

LIT155L

Horror Film: The Vampire Film

Leicester

T-Th, 9AM – 12:30 Summer 2020

Syllabus

LIT 155L – Topics in the Classic Vampire Film

Critical approaches: Genres, Media

Professor: H. Marshall Leicester, Jr.

hml@ucsc.edu

Office Hours: TBA

TAs

Eric Sneathen (esneathe@ucsc.edu)

Office Hours: Wednesday, 10-12 and by appt.

Chacko Kuruvilla (ckuruvil@ucsc.edu)

Office Hours: Friday 10-12 and by apt.

Class Meetings: Tuesday-Thursday 9:00AM-12:30 Zoom Online

Instruction in this class will be remote, via Zoom. The course is hosted on [Canvas](#). You do not need to sign up for an account, just login with your CruzID and Gold Password at canvas.ucsc.edu. See [Canvas Getting Started Student Guide](#) for further help.

Access to the Zoom sites for the Tuesday and Thursday classes is posted on the Front Page of the Canvas site for the class. Once you are signed in to Canvas, you should also receive a notice and the sign-in to each class in your email prior to the beginning of class.

Zoom Protocols:

Please join Zoom with **video enabled** so we can see your face during class. Please **mute your audio** unless you are about to speak (the mute button is in the upper right-hand corner of your image on the screen). Please **“raise your hand”** when you want to join in the discussion (the “raise hand” button is under “participants” at the bottom of the Zoom screen on the right). **Chat will be enabled** during class. Please confine chat to topics relevant to the class. You may comment on discussion, and ask questions about lectures and discussions in process. The co-instructors will keep track of questions, answer those that they can, and pass others on to me at intervals during the session.

Readings:

There are no hard copy readings for this class and everything will be

available in the Reader on Canvas. Working from home you can read the material online, or download it as a .pdf file and read or print it.

There is one **required** text: Michelle le Blanc and Colin Odell, *The Pocket Essential Vampire Films* (Pocket Essentials 2008). The book is out of print, so I've supplied it in the Reader

Films for review: The movies for this course will be made available for students in an online, password-protected site accessible through Google Drive, *after* the film showing each week. Instructions for viewing available shortly.

Requirements:

Note: Senate regulations specify that the credit workload for a 5-unit Summer Session course is an average of 30 hours per week, including class participation, outside-class reading and film watching, and writing papers. You will be lucky to keep it to that, but I'm required to tell you, so please don't feel insulted. Required information for all UCSC classes about disability accommodations, plagiarism, and sexual harassment (Title IX) are included at the end of this syllabus, as well as some suggestions for group tutoring work and a brief trigger warning for nudity and simulated sex in week 4. A calendar for add/drop and other deadlines is there as well. Summer Session has one rule unlike the other quarters: **You will not be dropped for non-attendance or non-payment.** You must drop yourself. Dropping before the deadline results in a full-tuition reversal/refund. Withdraw posts a W for the grade and full tuition is charged (no refund).

- 1. Regular and Timely attendance.** Attendance at synchronous class is required and will be monitored. More than one absence without explanation is grounds for reduction in grade, three absences are grounds for failure. Makeup work must be done promptly and students are expected to keep up with the work of the class.
- 2. Careful and timely reading and re-viewing of course materials.** These are available on Canvas (see above). **They will be added to from time to time; when new readings are announced, you are responsible for them.** Some articles are theoretical or general in nature; most are directed to the interpretation of specific films. Please note that in general readings should be completed **before** the class in which they are assigned. Every effort will be made to assign readings so they can be done over the weekend before class.
- 3. The core films (viewed in class) are to be viewed *twice* by all students, once in class and once via Google Drive outside of class.**

This is the most basic and primary requirement of the course. This is a class in the textual interpretation of film. You cannot understand a film as text having seen it once.

4. Written Work:

First week: All Students: A 1-page reflection on a specific example of film syntax drawn from *Nosferatu*, and due on Assignments on Canvas by 11:59PM on Wednesday, June 24. Details of the assignment are under "Week 1" below.

Class Session Papers (Weeks 2 to 5):

- 1) On a rotating basis, everyone in the class will produce some form of writing for all but one of our class sessions. There are two kinds of writing required: a response paper, and brief reports. In both cases, the more specific you are about the particular film you are writing on the better. Particular assignments and due dates will appear below in the Schedule, for your ease of reference. All written work is to be done after viewing the core movies **twice**, once in class and once outside of class from Google Drive.
- 2) 1) A 2-page (approximately 500 word) response paper will be due for presentation in class on an assigned Tuesday or Thursday, based on the group you have been assigned to. It is to be delivered in class on the assigned day and posted under "Assignments" on Canvas by 11:59PM the day it is delivered. (In other words, you will have the chance to revise and refine this paper after you have presented it to the class.) Please notify the instructor of your topic the day before your presentation, as it helps me plan the discussion.
- 3) 2) A series of brief reports on "something I noticed" about the film scheduled for discussion in class. This is required for both class days from everyone who is not presenting that week (i.e. you will submit a total of 8 of these brief "something I noticed" reports). It does not need to be long or analytical (so a few sentences or a single paragraph), but it should be something you couldn't get from just looking up the film on the web or consulting Wikipedia. This is the minimum requirement. **However**, you may at any time expand this minimum in the direction of "Something I noticed and thought more about" (up to, say, 250 words, or 1 page), in which you state a thesis or formulate a question about the film scheduled for class. If you ask a question, you should try briefly to answer it; if you have a thesis, you should give reasons supporting your argument. In either case, this is to be posted under

"Discussions" on Canvas the night before the class of the movie you are writing about.

- 4) To ensure some fairness and reasonable pacing of assignments, they will be scheduled according to your assigned group, as specified for each class meeting by date below. For the purposes of *recording, commenting, and grading*, the class will be divided into four groups (A, B, C, D), so that the instructors can become familiar with you and interact with your work. For purposes of *discussion*, each group will be further divided into two groups (A1, A2, B1, B2, etc.) for the week in which they write and report in class, so that there are never more than 6-7 people writing and reporting on any given day. Thus, each group will be reporting on one of two different movies in their designated week. For example, group A1 will report on *Dracula* on Tuesday, while group A2 is exempt from submitting an assignment, and all other groups are submitting their brief "something I noticed" reports. On Thursday, group A2 will report on *Dracula's Daughter*, while group A1 is exempt from submitting an assignment, and all other groups are submitting their brief "something I noticed" reports. This is conceptually cumbersome, but the aim is to provide time for everyone to shape our discussion of these films, without having to try to keep track of 8 groups with different names.

