward his secret slaughterhouse” (272).

Delaura and Humbert are the Gothic-postmodern monsters lusting for children under the guise that it is the forbidden love they cannot attain, as they acknowledge their vampiristic sexual abuse and destruction of children. Gene H. Bell-Villada repeatedly defines Delaura and María’s relationship as “a love story that dramatizes the demons and dangers of not being able to love…” between two destroyed individuals who find a twisted corrupt ‘love’ “[in] an archaic world in which individuals, owing to the limits imposed on them by their society, find their deeper potentials ultimately blocked and frustrated” (250). Bell-Villada claims the ideal would be a priest who could find an adult partner to satisfy his needs, but church law disallows sex and marriage and the system creates a secretive, perverse desire by disallowing what is ‘normative,’ sexual relations between adults, and that perversion is reflected onto the truly perverse relationship with a child.
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As Humbert identifies his monstrous “hell furnace of localized lust for every passing nymphet…[his] palliative agents” (Nabokov 18), Nabokov heightens the hyper-real musings of the insane, unreliable, postmodern-schizoid voice to draw attention to the atrocious. Heinz Antor identifies the unreliability of the narrator as the postmodern reader looks for “the negotiation of a new ethics” (12). Humbert recognizes his position as the unreliable monster and ponders his new purpose. He states that “Dolores Haze has been deprived of her childhood by a maniac…I see nothing for the treatment of my misery but the melancholy and very local palliative of articulate art” (283; Brodsky 53) Anna Brodsky understands that Humbert claims to be an artist, creator. Yet, like Dracula creating an army from the dead, Humbert is the anti-creator, “the very antithesis of that ‘kindness’ and ‘tenderness’ that is supposed to be an essential feature of art, for he unconscionably and quite deliberately destroys the childhood of another human being” (Brodsky 53). Brodsky finds that “the gist of Humbert’s crime is in not having ‘forbidden sex,’” but in destroying another life” (53). Humbert’s destruction of childhood links him to what Nabokov picked out as the most haunting and terrifying detail of Nazi terror—“the destruction of innocent children” and “is Nabokov’s experience of the Holocaust…the question it presented whether, in its wake, anything, art included, could be good” (Brodsky 53). Nabokov reflected on the Nazi genocide: “…there are things that hurt too deeply, for example German ugliness, burning children in ovens…I find such hatred toward Germans, concentration camps and any kind of tyranny…” (Brodsky 51).

In an analogous scene, Humbert stalks children in schoolyards, as Lolita must satiate his “desire to have her caress me while” (Nabokov 161) the children left school. This scene evokes
images of Nazi captors playing with children, who were lined up for extermination. Lolita represents those exterminated children, as Humbert represents the Nazi murderers (Amis).

Delaura’s destruction of María also parallels Humbert’s destruction of Lolita’s childhood and her destroyed life. Lolita is trapped with her stepfather; her mother is dead. Humbert understands “You see, she had no where else to go” (142). María is the captive who suffers sexual abuse, the death of her innocence, that is the precursor to her torturous death at the hands of the Inquisition trained Bishop. The perverted men celebrate their ‘lovers’ while the women literally die.

Both Nabokov and Márquez look to corrupt power systems, Nazis, the Church, and totalitarian regimes that Brodsky relates for Nabokov as identifying the “corruption and …collusion with the corruption around him…celebration is more paradoxical, and more beset by the pervasive evil in the world” (Brodsky 54). Like Humbert, Delaura’s art, the act of exorcism, is a farce and does not exist beyond the system he enforces, so, “it is impossible to decide where Humbert’s [and Delaura’s] criminality stops and his exquisite art begins, indeed, it seems doubtful that such a neat demarcation exists” (54). As much controversy as Nabokov stirred with Lolita, his message loomed of his outrage that the Nazis had existed and that “ethical dimensions of the novel” (54) needed exploration. Nabokov had fled both the Bolshevik’s and then the Nazis. In his afterword to Lolita, Nabokov shared: “My private tragedy, which cannot, and indeed should not, be anybody’s concern…” (317) joins the historical and creative; he brings forward the representative vampire he creates in Humbert and the destroyed Haze family to create a postmodern, fantastic microcosm reflecting human corruption and materiality as antagonist to the mid-twentieth century post-war American sensibility of family that Nabokov
viewed as unreal propaganda and the farce of a newer system after the unspeakable occurrences of World War II.