Final Paper A five-to-ten page analysis of a topic of your choosing related to the films and themes of the course and due at the beginning of the week after classes end. Further details forthcoming nearer to the due date.

Particular assignments and due dates will appear below in the Schedule. **All written work is to be done after viewing the core movies *twice*, once in class and once outside of class on Google Drive.** Class papers are intended to facilitate discussion. They are due to discuss in class on the day assigned, but may be submitted on canvas by midnight that day.

Binge watching for extra credit:

Throughout the quarter I will be sending you on Google Drive additional vampire movies that seem to me important or interesting contributions to the genre. Anyone who watches and reports to me on five of these will receive extra credit for the class. All that "report" means is a brief paragraph that proves you watched the movie, that is, something about it you couldn't get from looking it up on the internet. These are not required to be analytical. They must all be in by the last class, as time is tight at the end of the quarter.

Class Schedule

Before the First Class (over the weekend):

- 1, **Read Through this syllabus with care** and keep doing so throughout the quarter. **RTFS** is the first, though perhaps not the primary (see **3.** above), rule of the course.
2. Read “What’s a Horror Movie” posted in the Reader (on the Files site on Canvas) and attached to this syllabus, along with the list of film terms attached to the syllabus, which will be discussed at the first class.
3. Watch the short film clip “The Boring Prophet” on the Course Movies site <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B4id7X6db7T3MXlrVFN3dFBRdU0/view?usp=sharing>, and read ‘Expressionism, Architecture and Space” in the Reader.

Just for fun: *Le Manoir du diable* [*The Devil’s Mansion*] (France: Georges Méliès, 1896) 3 minutes, 18 seconds. The first recorded cinematic use of vampire iconography <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OPmKaz3Quzo>

Binge Watching: I’m sending you *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari* (Germany: Robert Wiene, Decla –Bioscope, 1920) on Google Drive. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B4id7X6db7T3ZndkWjJhUVZmQXM/view?usp=sharing>

Though not a vampire film, this movie is generally accepted as the prime originator of what became the “look” of horror film for the next 30 years – German and Hollywood “expressionism.” It is messed with in *Nosferatu*. You access the film through the email I send you. Double-click on the film. It may take a little while to load (usually less than half an hour) you will then be able to view it through, and to skip around in it as well. If you need more help with this, email me at hml@ucsc.edu.

Over The next two weeks: Read Wood, “Introduction,” in the Reader on Canvas, and Le Blanc and Odell, *The Pocket Essential Vampire Films*, required text (see “Readings” above) .

Week 1 The vampire movie and horror in the silent era.

(June 23-25)

Tuesday June 23: a) Introductory, b) Lecture: how to watch a movie (be sure to have read through the list of film terms attached to the syllabus).

First Paper Assignment: All Students (Due in class Thursday June

25)

For your first paper in this class, briefly identify 1 or 2 of the following in *Nosferatu*. Reflect briefly on the function in the film of one or more of the shots or cuts you identify, and/or generate some questions for discussion about them.

- | | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| 1) a pan | 2) a tracking or travelling shot |
| 3) a high- or low-angle shot | 4) a closeup or long shot |
| 5) a shot using deep focus or an iris effect | 6) a shot-reverse shot sequence |
| 7) a match cut | 8) a cross cut |

Movie Viewing: *Nosferatu* (Germany: F. W. Murnau, Decla-Bioscope 1922)

Brief first-response discussion at the end of the class (if time). This movie is one of the longest we'll watch – be prepared to stay a little later, It won't happen again.

Wednesday June 24:

Watch *Nosferatu* again on Google Drive.

Reading: Wood, "The Dark Mirror" in the Reader (Canvas)

Suggested for Thursday, due by the beginning of next week: Bronfen, "Speaking With Eyes," Reader.

Prepare a one-page paper for discussion in class tomorrow. Remember to re-watch *Nosferatu* first. Post it on Canvas Discussions by 11:59pm this night.

Thursday, June 25: **One-page papers on film syntax in *Nosferatu* due for discussion in class.** General discussion and analysis of the movie.

Movie viewing: *Dracula* (US: Tod Browning, Universal 1931)

Over the Weekend:

Watch *Dracula* Again on Google Drive.

Watch the filmclip "Abbott and Costello end full" on Google Drive

Watch *Son of Dracula* (US: Robert Siodmak, Universal 1943) on Google Drive.

Reading: Bronfen, "Speaking with Eyes" in Reader. Robert Spadoni, "The Vampire's Hiss and the Madman's Laugh" in Reader. Begin "Loose Canons" in the Reader.

Binge watching: 1) The Spanish *Drácula* (US: George Melford and Enrique Tovar Ávalos, Universal 1931) – made simultaneously with Browning's version on the same sets. 2) *Vampyr* (France/Germany/Sweden: Carl Theodore Dreyer, 1931)

Group A1 prepare 2-page response papers on *Dracula* for Tuesday's class after a second viewing of the movie.

Group A2, Exempt.

All others: "Something I Noticed about *Dracula*," posted on Canvas "Discussions" by 11:59PM Monday.

Week 2 (June 30-July 2) The vampire movie and horror in the Hollywood studio era, 1931-1945.

Tuesday, June 30:

Group A1 papers on *Dracula* due for presentation/discussion in class.

All others: "Something I Noticed about *Dracula*" as already posted on Canvas Discussions.

Movie viewing: *Dracula's Daughter* (US: Lambert Hillyer, Universal 1936)

Wednesday, July 1:

Watch *Dracula's Daughter* again on Canvas.

Group A2: 2-page response papers on *Dracula's Daughter* for this class after a second viewing of the movie.

Group A1, exempt.

Everybody else: "Something I Noticed about *Dracula's Daughter*" on Discussions by 11:59PM PM.