The vampiric, demonic Humbert, Delaura, and Dracula represent the corrupt world that fails the women they lust after, sexualize, and then take as their symbolic death-brides, killing the future for the young women. Women’s lives have been drained and destroyed in man’s pursuit of power, promotion, and promulgation. Martin Amis reflects on Lolita and ponders “how many readers survive the novel without realizing that its heroine is, so to speak, dead on arrival like her child” (“Low Hum”). The women in Lolita like the women in Of Love and Other Demons are dead. Both Sierva María and Lolita are dead in the respective novel’s opening. Here the dead narrator, Humbert (HH) marks the “tombstones” in the memoir (Nabokov 3) and introduces us to dead women, including Lolita, Mrs. Richard F. Schiller, and her “stillborn girl” (4). Annabel, dies as a child, and she was “the objective, absolutely optical replica of a beloved face, a little ghost in natural colors (and this is how I see Lolita)” (11). His wives die, Valeria in childbirth and Charlotte in an accident, symbolically ending motherhood and childhood where “The caretakers of the various cemeteries involved report that no ghosts walk” (4). Sierva Maria’s infamous crypt is open in the convent, and, as her child-corpse is exhumed, the narrator tells the story of her death. María’s mother, a junky, is the walking dead. Dulce Olivia is a ghost living with other invisible women in the asylum. The nuns of Santa Clara are isolated and the building is a crypt “occupied by those interred in life,” (García Márquez, Of Love 62) women imprisoned, “abandoned by the hand of God” (63) and buried alive (72). These women continue on as specters, haunting.
In Dracula, the promiscuous Lucy Westenra, Dracula’s first London victim, wanders the streets in her bloody wedding dress, the virgin death-‘bride’ who kidnaps children and drains their blood, the anti-mother nursing children on death (Halberstram 100). The scenario in Dracula represents the vampiric quality and message in these novels: women can only be victims of the vampire, while heroic, Empirical men carry the weapons for Christ—crucifixes, wooden stakes, knives, hammers, and communion wafers—in order to decapitate the Other.

At the end Of Love and Other Demons, “phantasmagoric nuns with veiled faces who brandished their crucifixes” chase the vampiric Delaura from María and the convent yelling “Vade retro, Satana” (146), identifying the monster, but they are powerless to change the course; religion has failed women. Simultaneously, the dead Dulce Olivia “shrieked in fury” at Ygnacio that María is the “pregnant whore” of the “Bishop’s son” (García Márquez, Of Love 138), but it is too late. These women and children are dead and powerless to change or create a future.

María, Lolita, and their dead babies represent the future world that holds no hope. They are dead and the world is childless, cast off like the bloody child the anti-mother Lucy Westnera “flung to the ground…the child that up to now she had clutched strenuously to her breast” (Stoker 181). The message reminds Christians that without the Mary figure, the Christ figure does not exist, and humans do not have eternal life in heaven. Without Mary, the church does not exist. So, María’s exorcism is an ironic undoing of a system that García Márquez judges. Carlos Fuentes claimed such a “vision of justice is absolute” (Payne 35).

In Vampires, Mummies, and Liberals: Bram Stoker and the Politics of Popular Fiction (1996), David Glover discusses Bram Stoker’s Irish, post-Victorian, Protestant, Nationalist, and Liberal views, and points to him as an author who positioned Dracula to look at colonialism and
the Empire, and showed “his consistent concern with questions of nationhood, character, and sexuality, and the close links between them” (8). Stoker was an Irishman and the pull between home rule and British colonialism in Ireland created tension in his Nationalistic stance. In order to find a place of compromise and moving away from the literal, Stoker moved to fiction. Glover finds that Stoker uses the Gothic and fantasy in fiction to relay a story while avoiding the limits of classical realism. This move toward fantasy elucidates the dream-state. Stoker’s narrator in *The Jewel of Seven Stars* remarks, “For it is in the arcane of dreams that existences merge and renew themselves, change and yet keep the same—like the soul of a musician in a fugue” (Glover 15). In a psychoanalytical reading, Freud’s 1908 essay “Creative Writers and Daydreaming” discussed how fantasy crosses into the waking state of day-dreams and becomes “the wishful fantasies of whole nations” (Glover 16). Postmodern theorist Frederic Jameson says that the idea of day-dreaming and fantasy is to take “triumphantly…from it what [one] can…in our or its own time be dreamt or fantasied as such” (74-5). This fantasy world is the world destroyed in order to entice the larger political message. Here, the Stoker, Nabokov, and García Márquez presuppose the ability of the reader to decipher the message, yet, in the controversy of these novels, one questions the use of the fantasy and the magical to elucidate a hopeful response.
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