Finish "Loose Canons" if you haven't already – **there will be a quiz.**

Thursday, July 2

Discussion, *Dracula's Daughter*, drawing on Group A2 papers and Noticings.

Movie Viewing: *Isle of the Dead* (US: Mark Robson, RKO, 1945)

Over the Weekend

Watch *Isle of The Dead* Again

Group B1 prepare 2-page response papers on *Isle of the Dead* for Tuesday.

Group B2, exempt.

Everybody else: “Something I noticed about *Isle of the Dead*” for posting on Discussions Monday night.

Read “Exploitation” in the Reader

Week 3 (July 7-9): The End of Hollywood studio Horror and the Gothic Revival of the 60s and 70s (Next two weeks: sex, violence and gender in the post-Hollywood vampire movie in Europe and the US)

Tuesday July 7:

Group B1 papers on *Isle of the Dead* due for presentation and discussion, Noticers join in.

Movie Viewing: *Horror of Dracula* (UK: Terence Fisher, Hammer Films, 1958)

Wednesday, July 8:

Watch *Horror of Dracula* again

Group B2 2-page papers on *Horror of Dracula* for Thursday,

Group B1, exempt.

Everybody else, post Noticings, questions, or theses on Canvas Discussions by 11:59PM .

Watch *The Vampire Lovers* on Google Doc

Start reading “Carmilla” In the Reader

Thursday, July 9:

Group B2 2-page papers due

Discussion of *Horror of Dracula*

LIT155L

Horror Film: The Vampire Film

Leicester

T-Th, 9AM – 12:30 Summer 2020

Movie viewing: *La Fille de Dracula* [Dracula's Daughter] (France/Portugal: Jesús Franco, Interfilme/Comptoire Français du Filme, 1972).

Over the Weekend:

Rewatch *La Fille de Dracula*

Watch *Blood and Roses* [*Et mourir de Plaisir*] (France: /Italy: Roger Vadim, Films E.G.E./Documento Film 1960

Reading: FINISH "CARMILLA,"
Read "Immoral Tales I" in the Reader

Group C1 prepare papers on *La Fille de Dracula* for Tuesday

Group C2, exempt.

Everybody else, Noticings, questions, or theses on *La Fille de Dracula* posted on Canvas Discussions by 11:59PM Monday.

Week 4 (July 14-16) Sex, violence and gender continued; The Postmodern Vampire

Tuesday, July 14 (Bastille Day – les aristos à la lanterne):

Group C1 papers on *La Fille de Dracula* due for presentation/discussion in class.

Movie Viewing: *La Morte vivante* [The Living Dead Girl] (France: Jean Rollin, Les Films ABC/Films Aleriaz/Films du Yaka 1982).

Wednesday, July 15:

Group C2 prepare papers on *La Morte vivante*

Group C1 exempt

Everybody else, Noticings, questions, or theses on *La Morte vivante* posted on Canvas Discussions by 11:59 PM.

Reading: FINISH "IMMORAL TALES II.

Thursday, July 16:

Group C2 papers on *La Morte vivante* due for presentation/discussion in class.

Movie Viewing: *Martin* (US: George A. Romero, Braddock Associates 1976).

Over the Weekend:

LIT155L

Horror Film: The Vampire Film

Leicester

T-Th, 9AM – 12:30 Summer 2020

Rewatch *Martin*

Group D1 prepare papers on *Martin*.

Group D2 exempt.

Everybody else, Noticings, questions or theses posted on Canvas Discussions by 11:59PM Monday

Watch *Jiangshi Xiansheng* [Mr. Vampire] (Hong Kong: Lao Kun Wai, Bo Ho Films, 1985), and *Strigoi: The Undead* (Faye Jackson: St. Moritz Productions, Touch Piece Productions, 2009)

Reading TBA.

if you haven't already, start work on your final papers, due the following Sunday, July 26.

Week 5 (July 21-23) Other Vampires and conclusion

Tuesday, July 21: **Group D1 papers on *Martin* due for presentation/discussion in class.**

Movie Viewing: *Låt den rätte komma in* [*Let the Right One In*] (Sweden: Tomas Alfredson, EFTI, Sandrew Metronome Distribution Sverige AB, Filmpool Nord 2008)

Wednesday July 22:

Group D2 prepare papers on *Låt den rätte komma in* for Thursday

If you haven't already, start work on your final papers, they'll be due **SUNDAY July 26**

Thursday, July 23: **Last Class, Group D2 papers on *Låt den rätte komma in***
General discussion, *Let the Right One In*, final paper topics, and TBA.

FINAL PAPERS DUE BY EMAIL TO BY SUNDAY, JULY 26. THIS IS PERFORCE A FIRM DEADLINE BECAUSE GRADES ARE DUE JULY 30,

Basic Film Vocabulary

Angle – the relationship of the camera to what is being filmed. **High angle** refers to the camera looking down on the filmed subject. **Low angle** means the camera is looking up at the subject. A **straight-on angle** places the camera and the subject on the same level.

Apparatus – The material means by which films are made, cameras, sound recording devices, lights etc.

Close-up – a framing in which the scale of the object shown relative to the **frame** is relatively large.

Cut – 1. Joining two strips of film together with a splice. 2. In the finished film, the instantaneous change from one shot to another. **Crosscutting**: editing that alternates shots of two or more lines of action going on in different places, usually simultaneously (distinguished from **parallel cutting**, where the scenes in the alternating cuts are not simultaneous).

Diegesis – in a narrative film, the fictional world created by the film's story. That world need not behave in the same way as our non-diegetic world.

Dissolve – A transition between two shots, less abrupt than a cut, where one image gradually disappears while another image gradually appears. Sometimes called a **lap-dissolve** because of this overlapping effect.

Establishing shot – a shot with a distinct framing that shows the spatial relations among the figures, objects and setting in a scene. Also called a **master shot**. Editing and camera movement within the space set up by the establishing shot (close-ups, cuts etc.) are called the **analysis**.

Fade – 1. **Fade-in**: a dark screen that gradually brightens as a shot appears. 2.

Fade-out: a shot that gradually darkens as the screen goes black.

Following Shot: A shot with framing that shifts to keep a moving figure onscreen.

Frame: A single image on a strip of film.

Framing: The use of the edges of the film frame to select and compose what will be visible on-screen.

Mise -en-scène: All of the elements placed in front of the camera: settings, props, lighting, costumes, makeup, actors and their behavior. Generally, everything that is in the frame.

Montage: Editing. The way in which shots are spliced together to create a continuous film. Generally, everything that happens between frames.

Montage sequence (or just **sequence**): a segment of film that summarizes a topic or compresses a passage of time into brief symbolic or typical images; the segment is often set off by the use of filmic techniques that contrast with the treatment in other segments.

Motif: A significant repeated image, idea etc. The image version is also called a **rhyme**.

180-degree rule: A classical film approach that dictates that the camera should stay on one side of the action to ensure consistent spatial relations between objects on the right and left sides of the frame.

Pan: or panoramic shot. A camera movement in which the camera turns on its axis from a stationary fixed point (e.g. on a tripod). The classic pan stays true to the line of the horizon.

Profilmic event: the pre-diegetic action, what's really in front of the camera – e.g. actors on a sound stage or on location – as opposed to the fiction of the diegesis

Scene: a segment in a narrative film that takes place in one time and space.

Shot: the basic unit of film construction, designating camera on → camera off. In the finished film “shot” refers to one uninterrupted image (no cuts).

Tracking Shot: a camera movement in which the camera body is moving through space horizontal to the ground on a moving support, often literally on a track. Some versions and variations are the **dolly shot** (camera on a cart that is pushed along freely; the crane **shot** (camera mounted on a crane, allowing for movement up and down as well as laterally).

Some General Paper-Writing Cues

There are two assumptions that seem to show up a lot in writing about film, especially genre-film:

One is that what one is supposed to be looking for in doing this kind of work is the “effectiveness” of the film’s effect on an audience (a collapse of the viewing position to the lowest sort of lowest-common-denominator genre audience). It comes out in a very mystified account of how movies force us to feel things, which most of you probably don't believe when you aren't writing for teachers. That is to say, **most of you likely don't really believe that film techniques can be reduced to behaviorist stimulus-response formulas that reliably elicit certain emotions** (you

likely don't believe that shot of woman hiding from monster + reverse shot of monster coming towards her = mortal fright, or at the very least you ought to have suspicions as to efficacy of such a formulaic approach ever and always producing mortal fright), so try not to act as if you do.

The other assumption, complementary to the first, is that the only affect worth considering in this quest is "horror," whatever that is taken to mean (suspense, mystery, shock, fright, et cetera). This assumption tends to produce, for example, analyses of shot-reverse shot sequences arguing that going back-and-forth between monster and onscreen viewers of the monster necessarily involves the cinema audience in *sharing* the horror of the characters onscreen (again, refer back to the dubious formula above). This assumption also seems a good occasion to **reflect upon the degree to which a given horror film addresses itself to the body in ways more expansive than that of simply "horrifying" us**. Still another thing to remember here is that the question is not whether or not the film "works" in terms of producing its allegedly desired affects and effects. The questions instead are the following: **What does the film think should work** (formal techniques and use of "scary stuff")? **What does the film think you have learned to think should work** (the discourse history of the genre)? **What does the film do that cuts against both these tendencies**, undermining them, working against its own explicit plot and theme, doubling back on and re-deploying available discursive elements so that they no longer mean what we've told ourselves they mean? —because you've used them differently and simply because history happens, that earlier film happened, and it can never mean the same thing twice.

As you watch, think, and write, be aware that **shots and sequences come down to you mediated by a determinate agency** (the camera, the editing, the music and noise tracks, etc.). **Try to be attentive to the ways in which these films foreground the active work of the enunciation** (the jargon word for all that stuff in the previous parenthesis), **which tends to get in the way of passive, identificatory looking**. Try to think about **how cinematic technique often functions as the punctuation of visual content**, something that can **distance** us from that content rather than force us to identify with it. At a brass tacks level, such an approach has the merit of forcing us to consider the possibility that in shot-reverse shot sequences there might be a discrepancy between what's onscreen in one shot (what we can see) and the reaction of the characters in the reverse shot—what the characters say they see. One way to get going on a paper is to find a place in the film where "we" (the camera) see something "they" don't

What's A Horror Movie?:!

Discourse and Psychoanalysis

We could begin by noting that in the phrase "horror movie," the word "horror" is not the same kind of term as "science fiction" or "western," or even "women's picture" is for those genres. It is more closely allied to a genre-name like "erotic film" or "fantasy," in that "horror" here names both a subject matter (a genre proper?) and an affect or feeling which that subject matter is supposed or expected (or hoped) to produce. I'll take the two sides of this split denotation in turn, beginning with the genre, and going on to the affect. From the generic slant one might note that the horror film partakes of the general problem that haunts the definition of genre, the problem of history. That is, if the subject matter of the genre is a set of things which "are horrible" in their essence, and which the examples of the genre deliver, how can it have a history? how is it that these things that deliver the horrible can change?

I

As a genre, "horror" names a content, a set of themes, forms, stories, particular elements like vampires or things from outer space, typical situations (the slasher pursues the teenagers), etc. It names a range of subject matter that we might call a discourse. "Discourse" comes from Latin curro, currere, to run,

and it means that aspect of language-knowledge (above the level of common competence as mere speakers) that runs around the community of speakers, what's current, what everybody who's in on the discourse knows. "The discourse of horror" is a collection of elements, whether words or images or bodily motions or institutions that can be used to signify horror (the affect), because they've been used that way before. These elements of the discourse "horror" are drawn from all over, from literature, from the movies, from the newspapers and the folk imagination (legend, myth, folktale), from criticism as well as art. This giant collection of things is a text, insofar as it's composed or woven from particular verbal, visual, even musical signifiers (like theramin or other electronic music), but it is also a shifting collection of practices, ways of using things. A vampire is an element of discourse in this sense, but so -- after John Carpenter's Halloween of 1978 -- is a point-of-view shot from a moving camera (a Steadicam is best) where we don't see the person looking (there is no reverse shot), only what is looked at (especially if it is a teenage girl taking off her clothes), accompanied by the sound of heavy breathing on the soundtrack. Such a composite practice or combination of signifying elements signifies "slasher," and it is detachable and reusable. It carries with it an explicit sense, known to the discourse-community, of where it was before it got into its present position and arrangement. It signifies "horror" prior and in addition to whatever it is doing at the moment.

One of the things this definition of "horror" as discourse means is that the content of the discourse, its repertoire of signifiers, is historical and contingent, that is, has an arbitrary element: particular signifiers and signifying practices, as the example of the slasher POV shot shows, can move in or out of the discourse, didn't always signify what they do now (like that shot), or can stop signifying horror and be replaced by something else, as in the shift from rat-teeth to canines as the mark of the vampire from *Nosferatu* to *Horror of Dracula*. On the other hand, though, this shifting quality also means that elements of the discourse are available for new uses in different situations, they don't have to be used in exactly the same way they were before. The vast and shifting array of elements in the Discourse Horror are always ready to be altered, recombined, stressed or discarded, connected, corrected or dropped, depending on the different uses people want to make of them.

To see the raw material of horror films in this discursive way is helpful, I think, because it makes it easier to see any given horror movie (for instance) not as a thing that somehow has an essence ("the horrible") that makes it a horror movie rather than some other kind, but as an individual composition or construction, a particular use of the material. Elements of a discourse can be used in other discourses, or used differently to produce (join up with) another discourse: The difference between "science fiction" and "horror," when there is one, is not a matter of different contents, from this perspective, but of different

ways of reading the same elements. A discourse is a subfield of language as a whole, or a set of relatively determinate practices with respect to language as a whole, and its boundaries are shifting and permeable. This the perspective from which I would like to address the term genre (as in "the horror genre," "the western," etc.): A genre is a discourse and a set of discursive practices, a way of treating signifying elements. This view has some further consequences.

First, this view allows me to stress the agency of the users of the discourse, rather than just the domination of the discourse itself. Because a whole lot of things can signify horror, "horror" for the particular user of the discourse (e.g. the movie maker) gets defined by which ones she chooses to include or discard, which ones he stresses, which ones she makes up or appropriates that weren't in the discourse before. It's not exactly that horror as a discursive practice or generic project is whatever I say it is, because I have to use at least some of the elements that were used this way before -- I am constrained by the previous social construction of the genre that has associated these signifiers rather than others with the discourse. But I do have a lot to say about what, within those rather loose boundaries, horror is for me for now, and for you here and now when you watch my movie (though you do get to push back at me in your response, e.g. by not coming, so I don't sell well and don't get to make any more).

One might say that a horror movie isn't so much a thing as it is a proposition, an offer to enter the discourse. It is like offering a contract that says you will use a certain number of things that are recognizable as belonging to the discourse, and then proposing to negotiate about the rest -- what other things you'll use, what stress you'll put on what's been used before, and so on. So I guess you could say that a genre is a proposition that entails subsequent negotiation.

Side note: Insofar as this course is a historical enterprise, it involves identifying the major or characteristic elements that belong to the horror genre or discourse at a given time or in a given film. It involves looking at various shifts in the discursive field over time. Thus, Un Chien andalou contains elements like the eyeball slitting that aren't part of the discourse of popular horror film (too violent) at the time the movie was made (though they seem already to have been felt to create the affect), but which come to be so later (in the slasher film). Similarly, the particular dreamlike ignoring or undoing of narrative into a set of eerie juxtaposed images that Vampyr proposes as a generator of horror, wasn't taken up in the popular genres as defined by the Universal Studios model in Dracula and Frankenstein, which committed the form to a clear narrative line with discrete, bounded episodes of horror at particular intervals.

There is, however, another, perhaps more difficult, entailment of the discursive definition of genre, which is that each individual "member of the genre" (a phrase that now has to be put in quotes) is in fact a proposed definition of the

genre of which it aspires to be a member. Genre, in this formulation, is always defined from the current example back, not from a foundation or essence forward. The current example (including my own definition here) proposes and negotiates what the other members of the genre of which it claims to be a member will have been. What's involved here is a project to undo certain common notions of history and of cause, a project identified by the terms genealogy and nachträglichkeit, respectively.

Genealogy refers to the practice of accounting for something by looking back from the object of study in the present to those elements in the past that seem to be connected to it as ancestors, it is a way of letting now control and order the view we take of then, rather than positing a past that inevitably, causally, led to and produced the present out of its ineluctable essence: knowing what we know now we can say that the shadow of the vampire's hand on the wall turned out to be part of the discourse of horror (it occurs, for example in Wes Craven's New Nightmare of 1994, and we wouldn't have known that was going to happen until it did, until Craven, in the wake of others like John Carpenter, made it happen), while buckteeth for vampires has not, so far (though Werner Herzog tried to revive it in his remake of Nosferatu in 19??).

Nachträglichkeit is a term of Freud's, parallel in the psychoanalytic field of the development of the human subject to genealogy in the historical field of that same development. As such, it may help to bridge the transition I'm about to make from discourse to affect, from institutional and social history to

psychoanalysis. The term is usually translated "deferred action" in English, though it literally means something like "dragging after" (tragen, to drag or draw, nach, after). It refers to a psychic mechanism, classically described in Freud's case-history of the "Wolf-man," a convenient name for a course like this. This patient had a dream of wolves sitting in a tree which, after extensive analysis, he and Freud both agreed concealed a repressed memory of observing his parents having intercourse a tergo (from behind), as Freud puts it, what we call "doggy style." The question, which both the analysis and Freud's account wrestled with endlessly, is whether this event actually happened (that is, whether the Wolf-man actually saw it), or whether it was only his fantasy masquerading as a memory, and Freud was eventually drawn to conclude that both were true. That is, the event itself was witnessed and entered into memory before it meant anything to the Wolf-man, and only came to function as a trauma and the source of his neurosis later (nachträglich), when he had developed physically and psychically to the point where it could take on this meaning. Once again, the point is that the event itself, at the time it was perceived, genuinely did not mean what it later came to, as evidenced by the fact that it didn't do damage then, and therefore that that meaning was not intrinsic to the event and was only given to it under new, contingent circumstances later. At the moment when the Wolf-man formed his neurosis, he reconfigured his past to accord with his present, and carried that reconfiguration forward unconsciously into his analysis many years later, when he reconfigured it again in the analysis itself in the attempt (only marginally

successful) to undo it. One might say that the event didn't cause the neurosis, the neurosis (and the subsequent analysis that brought it out) caused the event to take on the meaning it did, to become an event in what we could call the genealogy of the Wolf-man's character. For now, it is sufficient to note the parallel between the two terms, one referring to a way of reading the connections of events across time in the world, the other to a way of reading the unconscious constitution across time of the individual psyche, two processes with a common structure of reading and causality that moves from now back to then rather than from the past forward to the present.

II

In considering the horror film from the affective slant, the problem of what the "feeling of horror" consists in, we have to note from the beginning that the fact of presentation in a film we pay to see immediately complicates the character of the thing we're puzzling about, because the feeling itself can't be single. We aren't just talking about a feeling of simple terror that arises from a real danger, or even from a real hallucination (e.g. a dream), but about something we could call the pleasure of being scared, what one writer on this topic, Noel Carroll, calls "art horror," and that I'll call "horror" in quotes. One might think of a horror movie on the model of opera, considered as a form that is devoted to delivering a particular kind of intense musical pleasure, called an aria, every ten minutes or so. In the same way, a horror movie, or at least many traditional horror movies, seems dedicated to providing a scare every x minutes. We might look into the

possibilities of a definition like "horror' is imaginary fear," in the way that a tragic opera offers experiences of imaginary sorrow, and typically that fear, like that sorrow, is given to us as belonging first to another. We often seem to be dealing with a question of identification with a character, of losing oneself in some way in the represented experience of someone else (the vampire's prey, the slasher's victim). In a general way psychoanalysis seems like a good theoretical tack to take in trying to think about this, because there is general agreement that the experience in question is quasi-involuntary, a powerful feeling that comes when it comes, not when you want it to: you can tempt "horror," but you can't be sure of making it come, its springs are unconscious. One of the things that haunts the definition of affect, parallel to the problem of history and social construction that haunts the definition of genre is that a proper theory of something like "horror" has to explain how, if there is such a thing as "the horrible" in and of itself, how can it fail, why don't supposedly horrible things always horrify?

I'll begin this aspect of the discussion with the retelling of a story, not a claim about actual facts but a psychoanalytic myth of origin, a story told now to make sense of the way things are now, by positing, nachträglich, what might have happened then to bring them about this way². The myth is ascribed to Jacques Lacan, and it is called "The Mirror Stage." It begins with the

²Judith Feher Gurewich has seen this aspect of the mirror-stage with particular clarity. See her introduction "Who's Afraid of Jacques Lacan?" to Judith Feher Gurewich and Michel Tort, eds. in collaboration with Susan Fairfield, The Subject and the Self: Lacan and American Psychoanalysis (Jason Aronson, Inc: New Jersey and London) 1977, p. 22, and note 7.

psychoanalytic thesis, taken from Freud and elsewhere, that infant children ("infans" means "without language") in the first eighteen months of life are not good at distinguishing between themselves and their environment, and in fact treat the world as a part of themselves, constituting their world from their own needs and desires, from their drives (Triebe, pulsions, one could say motives in the sense of the things that push you along, or move you, whether you know it or not). The child thus lives a body that is fragmented, floating, with detachable parts. The mother's breast, for example, appears in order to feed the child, a body-part constituted by the hunger drive, then mysteriously floats away, comes back later, etc. The French term usually used for this kind of a body (or concept of a body) is corps morcelé, or "body in fragments" (morcelés, bits).

At a certain point, supposedly between about six and eighteen months, so the story goes, the child sees itself in a mirror, and identifies the mirror image with itself (realizes that what it sees in a mirror is itself). The child's reaction is a delighted (Lacan's word is "jubilant") "aha!" as if to say "Wow! you mean that's me?" The image is perceived as single, whole, coordinated, while the child still feels itself to be fragmented, morcelé. As a result of this split between inner feeling and suddenly perceived or posited external appearance, the child forms a project to become the wholeness its body looks like, and that project itself gives it an intense, anticipatory pleasure. The mirror-image is an ideal ego, or what is also called an "imaginary identification," based on the notion (derived from French philosopher of perception, Maurice Merleau-Ponty) that sight makes

wholes in this way; it is held to be a property of the Imaginary to constitute images as whole and complete. Ever after, the child will think of itself, and strive to be, that wholeness it imagines it sees, an ego or self. But the child (and the adult it becomes) will always fail in this project, because the wholeness is an illusion: the individual's reality is, and will always be, the collocation of conflicting drives, even if those drives are now to be repressed and to become largely unconscious.

Now if the imaginary self is an "I" who is another, an other that I can never reach except in fantasy, that phantasm itself has a double character. 1) Insofar as it functions as an escape from the feeling of morcellation, of being torn apart by the drives, the imaginary wholeness is something that is desired. The situation described in the mirror-stage in fact generates a definition of desire as that which is left over after you get what you think you want. Desire is what resides in the constant gap between the reality of the drives and the phantasmatic wholeness of the unreachable image. Unlike a need (food when hungry) or a demand ("give me that toy") desire is what can never be satisfied, a wanting in both senses -- that is: lacking something and therefore trying to get it. The image is what you want and don't feel yourself to be, your ideal of yourself.

But 2) Insofar as the image is by its very nature and constitution inadequate to the drives it is intended to subdue and unify, it is continually beset by the remainders it doesn't contain, beset by the uneasily repressed, the finally

irrepressible, that which wants to break free of the imposed false unity of the image, and which hates the ideal self both for its mocking unattainability and because it requires so much restraint of the drives. Thus, the experience of the inadequacy of the Imaginary, ideal image to the Reality of the drives is always double, both shunned or repressed and sought or unconsciously desired. The name for that experience has come to be jouissance, a word that means first "enjoyment" in the sense of the pleasure of what turns you on, and is connected to "jouir," the ordinary French word for experiencing orgasm. But the word also means "enjoyment" in the sense of possessing or exploiting something, making use of it as one enjoys a right or a benefit, a piece of land or a sexual partner -- it feels good, perhaps but it also siezes you, whether you -- your ego -- wants it or not. Jouissance is the breaking through ego defenses of the drives, an ecstatic experience of breaking up or losing yourself, which can be felt as pleasure or as a kind of, well, let's call it "horror," the loss of the stability you identify yourself with. Julia Kristeva, in a book called Powers of Horror, calls this kind of unpleasant jouissance that breaks through the cracks in the ego abjection, the loss of self that occurs in such experiences as vomiting or -- if that's what turns you off -- the scraping of fingernails on a blackboard, the sight of people being carved up in a slasher movie.

This whole way of imaging the ego and its situation has the advantage of stressing the positive as well as the negative aspects of failures of repression. It

has the advantage, in fact, of making the source of what turns you on and what horrifies you the same thing, or rather the same dynamic, the same structure of events. It also has the advantage of defining these feelings as a relation to the body, that is, as consequences of having a body, without, as in conventional Freudianism, having to specify a relation to particular privileged body parts such as castration (which would raise the problem of why women feel horror, and necessitate, as it always has, a lot of fast talking). What this doubleness or indeterminacy in the basic bodily and involuntary affect itself, in jouissance, suggests, is that the basic affect evades representation except retroactively (nachträglich, in fact). We are dealing with an experience whose ecstatic immediacy escapes determination and only gets itself called or constructed as "horror" (or pleasure, or funny or disgusting) after it has passed.

On this side of things, it remains to be said that psychoanalysis takes all acts of looking, all visual involvement with an object, or especially a person, as being like this one, the mirror-stage. Looking at someone (or even something) else, is akin to, or modeled on, looking at yourself.

But as long as we think of the mirror-stage and the Imaginary as simply, primordially there, as functions of an independent human faculty of seeing that is always the same, since it is an ability of the animal, we still won't easily be able to explain the problem of horror's failure, why different things are horrifying to different people, or to the same people sometimes and at others not -- why, that is, the retroactive representation of jouissance varies with individuals and times.

To address this question, we first have to ask another, namely, why is there a mirror in this story? Clearly the mirror isn't really necessary, and seems anomalous -- what about cultures that don't have mirrors? Don't they have egos? On reflection, it seems obvious that all that's really necessary for the mirror stage to occur is for the child to identify itself with the image it sees in a mud puddle, or someone else's eyes -- in fact all it has to do is make the connection somehow between its own body, which it can't see all of, and the bodies of others that it can see. By calling this event the mirror stage, Lacan deliberately brings in an image that makes it seem ego-formation is dependent on a particular piece of technology, something people had to make. This conspicuously inadequate image is, I think, deliberately inadequate, in exactly the way child's self-image is, in order to point to the fact that the apparently primordial and independent faculty of vision, the Imaginary, is itself always supported by some specific prior human construction. The mirror means that whatever there is to be looked at (oneself) is always already framed, constituted, by a network of prior cultural constructions -- that the Imaginary itself is always already Symbolic.

THIS MIGHT BE A GOOD PLACE to point out that this is where my two perspectives cross -- the entry of discourse into affect.

The Symbolic is the term in this system for language, considered in the largest possible way as any form of organized signifying relation or practice -- besides languages like English or French it includes such things as body-

language (pointing or crying) and kinship systems (ways of classifying the relations of human bodies to one another, whose arbitrary, human-made symbolic character is revealed in the fact that what counts as kin differs from culture to culture). The point about Language in this large sense is that it is something human beings made and something they constantly change, which is also something that is always here before any individual human being arrives, and into which each newly-arrived human being has to enter.

But to enter into language is to be separated from the "real world" (which now has to be put in quotes) to which language refers, by the very fact that reference puts what referred to at a distance -- defers it. Because the word is not the thing (it differs from it), it gets between the speaker and the thing and puts off (defers) access to it. For this way of thinking one is only a human being by entering into language: that is, one is only human by being separated from the world and from oneself. But this is a different way of saying what the myth of the mirror stage also says: you form your ego by installing an image (an image which is a fraud, which is really only a kind of language or representation, a symbolic image) between the reality of your drives and the separate mystery of the external world. The Imaginary is the Symbolic posing as the Real.

(The Real in this system is the "x-factor," what there is no direct access to, and it comes in two forms. 1) The mysteriousness or unreachability of the world outside of vision or representation, for example the fact that we know the world is "really" composed of atomic and subatomic dispositions of matter and energy

which don't appear to perception, and which can only be indirectly, mathematically, symbolized. 2) the mysteriousness of the instincts that make up the repressed drives -- sex, hunger, etc., that arise beyond the individual's control. The Real is only manifest in experience as a kind of poke of contingency or desire (jouissance), which generates Symbolic or Imaginary representations that endeavor, after the fact (nachträglich) to explain, contain and control whatever it is that happened.)

Symbolic and Imaginary, then, are words for two ways of experiencing the same object even if, as in a movie, that object is itself an image. To see the object as a signifier, part of a system, something that points beyond itself to a reality that it isn't, is to see it as symbolic, or as part of the Symbolic, a piece of language. But to see a film image as not just a picture of a real object but as if it were itself that object is to move it into the Imaginary, to convert the image to, and treat it as, a body capable of being desired or feared (it is one of the odd, and apparently distinctive, things about being human that we can do this). You make a film image Imaginary when you become caught up in it and invest it with your desire, when you treat it the same way the child in the mirror-stage treats its own image (remember that desire and fear are two ways of experiencing the same thing, jouissance). The dynamics and erotics of seeing are such that all seeing is tempted by or inclined to the Imaginary, to constituting the beheld as bodies of desire. But the Imaginary itself is also always liable to be invaded and undone by the Symbolic that supports it -- it's just a mirror, "just a movie."

Though all of this is necessarily sketchy and preliminary, it does offer a suggestion of what it might mean to think of a horror movie as a form (institution, discourse, genre) devoted to the pleasure of being scared. As a set of images that have been used this way before, and organized in ways that also have a relation to similar uses in the past, such a movie offers the potential raw material of the experience of Horror. Horror when it came, if it came, would be the Real, the experience of being morcellated, coming apart -- or maybe just the fear or fantasy of such an experience -- and our previous discussion suggests that the experience could be expected to be an undecidable balance or mix of abjection and pleasure, a jouissance. What a horror movie offers is "horror," a discursive or Symbolic presentation of what has been previously made by culture in order to call forth Horror. As such, the movie is a Symbolic waiting to be converted into an Imaginary, something that may succeed in calling real Horror out -- or it may not.

This view of the kind of thing a horror movie is, finally, has consequences for the method of analyzing them. Since Horror is complexly contingent, psychological, individual, varies from time to time, and is not reliably present in any given moment or movie, it seems more productive not to use it as a criterion, but to concentrate instead on "horror," the Symbolic-discursive framing or construction of a site where Horror could or should occur, according to the text (the movie) being analyzed. This method will attend, in other words, not to what actually scares you in the film you're studying (though of course you shouldn't

LIT155L

Horror Film: The Vampire Film

Leicester

T-Th, 9AM – 12:30 Summer 2020

ignore that), but rather to what the film thinks ought to scare you, what it posits as horrible.

Important Summer Session Remote 2020 Deadlines:

Session 1:

Drop: Monday, June 29

Request for "W": Friday, July 10

Session 2:

Drop: Monday, August 3

Request for "W": Friday, August 14

8-Week:

Drop: Monday, July 6

Request for "W": Friday, July 24

10-Week:

Drop: Monday, July 6

Request for "W": Friday, July 24

Summer is unique. **You will not be dropped for non-attendance or non-payment.** You must drop yourself. Dropping before the deadline results in a full-tuition reversal/refund. Withdraw posts a W for the grade and full tuition is charged (no refund).

For all dates and deadlines, including 'change of grade option' (P/NP) and grades due, here is the summer academic calendar: <https://summer.ucsc.edu/studentlife/index.html>

For questions about dropping, requesting a W grade for a course, or withdrawing from the summer quarter, email summer@ucsc.edu.

DRC Remote Accommodations:

The Disability Resources Center reduces barriers to inclusion and full participation for students with disabilities by providing support to individually determine reasonable academic accommodations. Operations continue via remote appointments. If you have questions or concerns about exam accommodations or any other disability-related matter, email the DRC Schedulers at drc@ucsc.edu for an appointment.

Small Group Tutoring

Small Group Tutoring (SGT) supports students academically to advance educational equity by designing inclusive learning environments outside of the classroom. In SGT, you can expect the Tutor to facilitate cooperative group activities designed to have students work together on the course content and develop study skills for the course. SGT is offered at least three times each week for the entire quarter. The Tutor is an undergraduate student who took the class, did well, and is trained to facilitate group sessions to focus on students' needs to succeed in the course. SGT is open to all students enrolled in the class and they must sign up on our online system: TutorTrac. When students sign up for SGT, they are committing to attend every week. For Summer 2020, students can begin signing up for tutoring on **Monday, June 22rd** and tutoring will begin **Wednesday, June 24th**. Students only have to sign up once for tutoring and their appointments will repeat weekly. Sign-ups will close on **Friday, August 14th** for all Summer Session Sign-Ups. This means that after **August 14th**, no new students can sign up for tutoring.

Want SGT to be successful for you? Bring your books, lecture notes, questions, and be open to working collaboratively with your peers. You can sign up using this link: <https://ucsc-go-redrock.com/tracweb40/NoAccess.4sp?errText=insufficient%20credentials%20to%20view%20content>

You can also find the link on our website: <https://lss.ucsc.edu/index.html>

Academic Dishonesty

Academic integrity is the cornerstone of a university education. Academic dishonesty diminishes the university as an institution and all members of the university community. It tarnishes the value of a UCSC degree. All members of the UCSC community have an explicit responsibility to foster an environment of trust, honesty, fairness, respect, and responsibility. All members of the university community are expected to present as their original work only that which is

LIT155L

Horror Film: The Vampire Film

Leicester

T-Th, 9AM – 12:30 Summer 2020

truly their own. All members of the community are expected to report observed instances of cheating, plagiarism, and other forms of academic dishonesty in order to ensure that the integrity of scholarship is valued and preserved at UCSC.

In the event a student is found in violation of the UCSC Academic Integrity policy, he or she may face both academic sanctions imposed by the instructor of record and disciplinary sanctions imposed either by the provost of his or her college or the Academic Tribunal convened to hear the case. Violations of the Academic Integrity policy can result in dismissal from the university and a permanent notation on a student's transcript.

For the full policy and disciplinary procedures on academic dishonesty, students and instructors should refer to the [Academic Integrity page](#) at the Division of Undergraduate Education.

Title IX:

The university cherishes the free and open exchange of ideas and enlargement of knowledge. To maintain this freedom and openness requires objectivity, mutual trust, and confidence; it requires the absence of coercion, intimidation, or exploitation. The principal responsibility for maintaining these conditions must rest upon those members of the university community who exercise most authority and leadership: faculty, managers, and supervisors.

The university has therefore instituted a number of measures designed to protect its community from sex discrimination, sexual harassment, sexual violence, and other related prohibited conduct. [Information about the Title IX Office](#), the [online reporting link](#), applicable campus resources, reporting responsibilities, the [UC Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment](#), and the UC Santa Cruz Procedures for Reporting and Responding to Reports of Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment can be found at titleix.ucsc.edu.

The Title IX Office is actively responding to reports and requests for consultation. If you are not currently working with someone in the office and want to make a report/request a consult, you can expect the fastest response by using our [online reporting link](#).

For more information please visit the [Title IX Operations under Covid-19](#) page.

Trigger Warning, week 4:

The levels of violence in these films are, by modern standards not high, and you probably wouldn't take a horror movie course without expecting some biting and gore along the way. Though our contemporary standards for the representation of sex and sexuality in popular films are pretty free, the movies we will watch in week 4, *La Fille de Dracula*, and *La Morte vivante*, though not actually pornographic, investigate issues of sexuality and the body in fairly graphic terms. There will be naked people engaging in simulated sexual activity. It is to be hoped that by that time you will be used to thinking about what is being done cinematically and interpretively with the content, rather than stopping at the content only. These films don't just *show* sex, they are *about* it.

LIT155L

Leicester

Horror Film: The Vampire Film

T-Th, 9AM – 12:30 Summer 2020